

**Minutes for Elevator Advisory Board Meeting  
June 9, 2004**

Attendees: DOL: Jonathan Brooks, Tom Chambers, Andy Frazier, Doug Lucas, Jerry Smith, Tommy Petty;  
Clyde Wagner, Wagner Consulting Group; Ron Brummitt, Elevator Specialties; Nick Mebane, ThyssenKrupp Elevator.  
Absent: Buddy Godwin, The Godwin Company;  
Roger Shumate, International Union of Elevator Constructors

Introductions were made by Jonathan Brooks. He relayed apologies from Buddy Godwin and Roger Shumate for their necessary absence. Also Commissioner Berry wanted to stop in for moment and scheduled prevented it today.

Jonathan explained why the Advisory Board was formed: to enforce provisions of the Elevator Safety Act to prevent injuries to public and to have input into areas of administrative policies/regulations. Commissioner went through Legislature to get this Board formed. Minutes will be taken at each meeting and distributed to each member as well as legislative members requesting it.

Explanation of membership and formation of the Ad Hoc Elevator Advisory Board. Membership consists of the Bureau Chief who serves as Officiator, 4 members to represent the elevator industry: 1 member to represent a major elevator manufacturing company, 1 member to represent an elevator service company, 1 member to be an elevator design professional, and 1 member to represent installation labor, maintenance, and repair of elevator equipment; 2 members to represent the regulated community: 1 for a county/municipality in the state and 1 as an owner of a building containing equipment; 2 members representing the public sector.

There was also an Advisory Board formed for the Amusement Device section of the Bureau to enforce ASTM standards and Amusement Device Safety Act.

Copies were given to each member present; The Elevator Safety Act, Advisory Board Bylaws. Discussion was held on number of meetings needed, how often, etc. Consensus was that members could discuss issues via phone and email to resolve questions, etc. Holding a meeting when necessary to cover a number of issues would only be needed twice a year. Meetings do not have to be in Raleigh and can be at a location centrally located for all members. This will be looked at before next meeting date.

The 2004 Code is out and will be effective October 1, 2004. A meeting will be held when this can be discussed.

A17.1 and A17.2 are codes we enforce and take no exception to. There are 2 elevator companies represented in membership; 1 union and 1 non-union.

There is draft legislation for review for elevator mechanics and personnel with enhancements of the Elevator Safety Act. The push is on to the industry for a standard of all inspectors to be certified. Almost all NC inspectors are certified presently. Legislation is for "license" to work on public elevators. Jonathan has a list of what legislation is in other states and will be reviewing. This may not happen for quite a while due to drafts from DOL, drafts to and from legal department, etc. before they can act on it. Drafts would be sent to Board members.

Questions on how this will be accomplished: Will Elevator Bureau run this program for certification? Will they do the training? Will need staffing to do this and where will staffing come from for testing, teaching the industry standards, codes, etc.

Nick Mebane stated that "certified" is a broad word. Licensing and training can be a long process. Need to evaluate what will be needed. Questions by others: What kinds of provisions will there be for occasions/occurrences like temporary mechanics (from out-of-state) that handle work on elevators during disasters in this state? Maybe a national standard should be set. Should licensing be yearly and/or re-issue license each year? Should there be re-certification every 3 years? There should be educational information and maybe testing capabilities on-line for distant areas. Liability issues should not be on elevator industry. There is certification required currently for amusement rides (NAARSO). Members meeting today tend to be in favor of this.

Discussion on Ascending Car Protection. We are still awaiting an interpretation from A17.1 Committee. Code says nothing can be put in elevator to prevent safety from setting. Question on whether the rope gripper was adjustable. The only company using in the downward position is Thyssenkrupp. Some have been seen in the field by Otis and Schindler. The test procedure should be given by the manufacturer and is not given currently. Inspectors do not know how to test it. There were comments around about the codes not keeping up with technology. Hollister Whitney makes the equipment. Tom Chambers sent a letter to the NC elevator companies on May 12, 2004 regarding this condition and the committee to interpret. It read that all rope gripper installations will be accepted where the rope gripper will set in a down over speed condition. This will stay in effect until the Elevator Bureau is provided with an interpretation from the A17.1 Committee. A copy was given to Board members.

The Advisory Board needs to have an agreement on this until the ruling is decided. They serve as a point of advice for others in industry with questions. Ultimately the decision will be made by the Bureau Chief and letter of 5/12/04 is ruling for now.

Jonathan asked for any specific concerns of us as a regulatory industry. One question was on security on elevators. If an owner has a tenant company with secure floor being used, there is a \$200 fee to cut out a floor by Elevator Bureau. He feels this is too much cost for their customers. Is it fair to them (elevator company) to have to cover these fees and pass them on to their customers? In answer, the fee is considered a Change/Alteration Fee. The requirements have been there for a while and are made by

Legislature. Until they come up with something different, the fee is probably not going to happen without a major legislative change.

Closing the meeting, Jonathan asked that all members email him with suggested meeting dates. Members will decide in near future.