

CONVEYANCE SAFETY CODE COUNCIL MEETING
Room 121C, 1400 East Washington Avenue, Madison
Contact: Helen Leong (608) 266-2112
March 22, 2018

9:30 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 (1-2)

B. Approval of Minutes of January 17, 2018 (3-5)

C. Administrative Matters

D. Legislative and Administrative Rule Matters - Discussion and Consideration (6-49)

1. Review and Discussion of Proposed Changes and Recommendations to the Conveyance Safety Code, SPS 305 and SPS 318 **(6-44)**
2. Discussion of potential adoption of ANSI E1.42 – 2016, Entertainment Technology – Design, Installation, and Use of Orchestra Pit Lifts to the Conveyance Safety Code, SPS 318 **(45-49)**
3. Discussion of updated standards, ASME A17.1-2016, Safety Code for Elevators and Escalators to the Conveyance Safety Code, SPS 318
4. Discussion of updated standards, ASME A18.1-2014 and A18.1-2017, Safety Standard for Platform Lifts and Stairway Chairlifts to the Conveyance Safety Code, 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 council’s agenda, please call the listed contact person. The council

may consider materials or items filed after the transmission of this notice. Interpreters for the hearing impaired provided upon request by contacting the Affirmative Action Officer, 608-266-2112.

**CONVEYANCE SAFETY CODE COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
January 17, 2018**

PRESENT: Scot Bromann, Jennie Macaluso (*arrived at 9:06 a.m.*), Keith Misustin, Ronald Mueller, Brian Rausch, Paul Rosenberg, Kenneth Smith

EXCUSED: Steven Ketelboeter

STAFF: Helen Leong, Administrative Rules Coordinator; Laura Smith, Bureau Assistant; Paul Rosenberg, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. A quorum of six (6) members was confirmed.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF DECEMBER 11, 2017

- *Correct the spelling of Robin Zentner's name on page 1 and page 2*

MOTION: Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Keith Misustin, to approve the minutes of December 11, 2017 as amended. Motion carried unanimously.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Election of Officers

COUNCIL CHAIR

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

Helen Leong 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.

Helen Leong called for nominations three (3) times.

Kenneth Smith was elected as Vice Chair by unanimous consent.

Council Meeting Date Scheduling

The council selected March 22, 2018 at 9:30 a.m. and April 18, 2018 at 9:00 a.m. as the next two meeting dates.

LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE RULE MATTERS

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

- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to accept the proposed language for SPS 318.1011 (7) as given in the table as Item 15. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to accept the proposed language for SPS 318.1702 (10) (b) 3 as given in the table as Item 23. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to adopt the note addressing SPS 318.1705 (3) as given in the table as Item 26. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to accept the proposed language for SPS 318.1705 (3) (cm) and (cs) as given in the table as Item 30. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Jennie Macaluso moved, seconded by Keith Misustin, to remove Item 42 as given in the table. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Jennie Macaluso, to table Item 43. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to require Category 1 and Category 5 testing on a 60-month cycle and maintain annual inspections for dumbwaiters. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Jennie Macaluso, to accept Item 45. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to strike Item 46 as given in the table. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to accept the proposed change as given in the table as Item 47. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to reject the proposed change in Item 48 in the table. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to reject Item 49 in the table. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to reject Item 50 in the table. Motion carried unanimously.

- MOTION:** Jennie Macaluso moved, seconded by Kenneth Smith, to accept Item 52 in the table. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to accept Item 53 with amendment as recorded in the table. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Paul Rosenberg moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to recommend requiring all applicable hydraulic tests on all hydraulic elevators. Motion carried. Jennie Macaluso dissented.
- MOTION:** Jennie Macaluso moved, seconded by Kenneth Smith, to dismiss 2a requiring that the permit-to-operate is accessible at the time of inspection or held in the conveyance, relating to SPS 318.1011 (3). Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Jennie Macaluso moved, seconded by Scot Bromann, to strike 4a, which would add testing of auxiliary lowering operation to Category 1 tests for hydraulic elevators. Motion failed 3-4.
- MOTION:** Paul Rosenberg moved, seconded by Kenneth Smith, to recommend adopting 4a, adding testing of auxiliary lowering operation to Category 1 tests for hydraulic elevators. Motion passed 4-3. Macaluso dissented.
- MOTION:** Paul Rosenberg moved, seconded by Kenneth Smith, to recommend adopting 5a, adding testing of auxiliary power systems to Category 1 tests for traction elevators. Motion carried. Scot Bromann and Jennie Macaluso dissented.
- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to recommend adopting 7a, adding a minimum dimension requirement to SPS 318. Motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting adjourned at 3:01 p.m.

AGENDA REQUEST FORM

1) Name and Title of Person Submitting the Request: Helen Leong, Administrative Rules Coordinator		2) Date When Request Submitted: 3/16/18 <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: 3/22/18	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 (<u>Fill out Board Appearance Request</u>) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	9) Name of Case Advisor(s), if required:	
10) Describe the issue and action that should be addressed:			
11) Signature of person making this request Helen Leong		Authorization	Date March 16, 2018
Supervisor (if required)		Date	
Executive Director signature (indicates approval to add post agenda deadline item to agenda)			
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 – but the proposed language to incorporate this item is pending Council approval.

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>Once the CBC is adopted and the legislative session ends, we can return to this question.</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>Proposed definitions from DIS Discussions: 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>ASME A17.1 2013 & 2016 - 8.10.2.2.2(kk) requires the inspector to verify the speed of the elevator in both directions with rated load and no load. <i>(kk) Speed. The speed of the car shall be verified with and without rated load, in both directions (2.16.3.2).</i></p> <p>ASME A17.1 2013 & 2016 - 8.10.3.2.3(cc) requires the same for hydraulic elevators. <i>(cc) Car Speed [3.28.1(k)]. The speed of the car shall be verified with rated load and with no load, in both directions. (Item 3.30)</i></p> <p>Brian Rausch Suggestions: Rated speed has to be defined as the <i>designed</i> speed before installation and the <i>actual</i> speed as tested and inspected after installation. That is because it is used both ways throughout the code in so many places, we couldn't possibly change it in all the necessary places to a different word. Operating speed is another matter because it is only in the down direction for a hydraulic elevator.</p> <p><i>Consider #33 in the discussion</i></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	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><i>See separate spreadsheet for discussion points related to potential adoption of this standard.</i></p>	Unknown	Allow industry to meet a common standard. Will save DSPS time in product and plan review. Make product design more

SPS 318						
NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	318.1700 (1) (b) Penalties					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. 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.	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" 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	\$520 - \$600 per occurrence except no cost	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
	Elevators, Item 14			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:	when part of a larger project	1/17/18 - Discussed and informally approved, with the exception of #13 in Table 1 and #2 in Table 3 relating to actual/rated speed. Council looking for definition of “rated speed” to include with these items on the tables. No motion made.

**Table SPS 318.1007-1
Elevators**

Item	Scope of Work
1.	<u>Change to Alteration or replacement of</u> hoistway enclosure walls, pit, or ceiling; or to number or location of landings served
2.	<u>Change Alteration</u> to machine-room, machinery-space, control-room, or control-space walls, floor, ceiling, or entrance; or to location of machinery
3.	<u>Conversion Alteration</u> of passenger elevator to freight type, or freight to passenger type
4.	<u>Change in class Alteration</u> of loading <u>class</u> for a freight elevator
5.	<u>Change to complete Alteration of</u> traction driving machine, motor, sheave, <u>and driving machine brake or emergency</u> brake
<u>6.</u>	<u>Replacement of entire driving machine, driving machine brake or emergency brake</u>

SPS 318

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
		6.7.		Installation of a fire sprinkler in a machine room, machinery space, control room, control space, or top of hoistway		
		7.8.		Increase in loading of more than 5% to machinery, beams, supports, or foundations		
		8.9.		Change to type of or addition <u>Alteration</u> of hoistway door or gate		
		9.10.		Installation or addition <u>Alteration</u> of hoistway-door interlock or combination mechanical lock and contacts		
		10.11.		Change to or addition of non-contact <u>Alteration of a solely contact type to another type of</u> reopening device on an elevator with firefighters' emergency operation		
		11.12.		Increase or decrease of more than 5% of the total load of car deadweight plus rated load		
		12.13.		Change <u>Increase or decrease</u> in rated load		
		13.14.		Change <u>Increase or decrease</u> in speed of more than 5%		
		14.15.		Change <u>Alteration or replacement</u> of safety device		
		15.16.		Change of or repair to speed <u>Alteration or replacement of overspeed</u> governor		
		16.17.		Change in type or addition <u>Addition</u> of an emergency brake or device protecting against unintended movement or ascending car overspeed		
		17.18.		Change in <u>Alteration to</u> suspension member, type, material, grade, <u>number or size</u> ; equalizers, fastening, or monitoring as defined in 8.7.2.21 and 8.7.3.25		
		18.19.		Increase in stresses of more than 5% to guiderails, supports, and fastenings		
		19.20.		Change <u>Alteration</u> to type or location of car or counterweight buffer or bumper		
		20.21.		Change <u>Alteration</u> to type of terminal stopping device		
		21.22.		Change <u>Alteration</u> to or addition of a top-of-car operating device		
		22.23.		Change <u>Replacement</u> of controller		
		23.24.		Change in <u>Alteration to</u> type of motion control		
		24.25.		Change in <u>Alteration to</u> type of operation control		
		25.		Change to or addition of a car emergency signaling device		
		26.		Change or connection to <u>Addition of</u> emergency or standby power system		

SPS 318

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

27.	Change <u>Alteration</u> to or addition of firefighters' emergency operation system
28.	Change <u>Alteration</u> to or addition of auxiliary power <u>supply raising or</u> lowering operation
29.	Change to or installation <u>Replacement or addition</u> of a plunger gripper
30.	Change to <u>Replacement of</u> a complete hydraulic driving machine <u>pumping unit</u> including motor, pump, and tank
31.	Change to <u>Alteration or replacement of</u> hydraulic control valve
32.	Change to <u>Alteration or replacement of</u> hydraulic 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
1.	Change to <u>Alteration or repair of</u> truss
2.	Change <u>Alteration</u> to rated speed or installation of speed varying system
3.	Installation or addition of skirt brushes
4.	<u>Alterations to safety component or safety switch as defined in 6.1.6.3 and 6.2.6.3 'Electrical protective devices'</u>

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

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

**Table SPS 318.1007-4
Platform Lifts**

SPS 318

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

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

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
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

SPS 318

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

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

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

Item	Scope of Work
-------------	----------------------

SPS 318

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

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

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.
----	--------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

SPS 318

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
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	<p>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?</p> <p>See table above for this change (17)</p>	\$600 per occurrence, often not part of a larger project	<p>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.</p> <p>Adopted 11.03.17, language pending</p>
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	<p>Clarify item 27 Change or addition to Firefighters' Emergency Operation system components</p> <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>See table above for proposed language to address this (27)</p> <p>Information from Robin: 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"</p>		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>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>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>See table above for proposed language to address this (4)</p>	\$560 per occurrence	
12.	Table SPS 318.1007-2 Plan review and approval. Escalators	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><u>SPS 318.1007 (2) (c) 3. b.</u> Note: Where the scope of work for an escalator includes a replacement of the majority of internal parts, even if retaining</p>	None	<p>Eliminate any confusion at time of budgeting and plan submittal.</p> <p>Adopted 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
	and Moving Walks			<u>the majority of the truss, that is considered a new installation under this subdivision.</u>		proposed language pending approval
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 become our eyes and ears in the field. useful in getting conveyances registered and keeping permits up to date.	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 registration card, in his/her possession when working on conveyances covered by the Act.	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 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, Preparatio	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. Review Proposed Amendment:	Minimal	Unlikely to affect current costs. Most now send a mechanic but should be required to continue to do so.

SPS 318						
NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	ns for department inspection			SPS 318.1011 (7) PREPARATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT INSPECTION. (bm) <u>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 entire inspection.</u>		Adopted 11.03.17, Discussed Proposed Language 12.11.2017; Updated Proposed Language Adopted, with amendments as marked 01.18.2018
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
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	The A17.1 elevator code is not clear regarding performance of elevator telephones	DIS/several users	Specify requirements of telephone operation, answering and responding.	Unknown	Provide clarification requested by many interested parties.

SPS 318						
NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	A17.1, 2.27.1	and answering services.				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
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	Would allow modern VOIP phone systems that rely on 20 minute uninterruptable power supply (UPS) to replace building phone systems including for elevators Dismissed 11.03.17
22.	SPS 318.1702 (10), Electric Elevators, Emergency	New cellular, internet and other shared systems are too easy to avoid required telephone monitoring system, have the service lapse or are	John Reese - Schindler	Require land lines or strict performance requirements for other systems. Provide for code compliant, reliable telephones.		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
	Operation and Signaling Devices	just not working at all points in elevator travel.				
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 no fire command center and 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, Discussed Proposed Language 12.11.2017; Updated Proposed Language Adopted 01.18.2018</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 industry	Protect persons, for example in living units of a condominium building where a neighbor above has an elevator. 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
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 residential type elevator in the existing hoistway. 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; Proposed Language Adopted 12/11/17</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>SPS 318.1705 (3) Note: <u>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></p>	Unknown	<p>Prevent design decisions that may be difficult or expensive to correct later</p> <p>Adopted 11.03.17; Proposed Language Adopted 01.18.2018</p>
27.	SPS 318.1705 (3) (c), Special Application Elevators,	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) <u>5. The clearance between the hoistway door and the floor surface may be up to 3/8 of an inch.</u></p>	None	<p>Prevent the door from closing over someone's feet reducing the likelihood that a child will be able to fit in the space</p>

SPS 318						
NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	Private Residence Elevators, for A17.1, 5.3.1.7.2					and possibly be injured or killed. Adopted 11.03.17; Proposed Language Adopted 12/11/17
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: SPS 318.1705 (3) <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</u>	Unknown	Adopted 11.03.17; Proposed Language Adopted 12/11/17

SPS 318

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
				<p><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></p>		
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: SPS 318.1705 (3) <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. Means for inspection shall be provided. The openings shall not be larger than is necessary to clear the suspension means.</u></p> <p>SPS 318.1705 (3) <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>	Minimal	<p>Protect persons, especially children who may gain access to spaces containing winding drum elevator equipment.</p> <p>Adopted 11.03.17; Discussed Proposed Language 12.11.2017; Updated Proposed Language Adopted 01.18.2018</p>
31.	SPS 318.1705 (3) (e) Special application	A residential elevator may have a phone keypad that gives the rider the impression that there is an operable phone when	Mark U.	Require covering or elimination of the keypad if not operable	None	<p>Avoid reliance on a device that is not operable</p> <p>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
	elevators, Private Residence Elevators	it may not be connected.				
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 (incomplete) use of elevators as one year.	Mark U.	<p>Issuance of Temporary Construction Use Permit and occasional verification inspections.</p> <p>Language pending on this topic.</p>	Re-inspection fee	<p>Will make it clear that such operation is not open-ended. Will allow inspector to verify the incomplete items and conditions remain safe and that trained operators are operating the elevator as required.</p> <p>12/11/17 Tabled until the Council can review specific proposed language</p>
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 impacts on the building structure at an increased speed.</p>	Minimal	12/11/17: tabled, language needed

SPS 318

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
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 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.”</p>	Council estimates: \$250 to \$1000/installation	Dismissed 12/11/17
35.	SPS 318.1708, General requirements, for A17.1, 8.6.5.16.5 to modify A17.1,	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	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

SPS 318

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	3.19.4.7.3 (a)	not meeting the code, they could be considered exempt from testing.				
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) 4. b.	DIS	<p>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.</p> <p>SPS 318.1708 (2) (b) 4. <u>d. The documents may be located on the top of the car only if another complete set of documents is located in a place that is accessible by the owner or the owner's agent.</u></p>	None	<p>Ensure that records are available to elevator personnel when needed.</p> <p>12/11/17: Proposed language pending</p>
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.	<p>Require the plan review information, approval letter, application form and any specification to remain in the maintenance record immediately after a mod. project.</p> <p>SPS 318.1008 (4) EVIDENCE OF APPROVAL. Where plan approval is required by this chapter, one set of plans bearing the stamp of approval, a copy of the specifications, the approval-application form, and the approval letter shall be kept at the installation or alteration site from the beginning of construction until an inspection determines compliance with this chapter for the approved scope of work. <u>Once an inspection determines compliance with this chapter for the approved scope of work, the evidence of approval shall be retained with the on-site maintenance records.</u></p>	None	<p>Ensure that records are available to elevator personnel when needed.</p> <p>12/11/17: Proposed language pending</p>

SPS 318

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
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	<p>Make clear that these are property of the owner.</p> <p>Provide the owner with more than the original installer as an option for future service and testing. Would eliminate conflict and complaints to DSPS.</p>	None	Dismissed 12/11/17
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 Dismissed 12/11/17
40.	SPS 318.1708, General Requirements, for A17.1, 8.6.4.19.7 and	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	<p>Allow the owner to perform the emergency/stand-by power Cat 1 test if trained to do so.</p> <p>Elevator tests would be performed by the owner and not signed off on by a licensed elevator contractor or personnel.</p>		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
	8.6.5.14.3 (f)					
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	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: Proposal combined with #44
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 Dismissed 01/17/2018
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	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 <u>1 year</u> where the modernization includes updating the firefighters emergency operation. Long discussion on this topic, Council members want to consider this topic further with other stakeholders and will reconvene with an opinion at the next meeting.	Varies	Make clear for planning purposes that each elevator in a group operation must meet certain codes Discussed and tabled 01/17/2018

SPS 318

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
		mod. project. Inspectors may give a wide range of compliance dates for the remaining elevator(s).				
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	<p>Change to a 3 year inspection and PTO cycle.</p> <p>SPS 318.1708 <i>(d) Periodic inspection and test frequency. Substitute the following wording for the requirements in ASME A17.1 section 8.11.1.3:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Periodic inspections shall be made at intervals not longer than one year. 2. <u>Except as provided in (h), category Category 1 periodic tests shall be made at intervals not longer than one year.</u> 3. Category 3 periodic tests shall be made at intervals not longer than 3 years. 4. Category 5 periodic tests shall be made at intervals not longer than 5 years. <p><i>(h) Periodic tests of dumbwaiters. Category 1 periodic tests of <u>dumbwaiters shall be made at intervals of not longer than 5 years.</u></i></p>	\$300/year reduction for inspection fee, \$50/year reduction for PTO fee	<p>Reduce costs for building owners for small devices that do not carry a rider.</p> <p>Adopted 01/17/2018, Proposed Language Pending</p>
45.	SPS 318.1708 (6) (e) 1. c., General Requirements for	Code is unclear regarding how hoistway entrances are to be secured when placing an elevator out of service.	Adam S.	<p>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.</p> <p>SPS 318.1708 (6) (e) 1. c. For elevators, dumbwaiters, and <u>material lifts, securing or locking of permanently barricading or</u></p>	None	<p>Clarifies the process and makes it more logical.</p> <p>Adopted 01/17/2018,</p>

SPS 318						
NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	Periodic Inspections and Witnessing the Tests, Installation placed out of service			<u>sealing in the closed position the hoistway doors and access doors, except the bottom landing door, which may be secured by using the interlock.</u>		Proposed Language Pending
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. Dismissed 01/17/2018
47.	SPS 318.1708 (6) (f) General Requirements for Periodic Inspection	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. SPS 318.1708 (6) (f) Installation converted to a <u>Type A</u> material lift. These are department rules in addition to the requirements in ASME A17.1 section 8.11.1.4: 1. Converting an existing elevator to a <u>Type A</u> material lift shall include all of the following: a. Removal of in-car controls and car-top controls.	None	Correct an error Adopted 01/17/2018; Proposed language pending

SPS 318

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	s and Witnessing of Tests, Installation covered to a material lift			<p>b. Conversion of hall calls to call/send controls.</p> <p>c. Installations of signs meeting ANSI Z535.4 stating "For Material Only. No Riders Permitted" at the call/send controls and the former location of the car operating panel in letters not less than ½ inch in height and centered on the back wall of the car 72 inches above the car floor in letters not less than 2 inches in height.</p> <p>d. Verification of compliance with subd. 1. a. to c. by the department or agent municipality.</p> <p>e. Approval of the building code authority where the elevator is part of a required accessible route in an occupied building.</p> <p>2. A conveyance converted to a <u>Type A</u> material lift is no longer required to have periodic inspections or tests.</p> <p>Note: A <u>Type A</u> material lift, although not regulated by the Department, is still subject to federal or state regulations regarding occupational safety. Improper maintenance can result in injury or death for persons loading or unloading materials, maintaining equipment, or otherwise occupying the building.</p> <p>3. Converting a <u>Type A</u> material lift back to a conveyance shall include complying with the permit-to-operate requirements in s. SPS 318.1011 and satisfactory completion of all applicable tests and inspections prior to returning the elevator to service.</p>		
48.	SPS 318.1802 (10); Vertical Platform Lifts, Emergency Signals,	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. Dismissed 01/17/2018

SPS 318

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	for A18.1, 10.3.3.3					
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.	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 Dismissed 01/17/2018
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. Dismissed 01/17/2018
51.	SPS 318.1804,	There is no allowance for reduced fees or	DIS	Allow temporary installations of stairway chairlifts where elevator is down for repairs	Unknown	Make possible the temporary use of

SPS 318

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	Inclined Stairway Chair Lifts, and SPS 302, Fee Schedule	temporary reduction in stairway width to allow a SCL to be installed temporarily where an elevator is down for service.		Council concerned that such an allowance would exceed scope of rule project, would like more specific guidance on how to proceed for such a temporary installation.		stairway chair lifts. Discussed and tabled 01/17/2018
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. A18.1 Section 4: Inclined Stairway Chairlifts SPS 318.1810 (4) ROUTINE INSPECTIONS AND TESTS. Substitute the following wording for the requirements in ASME A18.1 section 10.2.1: Routine inspections and tests of sections 2, 5, 6, and 7 lifts shall be performed at intervals of not longer than one year. Routine inspections and tests of section 4 lifts shall be performed at intervals of not longer than 3 years.	\$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. Adopted 01/17/2018; Proposed language pending
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 readily visible to inspectors without disassembly SPS 318.1810 (7) FIVE-YEAR INSPECTION AND TEST REQUIREMENTS. (a) This is a department rule in addition to the requirements in ASME A18.1 section 10.3.3.1: Where a lift is equipped with a safety device that is subject to testing, the 5-year safety test – and where applicable, the governor test in ASME A18.1 section 10.3.3.2 – shall be performed. The test	Minimal	Reduce time wasted finding evidence that tests were done prior to completing inspections or issuing PTOs Adopted 01/17/2018;

SPS 318						
NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
				<p>results shall be submitted to the department or agent municipality on an approved form.</p> <p><u>(b) Substitute the following wording for the requirements in ASME 18.1 subsection 10.3.3.1 (b): For Type A safeties and Type A safety parts of Type C safeties, there shall be sufficient travel of the safety rollers or dogs remaining after the test to bring the platform and its rated load to rest on safety application at governor tripping speed. A metal tag shall be attached to the safety-releasing carrier in a permanent manner that is readily visible to inspectors without disassembly, giving the date of the safety test together with the name of the person or firm who performed the test.</u></p>		Proposed language pending
55.	SPS 318	Provide guidance of when the PTO is likely to be withheld for inspectors, contractors, and owners by providing lists of major and minor violations during annual elevator inspections.	Charlie Slater	Proposal for an Appendix on Major and Minor Violations		
56.	SPS 318.1708 (2) (k) 1., General Requirements, Maintenance, Repair, and	Suggest an informational note to clarify that hospitals may be required to do conduct firefighters' emergency operation key switch testing more often than quarterly under other	DIS - frequent inquiries			

SPS 318

NO .	RULE PROVISI ON	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPO SED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTE NTIAL IMPA CT/CO ST	COMMENTS/S TATUS
	Testing, Special Provisions	applicable federal or state regulations outside of SPS 318.				

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 8.6.5.14.1 and 8.6.5.14.2 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 8.6.5.14.1 and 8.6.5.14.2 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 8.6.5.14.1 and 8.6.5.14.2) 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. <i>SPS 318.1708 (h) Maintenance and testing of hydraulic elevators. Substitute the following</i>	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.	<i>Adopted 01/17/2018; Proposed language pending</i>

SPS 318

NO.	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT / COST	COMMENTS / STATUS
				<p>wording for the requirements in the introductory paragraph of ASME A17.1 section 8.6.5.8: An elevator installed prior to January 1, 1994, that has hydraulic piping or a portion of its hydraulic cylinder either in the ground or below the pit floor, and not visible for inspection, shall be tested in accordance with the requirements in ASME A17.1 sections 8.6.5.14.1 and 8.6.5.14.2 or shall conform to the requirements in ASME A17.1 section 8.6.5.8(a) or 8.6.5.8(b).</p>		
2a.	Permit to Operate	Elevators are required to maintain a valid Permit to Operate 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	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 maintenance records. Although many owners still display the Permit to Operate, without Code language there is no enforceable requirement to do so.	No cost is associated with this change if the original Permit to Operate is displayed, otherwise it would be the cost of copying the original.	Dismissed 01/17/2018

SPS 318

NO.	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT / COST	COMMENTS / STATUS
		elevator has a valid Permit to Operate.				
3a.	On-Site Documentation	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 the installation company provide this at the time of acceptance inspection, would be a simple way of ensuring it gets provided on site.	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> <p>The 2016 updated standard changed this section quite a bit, will want to return to this topic once the entire standard has been reviewed to see what might be needed.</p>	No cost	Discussed and tabled 01/17/2018
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	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	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,	<p>The Council endorses the idea that “non-required devices that are installed shall function.”</p> <p>Adopted 01/17/2018;</p>

SPS 318

NO.	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT / COST	COMMENTS / STATUS
		<p>be tested as part of a Category 1 test because they are often found not to be working.</p>		<p>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.</p> <p>Two proposals:</p> <p>1. To Address the Specific Issue Outlined Above:</p> <p>SPS 318.1708 (2) (i) <u>3. ‘Auxiliary power lowering operation.’ This is a department rule in addition to the requirements in ASME 17.1 section 8.6.5.14.3: Where an auxiliary power lowering operation (3.26.10) is installed as part of the standby or emergency power operation, a test shall be performed as part of the Category 1 test requirements.</u></p> <p>2. To Address a Broader Issue Endorsed by the Council:</p> <p>SPS 318.1011 (2) <u>(c) Where a conveyance has devices or standby or emergency power operations installed, the devices and operations</u></p>	<p>other costs would vary depending on the elevator service contract.</p>	<p>Proposed language pending</p>

SPS 318

NO.	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT / COST	COMMENTS / STATUS
				<p><u>shall be tested and operational per manufacturer recommendations depending on the type of conveyance.</u></p> <p>SPS 318.1011 (5) (b) <u>3. Where an existing conveyance has devices or standby or emergency power operations installed, the devices and operations shall be tested and operational depending upon the type of conveyance.</u></p>		
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 an entrapped passenger.	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 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.	Testing this device would add about ten minutes to a Category 1 test. The costs would vary according to the elevator's service contract.	Adopted 01/17/2018; Review Proposed language pending in #4a, it should incorporate these concerns.
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	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	The cost would be any costs associated with a periodic inspection.	Item will be discussed in the context of Item 32 in the spreadsheet due to the related topic. Tabled 01/17/2018

SPS 318

NO.	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT / COST	COMMENTS / STATUS
		<p>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.</p>		<p>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.</p>		
7a.	Counterweight Runby Data Plate	<p>Under the current conditions of a periodic elevator inspection, if rope or belt stretch has 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</p>	Adam Smith	<p>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 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>For elevators being installed by companies that already use the proposed sign, no 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</p>	<p>Adopted 01/17/2018; Proposed language pending</p>

SPS 318

NO.	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT / COST	COMMENTS / STATUS
		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.		8.7.1.8 8.9 8.6.1.5 2.4.5 Counterweight Runby Data Plate 2.16.3.3 (2.16.3.3.1 to 2.16.3.3.3) SPS 318.1702 (1) <u>(bm) This is a department rule in addition to the requirements in ASME 17.1 section 2.4.5: The data plate shall indicate the minimum designed counterweight runby.</u>	means do not need to be shortened.	
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.	Tabled 01/17/2018

AGENDA REQUEST FORM

1) Name and Title of Person Submitting the Request: Helen Leong, Administrative Rules Coordinator		2) Date When Request Submitted: 3/16/18 <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: 3/22/18	5) Attachments: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	6) How should the item be titled on the agenda page? Discussion of Potential Adoption of ANSI E1.42 – 2016, Entertainment Technology – Design, Installation, and Use of Orchestra Pit Lifts to the Conveyance Safety Code, 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) Signature of person making this request Helen Leong		Authorization Date March 16, 2018	
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.			

No.	Code Provision	Recommended by	Comments	Potential Cost	Notes
E1.	Forward This standard does not address the fall hazard presented at the stage edge when the Lift platform is lower than stage floor level.	Sub-Committee	When the lift is below the stage or audience level, a potential for a significant fall hazard exists. If WI wants to safeguard against this hazard, additional language will need to be included to cover this hazard. An example of a stage edge fall protection plan is included in Annex B.		
E2.	1.1.1.1 Subsequent Inspections	Sub-Committee	If WI wants to require inspections of these lifts on a periodic basis after installation, additional language will need to be drafted. Recommend annual inspections with 5-year full load tests.		
E3.	1.1.2 Equipment covered by this standard; 1.1.4 Equipment not covered by this standard	Sub-Committee	Speed @ 15 fpm or less. No passengers, single section lifts only, does not cover organ lifts, sound control lifts, etc. WI should consider if it wants to cover any of the items exempted in 1.1.2 and 1.1.4.		
E4.	3.2.2 Qualified person	Sub-Committee	Persons performing tests and maintenance on these lifts will need to meet this definition. Currently, most of these newer lifts are not manufactured by elevator companies. Will the owner be required to have a WI licensed person work on these lifts? Wisconsin based elevator companies are not trained on these new products. Will the owner be able to call in the OEM for testing or maintenance? Licensing vs qualification. The OEM techs do not have WI elevator licenses and while qualified to work on these lifts, may not meet the requirements to obtain a Wisconsin elevator license.		
E5.	3.3.6 Dead load	Sub-Committee	This is similar to empty load in A17.1, may need to be taken into consideration for the SPS 318 Alteration		

No.	Code Provision	Recommended by	Comments	Potential Cost	Notes
			section and any associated sections that may need to reference this.		
E6.	3.3.18 Lifting load; 3.3.36 Static load	Sub-Committee	Where can this information be obtained? When would this information be gathered and submitted?		
E7.	4.1.4.1 Brakes	Sub-Committee	Two separate means of stopping and preventing unintended movement of the lift platform. ESTA does not list what capacity the brake should be capable of holding. Clarify? 125% like A17.1? Testing limitations on very large capacities. ESTA Member states that it was not their intent to test the brakes with more than 100%.		
E8.	4.1.4.1.2 Brakes	Sub-Committee	What is this? Ask for an example from manufacturers. Serapid uses a steel frame sectional beam. Inspectors will have to verify.		
E9.	4.1.6 Drift; 4.3.3 Horizontal clearances	Sub-Committee	This sounds great.		
E10.	4.3.3 ; Horizontal Clearances; 4.3.3.1	Sub-Committee	Between the edge of the lift platform surface and what? Do we need to clarify?		
E11.	4.6 Lighting	Sub-Committee	Is this enough detail?		
E12.	4.6.1 Illumination levels	Sub-Committee	Measured where? Need to include more detail.		
E13.	5.1.3 Drive machinery disconnect	Sub-Committee	Should this be a fused or breaker type akin to NEC 620.51?		
E14.	6.1.2 Device testing; 6.2.4 Restart	Sub-Committee	FYI for inspections		
E15.	6.3.1.1 Shear and crushing protection, Use	Sub-Committee	Protection can be pressure, optical, or other suitable guarding mechanism. Who determines suitable? Bevels		

No.	Code Provision	Recommended by	Comments	Potential Cost	Notes
			are allowed where horizontal projection is less than 1". 60-degree bevel.		
E16.	6.3.3 Test force	Sub-Committee	Need better testing tools.		
E17.	6.4.6 Emergency unlocking signage	Sub-Committee	If the unlocking device is a key or a button, should it be stored or kept away from untrained personnel?		
E18.	7.9.1 Dynamic test loads, Test	Sub-Committee	Fixed speed lifts are to be run with lifting load (rated load) at speed for five cycles.		
E19.	7.9.7 Inspect the following; 7.9.7.5	Sub-Committee	The criteria is "any other anomalies." Is this too vague?		
E20.	Chapter 8: Operation, Maintenance and Repair	Sub-Committee	Should this section apply to all new and existing lifts? Testing guidelines would be good for all lifts but will need clarification.		
E21.	8.1.2 Records	Sub-Committee	A large facility could have many, many people capable of operating the lifts.		
E22.	8.3.2 Trained personnel	Sub-Committee	As defined, qualified person is not a Wisconsin elevator mechanic. Does maintenance need to be done with an OEM rep sub-contracting a WI licensed mechanic? Testing, too?		
E23.	8.3.3 Manufacturer's instructions	Sub-Committee	MCP equivalency? In ASME A17.1 MCP is written by current service company. Current service company not tied to the whim of the OEM.		
E24.	8.3.4 Record keeping requirements	Sub-Committee	Paper or electronic?		
E25.	Annex A1.1.1.1 Subsequent inspections	Sub-Committee	SPS will need language to have annual inspections and acceptance and five-year testing. Should we have 5-year testing with weight?		
E26.	Inspection Items	Sub-Committee	What items should be tested at the annual? Do we need to specifically spell them out?		
E27.	Pit Access	Sub-Committee	The motors and control mechanisms are often located in the pit. Should we have language requiring a means		

No.	Code Provision	Recommended by	Comments	Potential Cost	Notes
			to access the pit be made available for use when the lift is at the lowest landing? Serapid installs a trap door in the platform, Gala has a door and ladder in the landing at the lowest landing.		