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* * * * * * *

CHAIRMAN FOX: We will call the meeting to order and move to the agenda for the December 1st meeting.

Introductions. We have some folks who are out in the audience. There's Cassandra Beiling; WSMV, Nicole and C. Gordon; and we have iMac.

Jennifer, can you tell those folks how to do the -- put their names up there, please?

MS. MURPHY: If you-all will go to the bottom of your screen, there is a place where you can click "chat." If you will please go to the chat box, type in your first and last name, and also your affiliation.

MR. HERROD: It would be good to have everybody identify themselves on their display, too. So if you could do that for us, also, that would help out.

CHAIRMAN FOX: The gentleman from iMac, can you put your name on the display, please?

MS. GEORGE: And, also, WSMV, if you would do that as well.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Yes. And Nicole.
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And, Ms. Gordon, can you put your first and last name?

MS. GORDON: How do I do that?

MS. PRESSON: If you'll see the three little dots -- if you hover over your picture, do you see the three little dots? Click there. I think you can click there and change your name there.

MS. GEORGE: Yes. There's a drop-down menu that says "Rename," and you can do it there.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Very good, Ms. Gordon.

Thank you, Mr. Small.

MR. HERROD: We need everyone to do that, board members and others.

Rich Eller, I see -- is that your full identifier?

(No verbal response.)

MR. HERROD: We need WSMV, too, also, if you don't mind.

MR. ELLER: I believe you can see my name, and the identifier is in the chat.

THE REPORTER: What's your name? I can't see it. I'm the court reporter, so you'll
need to say your name before you speak.

MR. ELLER: Rich Eller.

MR. HALE: James Roy, if you click
participant, and then click your own name, you can
rename yourself.

MS. GEORGE: I don't know if it's
just me that's hearing a beep, beep, beep, but
it's probably because everyone is not muted. If
you could mute yourself until you speak, it
eliminates any interference coming in. Just mute
yourself until you speak. Thank you.

MR. MOORER: What am I supposed to
do this? This Lewis Moorer. I've gone down here
to the right-hand corner, and it says to everyone,
a note, and I've put my name, Lewis Moorer, Jr.,
board member. Is that what I'm supposed to do?

MS. GEORGE: Yes. Thank you.

MR. MOORER: It's still there.

Should it just still be there?

MS. MURPHY: Yes, sir, it should
be.

MR. MOORER: Okay. It's there.

Good. Great, great, great.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Okay. It looks like
we have everyone identified.

---

We will move to the adoption of the
agenda. I would entertain a motion to adopt the
agenda for the December 1st, 2020 meeting.

MR. MOORE: Larry Moore.

I'll make that motion.

MS. O'CONNOR: Kelly O'Connor.

I'll second.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Thank you. We have
a motion and a second. Any discussion?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRMAN FOX: Hearing none, roll
call vote, please.

Mr. LaPorte?

MR. LaPORTE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOX: David Hale?

MR. HALE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Larry Moore.

MR. MOORE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Mr. Pope?

MR. POPE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Mr. Moorer?

MR. MOORER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOX: I think that has
everybody. Y'all keep moving on me.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Mr. LaPorte?

MR. LaPORTE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Mr. Hale?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRMAN FOX: Mr. Hale, I'm sorry.

MR. HALE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Mr. Moorer?

MR. MOORER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Mr. Moore?

MR. MOORE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Ms. O'Connor.

MS. O'CONNOR: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Okay. Motion
carries.

Now we would hear from the Elevator
Unit's report. Mr. McPherson?

MR. MCPHERSON: Yes, sir. To date,
we have inspected, across the state, 15,427 units.
We have a total of -- to date, we've inspected
24,348. We have accepted, since the first of the
year, 1,010 either remodel or brand-new
construction. We currently have 485 construction
permits active now. We have no incidents with
injury to report.
Our unit is growing. We have, currently, 27 inspectors across the state, not including Mr. Jackson nor myself. And we are looking to hire one more for the Nashville area here in the next matter of days.

We're still struggling a little bit, off and on, with getting in and out of places for COVID, but not near as bad as we were. But over all, the Elevator Unit is doing great and growing.

Mr. Herrod: Mike, can you report on the latest delinquency rate and what it -- the peak of it and what it is now?

Mr. MCPHERSON: About a year ago, we were close to 17 percent delinquent. As of yesterday, we were 4.7, so we are doing very well there. We've had a little bit of inspectors out for health reasons that their FMLA put us back. And, of course, we have been shorthanded for a while. So now, with these new approvals and the hiring, we are able to inspect more efficiently.

Mr. Herrod: Do you have anything else?

Mr. MCPHERSON: Nothing to report on other than some new business.

Mr. Herrod: I think that concludes our report, Chairman.

Chairman Fox: Okay.

The next item will be Item Number 6, the Amusement Device Unit report. Mr. Hardy?

Mr. Hardy: Thank you, Chairman. I said the board members should have the regular stats that I report in our quarterly board meetings, but I want to go through those real briefly.

This fiscal year, beginning 7/1, we have permitted a total of 124 companies. And, you know, in the back of my mind always is how are we doing in comparison to the previous year. And if you remember last year, you know, COVID really wasn't in the picture from 7/1 of '19 to December. Last year, we permitted 127 companies in this same time frame. So actually, we're at 98 percent of companies permitted, in comparison to where we were last year. And I think that's pretty good when you consider that last year, we were in our peak fair season. So we're right there at 98 percent of what we did last year as far as total companies permitted with this same time frame.

Now, as far as devices registered, we have registered 1,148 devices for this fiscal year. And as a comparison to last year -- again, when the fair season was in full swing -- we had permitted 1,180 devices -- or not permitted, but let's say registered, because we permit companies and register devices.

But that is 97 percent of comparing to where we were this same period last year. So I also think that's good.

We are at zero accidents for this fiscal year. We're still seeing some sprained ankles and shoulders and typical trampoline park incidents, which, you know, there's no problem with the equipment in these cases, and we are not registering these as reportable accidents at this time. We had zero where we deemed as being reportable so far this fiscal year.

That's really all I have. I'd be glad to entertain any questions.

Chairman Fox: Any questions from the Board? Anything else, reference, to the Amusement Device Unit report?

(No verbal response.)

Mr. Hardy: Again, that's all I have. Thank you, Chairman.

Chairman Fox: All right. Thank you, sir.

All right. Nothing under old business. Under new business, we have Mr. Mike Church from the Hankal Hall project. And he has asked to address the Board.

Mr. Church?

Mr. Church: Yes. Good morning.

Can you hear me okay?

Chairman Fox: Yes, sir.

Mr. LaPORTE: Can I interrupt a second? As you know, Mr. Church works for the same company that I work for, so I will recuse myself from this variance request.

Chairman Fox: Yes, sir.

Mr. Church: Good morning. I'm back today to request a variance for Tennessee State University, Hankal Hall, located at 3500 John A. Merritt Boulevard in Nashville, Tennessee. The university is replacing a six-stop hydraulic elevator with machine rimless traction elevator with a speed of 150 feet a minute.
The elevator was originally a duplex hydraulic system where KONE replaced one of the two elevators with a machine traction elevator in 2014. The university would now like to replace the second elevator with an MRL traction elevator and duplex it with the other elevator to make it a more efficient system.

The existing pit on this elevator is 53.5 inches. KONE is requesting for the owner a variance to allow a 45.5-inch apron guard, in lieu of a 48-inch apron guard, and to use the existing pit without modification. KONE had requested a variance of a 12-foot zero overhead condition that was turned down in the last board meeting.

Tennessee State University has made the decision to extend the shaft up to achieve a 13 foot 8 inch to the underside of the new shaft ceiling. The elevator overhead will now be 13 foot 0 inches to the bottom of the elevator hoist feed. Both elevator overheads will be extended to the 13 foot 8 inches and the collapsible cartop handrail on Car Number 2 will be replaced with a noncollapsible code cartop handrail.

This request to raise both shafts is awaiting approval by the state's architect's office, and TSU expects approval in the next week. However, if extending the shaft, for some reason, is not approved by the state architect's office, KONE will install a 7 foot 3 inch cab to allow for a code-compliant cartop handrail and adequate refuge clearances on the Car Number 1 that we are proposing to replace.

A little bit of background is that KONE has received -- actually, requested -- I'm sorry -- and granted a variance on the shortening of the toe guard or apron on ten other projects. So we're asking the Board to approve this project as well. And the only thing that we're asking for on this project is to shorten that toe guard by two-and-a-half inches.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Who is going to respond? Mr. McPherson?

MR. MCPHERSON: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Okay.

MR. POPE: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN FOX: Yes, ma'am?

MS. O'CONNOR: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN FOX: Motion passes.
Next item on the agenda is Mr. Eller from HomeLift, LLC, Brownsboro, Tennessee.

MR. ELLER: This is a unique situation here. This is a barbershop in Brownsboro, Tennessee, a rural town. It's on a town square, very old buildings. The gentleman who owns the barbershop is in a powered wheelchair, recently, so he's handicapped. And he wants access to the upper floor in this barbershop, which would create the necessity to have a variance to go to 16 feet with a VPL.

When we looked at, potentially, doing a ramp -- obviously, you can't do it in the front of the building, if it's on the town square. You wouldn't have enough room to do it. And in the back, the alleyway is too tight to put a ramp in. As far as a wheelchair lift, I can't do that because he's in a powered wheelchair, and having to, you know, have a wheelchair on both floors to access the second floor.

It's a barbershop. He's done this since he was a young child -- or, excuse me -- young adult. He, basically, wants to stay in the business, but he wants to have access to the upper floor because of his accident, and he doesn't have the cost to potentially put a commercial elevator in. So the only option I could come up with is a wheelchair lift, obviously, beyond the 14 feet, which is normally the code.

So I did not submit for a permit. I did not do that at this point. He wanted me to ask if he could get a variance, and then he'll proceed down that path.

So, it's unique. It's in a rural part of the state. I'm trying to give him a solution to figure out a way to get upstairs to get into the offices within this building above his barbershop. So that's what I'm in front of the Board for.

I understand clearly it's two feet above what we would do. And I understand that I'm not asking for a couple of inches. It's a unique situation.

An alternative, possibly -- I don't know. I know finances was a concern, a LULA lift might be in between, of course, you know, a regular lift and an elevator. That may be an option. What do you think about that?

CHAIRMAN FOX: Mr. McPherson?

MR. MCPHERSON: Hey, there. This is A18.1, 2.7 --

THE REPORTER: Can you say that number again, please.

MR. MCPHERSON: A18.1, 2.7. The max is 168 for the rise. This is asking for 192, so that's a two-foot difference, which is big.

Without seeing any print or anything else, it's kind of hard for me to be for it. I'm for it for this guy's life that he's living, but without seeing anything else.

I understand clearly it's two feet above what we would do. And I understand that I'm not asking for a couple of inches. It's a unique situation.

MR. HALE: Mr. Chair, this is David Hale.

Mr. Eller, has the local codes folks weighed in on this and the local fire service folks? Have they weighed in on this situation at all?

MR. ELLER: Rich Eller again.

At this time, they have not because we wanted to start the process here, because, obviously, if you turn us down, then there's no sense to go to any other people involved.

MR. HALE: David Hale, again.

It seems a little like, though, that we have the cart ahead of the horse. Because without seeing the plans, our inspectors would have a difficult time, you know, recommending or turning down. And without knowing what the local codes and the local fire service folks, what their input is on it, it would be difficult for me to make a vote at this point.

I'm certainly, you know, cognizant of the situation, and the unique situation, and the unique need that Mr. Eller is talking about here. It's very, very difficult for me to make a vote at this point without knowing the full story.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Mr. Eller?

MR. ELLER: This is a unique situation. I discussed that with Mr. Eller, I'm sorry to interrupt you, but just before you speak, tell us who you are. Just say "Rich Eller," and keep going.

MR. ELLER: Rich Eller at HomeLift, again, responding to Mike's comments. It is a unique situation. I did discuss a little with them the possibility of a LULA. The financing of a LULA and the construction cost in this old building would far exceed what he can handle. He's a barbershop owner. He doesn't have -- he just can't do it. At his age, he doesn't have it. He's in a rural town. He's just trying to find a way to get upstairs.
that this guy is trying to continue to make a living and I, you know, applaud that. And if we can do something that will help and not be totally out of the realm of the code, I'm all for that. But, personally, I don't think we have enough information yet.

MR. LaPORTE: Vic LaPorte.

David, I can help answer that. I agree, actually, with everything that Mike had said and actually was going to suggest a LULA also.

Mr. Eller, you're going to build a hoistway for this chairlift. You're going to have to build a hoistway for a LULA, too. And I think that cost would be fairly similar, because you have the short pit and overhead with the LULA.

One quick question: Were you planning on penetrating a floor?

MR. ELLER: Rich Eller from HomeLift again.

Yes. It would penetrate in order to gain access to the second floor. And if I can comment quickly back to the prior gentleman's -- this is an old building, so in terms of fire code, I'm not a fire inspector. I don't know all of those rules. There's no fire sprinkler in the building at this point. This has got to be at least a 50-year-old building. I mean, this is an old town square, so --

MR. LaPORTE: Right. Vic LaPorte again.

I think the issue isn't so much the fire code, because you would build a hoistway to meet the fire code. But a vertical platform lift is only recognized, not only by A18.1 to a maximum of 14 foot or 168 inches of rise, but, also, by the international building code. So even if we approve this to the building code, this would basically be an unrecognized piece of equipment.

I don't think the building code allows for it at all either. There are also other considerations that aren't normally thought of. By changing the rise of this by two feet, which may not sound like a lot to some people but, as Mike said, it is a lot. It's -- what is that? -- 12 1/2 percent additional travel. And, for example, 2.12.2, under emergency power, these lifts are basically battery-operated. Right? There are 110 volts supplied to them, but that's basically for the battery charger. And as a loss of power, this lift needs to operate at full load for five full cycles. That may affect that additional two feet, the ability for this lift to do that. There's also anchorage and attachment issues that would come up. Again, so this would be, really, a violation of A18.1 and the international building code. And A18.1 is very, very, very clear about the 168-inch maximum.

I certainly would be in favor of, you know, somehow if there's help for this gentleman, financially, to look at a LULA because this is just not the right piece of equipment for this application. A LULA would certainly qualify for this. I can't give you, obviously, a definitive answer here, but I would think the cost wouldn't be so substantially more that it would be out of the question. Commercial elevator, that's a whole different story, but I don't think that would, also, be necessary in this application.

MR. ELLER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Ms. George, are you comfortable with what we have? Are we getting the names and everything?

MS. GEORGE: Cassandra, are you good or would you like to do a roll call?

THE REPORTER: I'm not sure I understand what you're asking.

MS. GEORGE: Would you like for everyone to announce their names or do you think you're good with what we have?

THE REPORTER: So far I'm good with what we have, as long as we keep speaking, people are identifying themselves first. But so far, I'm good with what we have.

MR. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman -- Dan Bailey -- during the course of that discussion, LULA was referenced several times. And just for the record, LULA is an acronym, L-U-L-A, for what?

MR. LaPORTE: Vic LaPorte.

I apologize. I should've said that. LULA is a limited use limited access elevator.

MR. BAILEY: Thank you.

MR. HALE: David Hale, Mr. Chair. You know, I certainly feel for this guy's situation and, you know, possibly, if Mr. Eller came back with some additional information, some plans, something that we can, for lack of a better term, sink our teeth into, maybe a resolution could be made with the assistance of the staff there and that kind of
thing. But again, I sort of feel like we have a little bit of the cart before the horse. And if I go back to my comment about the fire department and so forth, anytime you penetrate a floor, you make a concern for the fire department. That comes from 30 years of fire service and retiring as a fire chief. Anytime you penetrate the floor, you change the fire load.

Now, the other thing is, is that I feel very strongly that the local fire department needs to, and codes, needs to look at this because you don't want -- as a fire service, you don't want to arrive on the scene and be surprised by the fact that he's trapped upstairs with a device you didn't know about.

MR. ELLER: Fair enough. This is Rich Eller from HomeLift.

CHAIRMAN FOX: This is Robbie Fox.

Any other questions or comments?

MR. ELLER: This is Rich from HomeLift again.

CHAIRMAN FOX: This is Robbie Fox.

I appreciate the comments and guidance. I'll do a little more homework. I understand this, no pun intended, a stretch trying to do this. I understand the implications of a limited use limited access elevator from a financial perspective, versus a VPL, a vertical platform lift. But at this time, I think I understand the Board's position that it's a no-go until we can either get some more information and come back to the table, get the fire department involved. I'm going to go back to the gentleman and say, you know, we're kind of pushing a rock up a hill here. It's not that it can't be done, but we've got to do a little more homework, and it's going to be difficult.

So I appreciate the time, appreciate getting on the agenda, and I took all your comments. And, once again, I appreciate the time.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Thank you, sir.

MR. ELLER: This is Robbie Fox.

Anything else on either one of those items, Number 8?

No verbal response.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Okay. Moving along to Number 9, open discussion items.

MR. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, Dan Bailey. I think you would need to make a motion to deny that variance request.

CHAIRMAN FOX: You're correct. I stand corrected.

I would entertain a motion to approve or deny Mr. Eller's request.

MR. BAILEY: Also, are there any conflicts?

CHAIRMAN FOX: And, Mr. LaPorte, are there any conflicts with you?

MR. LAPORTE: There are no conflicts.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Okay.

MR. POPE: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN FOX: Yes, sir.

MR. POPE: Can we just table this at this time? Would that not be better than giving the gentleman a no?

CHAIRMAN FOX: Well, that's where I think it's going to be -- we need to make a decision and then he can come back and request approval again.

MR. POPE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN FOX: So, again, I would entertain a motion to approve or deny his request.

MR. POPE: I make a motion we deny at this time.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Mr. Pope, James Roy
and if you can get the information necessary, you can come back to us.

MR. ELLER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Okay. Moving along to Item Number 9, open discussion items.

Mr. Herrod?

MR. HERROD: Yes. This is Tom Herrod, assistant commissioner for WRC. I would like the Board to discuss having the permits displayed in the elevator. Some years ago it was discussed and approved that the permits could be on file with a notice in elevator of such. And recently, there's been some concern as to situations where people have the elevators malfunction and people have been trapped for some period of time and calling out on the emergency phone, not knowing how to properly identify where they're at or the emergency contact within the elevator didn't work correctly. And then when they used their cell phone, they weren't sure what building they were in, what floor they were on, and that sort of thing. So perhaps displaying the permit again or some other identifying -- whether it be a permanent fixture or just the permit itself being displayed would help that situation.

So I would like our chief and assistant chief to comment, initially, on that just from their perspective of doing inspections. Because I know they've been hit up recently with questions as to whether or not we're doing our job on the permits and if we're negligent in some fashion.

So I would like Mike McPherson, our chief inspector, and then Thomas Jackson, our assistant chief, to comment from their perspective, and then get the board members' input on this, please. Mike McPherson, would you go first?

MR. MCPHERSON: Yes, sir. This is Mike McPherson. Just to reiterate what Mr. Herrod has said, we have been questioned a few times about what the proper procedure is. We are supposed to have these permits displayed inside the elevator car.

I think before, it was discussed or acceptable to put in a notification saying that the permit was on file in the maintenance department, or wherever, in lieu of having maybe an extra expired permit there displayed. But in case of such an emergency or an entrapment, it kind of takes care of everything. If you do have that permit there, it has a Tennessee number there that's displayed. And most importantly, it has the location, the physical address, of where the elevator is. So therefore, in an emergency case, emergency personnel, elevator company, fire department, whoever, can be dispatched to the correct location. You can add to that if you would like.

MR. JACKSON: Thomas Jackson, assistant chief elevator inspector.

We inspect the elevator communication under many different codes. It depends on what year the elevator was actually accepted determines what that communication requirement is. We've got elevators that were accepted under a 1996 code, which just calls for a two-way communication inside the elevator to an outside source. And then as it moves up through the years, the requirements have become more stringent.

Presently, the 2010 code requires communication outside the elevator that is utilized by pushing a button on the elevator. It calls a 24-hour answering service. It will state the location of the elevator and the number of the elevator.

The building owners have been -- it's the building owner's responsibility to inspect the elevator phones monthly and to keep a log on-site, stating that they have tested the phones. This is to help -- we come every six months. We may come in and a phone works, and then two weeks later the phone may go out. And if nobody was checking it, then it would be six months before we found an issue.

So the building owners are the -- the building owner's responsibility to test these phones is to help keep the phones working in good operating condition. So when they test these phones, if there's an issue with the location or with the elevator number, then it's their responsibility to notify either the elevator company or whoever monitors their phone to make the necessary corrections.

Our inspectors do check on their inspections, but phones go out from time to time, they change phone companies. There are many different scenarios that come into place, and if someone programs the wrong address into a phone, building owner should catch it. They should know their building address. So it's putting the
location in the elevator, whether it be a means of
installing the permits back in the elevator, which
is probably the easiest thing to do, or making the
building owners place some kind of placard inside
the elevator that has the address. That way, if
there is a phone issue, if there is a problem,
then that phone address will be located inside the
elevator, and the person that is entrapped can
make a phone call to 911 and give the proper
address. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FOX: This is Robbie Fox.
Any discussion on this before the Board?

MR. HALE: David Hale.
And I guess this is for Mr. Jackson
or Mr. McPherson, either one. Which is the
most -- which one is the most advantageous, would
you believe; to have the owner put signage in
there of where you are and what elevator, or
putting the permit back in the car? Which one of
those do you believe serves the purpose the best?

MR. MCPHERSON: This is Mike McPherson. I think just by putting the permit
back in there, I think that encompasses all the
information that one would need in an emergency
situation at all.

MR. HALE: So -- David Hale -- one
more question: Would they be allowed to put a
legible copy in the elevator, or would it be the
original permit?

MR. MCPHERSON: Mike McPherson.
I think that a copy is fine.

MR. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN FOX: Yes, sir.

MR. BAILEY: Dan Bailey, legal
counsel.
I just need to point out that the
rules currently require or say, regarding issuing
permits -- this is Rule 0800-03-04-.06,
paragraph 3, Posting of Permits: The required
permit or a sign designating where such permit is
located shall be posted in a conspicuous location
in elevator car or on or near the escalator,
dumbwaiter, or other lift.

CHAIRMAN FOX: This is Robbie Fox.
So you're asking us, at this point --
you're asking the Board to approve the change, or,
specifically, what do we need to change in that
particular section?

MR. BAILEY: Are you asking me that
question?

CHAIRMAN FOX: Yes, sir, I am.
MR. BAILEY: I was only pointing
out that the rules, currently, allow an elevator
owner to not post a permit, but to post a sign
indicating where the permit is located.
So what's being asked here is to
require them to put the permit in the elevator.
And, currently, the rules don't require that.

CHAIRMAN FOX: This is Robbie Fox
again.
So we would have to change a specific
section in that rule?

MR. BAILEY: Well, yes, you would
have to. It does require signage, as to where
it's located. Now, if the signage says -- you
know, gives the address of the building and the
number of the elevator, I think it's still going
to accomplish what you're trying to accomplish
here.

But I was just pointing out what the
rule currently says versus what's being requested.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Okay.

Mr. Herrod, were you going to comment
on that?
recommendation, if there is any, if you have a recommendation. Or if you would rather not say
and just give us some options there. I think that's what we wanted to do. Since this is an open discussion -- that's what we're looking for, just an open discussion on it.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Do you need us to vote on this?

MR. HALE: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN FOX: Yes, sir.

MR. HALE: David Hale. If I understand what Mr. Bailey is saying, correctly, in order to change it where they have to post the permit and don't have the option of putting a sign that says that the permit is in the maintenance department or the front desk or whatever, we would have to do a rule change. But is it possible that owners could be notified that we would like for that -- if you choose to put up the sign, it needs to include the address and what elevator you're in, identifying information, as opposed to having to make a rule change.

MR. MCPHERSON: This is Mike McPherson here. I think by just putting the -- the permit was kind of like a fix-all, because it accomplishes all the information that you would need. It seems that the rule reads that it's kind of -- Mr. Bailey can correct me -- it's one or the other. That's why I was just recommending the permit, because it already has all the information on it versus having a placard or anything else made up. That way, if you just post a permit, then you have all the information that you would need.

CHAIRMAN FOX: And this is Robbie Fox again.

But in order to change that, we would have to do a rule change. Am I correct, Mr. Bailey?

MR. BAILEY: Well, if the goal is to make it a requirement that the permit be posted in the elevator, then yes, you would have to do a rule change. Currently, the rule gives the owner the option of posting the permit, which they can certainly be encouraged to do, or posting a sign indicating where the permit is located.

Now, that signage could also give the address of the building and the number of the elevator. Right now, again, the rule doesn't require it. It can certainly be encouraged. I think most building owners want to have as, you know, safe a situation as they can. And to require it, yes, you might have to do a rule change.

MR. LaPORTE: Vic LaPorte.

Mike or T.J., I'm drawing a blank on this, but do either of you know offhand -- something is telling me -- isn't there a requirement in A17.1 2016 that requires the permit to be displayed in the elevator?

MR. JACKSON: Thomas Jackson, Assistant Chief Elevator Inspector.

Presently, we are under the 2010 code. I'm not sure what the 2016 code requires, at this time.

MR. LaPORTE: So we've approved that, so when we move to that, that may take care of his problem.

And, Mr. Bailey, this might be a funny question, but the rule, it says that signage is allowed. Rather than going through all the work of doing a rule change, the elevator department -- I mean, can they simply say that a sign is allowed, saying where the permit is, as long as the permit is in the elevator?

MR. BAILEY: I don't know if I understood that. You're saying put up a sign where the permit is, as long as the permit is in the elevator?

MR. LaPORTE: Well, if the building wanted to argue the rule, basically. We can tell the buildings -- and I am strongly in favor of having the permits displayed in the elevators. And typically, the reasons that people don't want them, some will claim vandalism, but as Mr. McPherson said, we would be okay with a quality copy, that it could be replaced. It's usually an esthetic thing, that they don't want to mount a certificate frame or see the certificate. And we're talking about elevators. People are in them for 10, 15, maybe 20 seconds. But that shouldn't be the concern. But if a building wanted to push back, if they knew the rule well, we can still require the permit to be in the elevator. And if they want to put up a sign saying that the permit is located in the elevator, that would kind of be a deterrent for the sign. But they can certainly do both.

MR. BAILEY: Well, I understand
what you're saying. I think a clearer reading of that rule is -- it certainly seems to say to me that if I'm a building owner, I have the option of either posting a permit in the elevator car or posting a sign that says where that permit is located.

Now, your point about the new elevator standards that has been approved but not yet in effect, if that addresses signage and requires it to be in the elevator car, then that -- those rules will go into effect sooner than we could ever do a rule change. So I think that's important to know, if that's the case, you know, because, like I said, those rules are going to be effective before we would ever be able to go back through the rulemaking process.

MR. LaPORTE: Right. Vic LaPorte, again. That's why I brought that up in that way, also. So, I guess, probably the elevator department and I'll take it upon myself, too, needs to do some research on that, what, specifically, in the 2016 code. And that may solve the problem.

But as far as -- I'm not speaking for the Board but for myself -- recommendation-wise, I strongly agree with that. We should be looking at permits being displayed or quality copies of permits being displayed.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Robbie Fox.

Mr. Herrod?

MR. HERROD: Yes. This is Tom Herrod.

I guess, based on the discussion, it seems like that there is a feeling or a thought that the best thing would be to display the permits. But requiring them, at this point in time, may not be within our jurisdiction, necessarily. But I think if the rule changes, they go into effect, Mr. Bailey, I believe, by July the 1st, if they're approved, it would be July the 1st of 2021 before they would go into effect. I would say that we could tell our owner/operators that permits will probably be required starting July the 1st, 2021, for a copy -- you know, original or the copy, and that to get in compliance, it would be good to go ahead and -- for them to get a head start, because within six months, we'll be back and they will be under that particular code, elevator code.

So I think what we'll do is to tell our owner/operators in the upcoming inspections of what requirements will likely be -- most probably be beginning in July of 2021 and ask them to move in that direction to comply with that and to post a permit or a copy of it.

So that's my thought right now, and I think, based on discussion, that's probably the best thing, course of action, at this time.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Robbie Fox.

I would agree. I mean, we can obviously take a roll call vote of the Board. But I haven't heard any adverse comments to the request.

MR. HALE: David Hale.

Mr. Chair, I wonder if -- and I am in support of putting in identification, and if the permit is the easiest way, then we can certainly do that. And I wonder if, in the interim, the owners just received a letter from the office that said this is coming in July anyway, and in the interest of public safety, you know, if you could move toward posting the permit, you know, some wording of that type, just encouraging the owners to go ahead and do that in the interest of public safety and with the knowledge that it's coming.

MR. HERROD: Mr. Chairman, this is Tom Herrod again. I think what Mr. Hale said is excellent. And what we can do, the more I think about it, permits are issued annually. Inspections are done every six months. So what we will do, as the permits go out, we will put a notice in there with those permits, asking them to display them --

CHAIRMAN FOX: This is Robbie Fox.

You dropped off, Mr. Herrod.

MR. HERROD: Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN FOX: We can now, sir.

MR. HERROD: Okay. Thank you. I think what we'll do is we issue the permits which are put out annually, as I said. We will put a notice in with that permit to ask to display the permit in the elevator going forward or a copy of it, a legible copy of it. And I think that will take care of the notice.

CHAIRMAN FOX: This is Robbie Fox, again, Mr. Herrod.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chair, this is Larry Moore. I've been looking at 2016 code, and I have found a section on identification that's
identification is, it says in buildings with more
than one elevator, each elevator in the building
shall be assigned a unique alphabetic, or
alphanumeric identification. And then it goes on
to tell the height of those letters, and then it
tells that the car operating panel, a minimum of
12mm or 5 inches of height. So there would be, in
2016 code, telling what that elevator is, and it's
got to be above the car operating panel, which is,
you know, where most of the phones are located, is
very close to that or part of that panel. So I
think that code may actually address what elevator
is what.

Also, later on, it mentions that you
have to have four-inch-high letters or
four-inch-high numbers indicating the floors on
the inside of the hoistway for those cars for
the -- inside the hoistway is visible. I'm
assuming that's more for maintenance than for the
elevator user.

But some of this, as far as knowing
which one is which, is going to be taken care of
by code on new installs. On the old, we'll still
have this issue. So that's just the information I
wanted to pass along. I hope that helped or

I would ask for at this time, would anyone be
adverse to supporting the idea of putting the
permits in the elevator with the information they
requested?

Mr. Herrod, were you going to
comment?

MR. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN FOX: Yes, sir.

MR. BAILEY: If I could just clear
up a couple of things. One is the upgrade of the
elevator standards will very likely go into effect
prior to July 1. Now, the fee increases cannot go
into effect until July 1, but the code upgrade
will go in effect in 90 days once it's filed with
the Secretary of State's office, which has to
first go through the AG's office. So it's likely
that code could go in effect around May, prior to
July 1. I just wanted to clarify that.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Robbie Fox.

So that clears it up. We don't have
to vote on it, then; is that correct? Or approve
it?

MR. BAILEY: I wasn't commenting on
that. I was just -- it had been said earlier that
the new elevator standards would go into effect

July 1. I was just pointing out it's likely to go
into effect sooner than that.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Okay.

MR. HERROD: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN FOX: Yes, sir.

MR. HERROD: Tom Herrod.

I guess, now, based on what you said,
Mr. Chairman, is it the Board's recommendation to
just hold off until the rule change comes into
effect, whether it's May or later, before we do
anything on requiring some kind of identification
in the elevators? Is that what the Board
recommends?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Bailey, this is
Larry Moore. I have a question for you. Because
it is stated that way in the rules, can we legally
enforce the requirement for permit until the rule
is changed?

MR. BAILEY: Until the new rules
become effective, and if those new rules address
this, currently, we're under the old rules. And
so the answer would be no, we cannot require them
to put the permit in the elevator car. They would
either have to have the permit or a sign saying
where the permit is located.
MR. LaPORTE: Mr. Bailey, Vic LaPorte. This rule -- I'm sorry -- code Section 1.2.2.1 that I'm referring to, though, which I think would be appropriate for them to require this, that is also in the current 2010 code, same section. So it doesn't specifically address to display a permit, but, again, it allows the Elevator Unit to exceed what's in the code.

Mike McPherson, you may want to comment on that. You probably have the experience of requiring above and beyond what's in the code in specific situations. I don't know, technically, about it being legal with the state's rules, but code-wise, it's normal practice.

Well, ultimately, we can, you know, recommend a sign or the permit to be displayed. So I think from here, going forward, no matter whatever code changes, I think that we should still stick to that practice, so recommending that the sign or certificate is there, as long as it has that information we're looking for, which is mainly the physical address of where the elevator is, is what we're looking for. So I think we recommend either one of those. I think we're safe in legal there.

I think that we could do that within our rules currently. And I think that is addressing the main thing that we want the public to be aware of, is where the elevator is located and what elevator they're in, if I'm correct on that. I think we can do that, but it either has to be them posting the permit or posting a sign that says where the permit is. But that sign can also identify the elevator they're in and where the permit is for that elevator where they're at.

But apparently, the rule does not require that you have all the information that Mr. McPherson talked about there a minute ago. Am I wrong on that or -- tell me.

MR. BAILEY: Well, the rule says the required permit or a sign designating where such permit is located shall be posted in a conspicuous location in the elevator car. But -- and as Mr. LaPorte was talking about, the code allows the authority having jurisdiction to, you know, go above and beyond any of the code requirements. And the only thing I'm saying is, is if they posted the permit in that car, that permit would say, you know, this elevator is located -- you know, like that.
that we instruct owner/operators to either post
the permit or add appropriate information to their
location, in the interest of public safety.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Robbie Fox.
We have a motion. Do we have a
second?

MR. LaPORTE: Vic LaPorte.
Second.

MR. POPE: Second.

James Roy Pope.

CHAIRMAN FOX: We have a second.

Any further discussion?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRMAN FOX: Hearing none, roll
call vote. Mr. LaPorte?

MR. LaPORTE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Mr. Hale?

MR. HALE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Mr. Moore?

MR. MOORE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Mr. Moorer?

MR. MOORER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Mr. Pope?

MR. POPE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOX: And Ms. O'Connor?

MS. O'CONNOR: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Thank you-all very
much.

Mr. Herrod, I think we accomplished
what we needed to on that particular one.

MR. HERROD: Yes, sir. Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Okay. Any other
items under the open discussion items that we need
to bring forward?

MR. JACKSON: Chairman Fox, if I
may. Thomas Jackson, city chief elevator
inspector.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Yes?

MR. JACKSON: We've had many
elevator companies -- due to the COVID pandemic,
we've got multiple elevator companies requesting
approval to install ultraviolet devices on
elevator handrails to eradicate bacteria and
viruses. This is not a device that comes with the
escalators. It is an add-on. So it's something
that we've done some research on. There's
presently two types of installations that have
been requested.

One device mounts externally at the
end of the handrail. The Elevator Unit is not in
favor of this application since we feel it's not
code compliant in meeting minimum clearances
between the handrail and an adjacent surface and
could possibly produce a pinch point.

The second is an internally mounted
device which eliminates the risk of passenger
pinch points. But one of the concerns that we had
was the effect of UV exposure on handrail
integrity which is an elastomer. Documentation
has been provided which shows no negative effects
on handrails after 50,000 hours of testing. The
devices researched have also been found to be UL
certified.

If the Elevator Board elected to
allow the installation of the UV devices, we have
several recommendations. We would recommend that
all elements of the device are to be mounted fully
internal to the truss and not be accessible to the
public. We would require that the UV light device
shall be UL listed, certified, labeled, and
marked. The UV lighting equipment and its wiring
should comply with all A17.1 and national
electrical code requirements. Documentation
containing information and procedures for
installation, repair, maintenance, and inspection
of the UV device should be provided and remain on
site. The application of any signs, stickers,
films, or advertising materials shall not be
installed on the handrails. Signage shall meet
the requirements of A17.1. Devices must be
installed by elevator personnel. Equipment shall
be so arranged so ultraviolet radiation does not
strike elevator personnel's eyes in harmful
intensity. We would request that the Elevator
Unit be notified in writing prior to the
installation of any UV device, and a special
inspection should be required following the
installation. A special inspection fee would
apply.

At this time, Mr. McPherson and I, we
have gone over the research. We've reached out to
some other states. Some states are accepting this
installation. Some states aren't. We can't find
anything detrimental to the installation of this
device at this time. So we, sort of, would like
the Board's approval or disapproval on the
installation of these devices.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Okay. Let's get a
motion and a second, and then we'll discuss it. I
would entertain a motion to approve or to deny.

MS. O'CONNOR: Kelly O'Connor, board member.

I would move to approve the recommendations made by the Elevator Unit on this issue.

MR. HALE: David Hale.

I'll second her motion.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Robbie Fox.

Thank you. Any discussion?

MR. LaPORTE: Vic LaPorte.

Mr. Jackson, I've got to say, I read your research here, and you really did an excellent job looking into this. I know quite a bit about these units, and you've addressed most every concern that I would have, and I agree with you a hundred percent about the external unit not being code compliant and should absolutely not be allowed. The internals only.

The only two things that I would add to the requirement -- one thing and one suggestion -- first, because this is an attachment -- it is not provided with the original unit.

And this comes more with the 2016 code when it's adopted, that there is maintenance and cure to these units. The ultraviolet LEDs need to be tested so often. They need to be cleaned. The special maintenance procedures should be included in the MCPs or added to the MCPs in the special provisions section. On the MCPs, that will be required with the 2016 code. And the second is this clearly an alteration, not -- all the states that I've worked in, these are being allowed, but only one state is doing the following, and that's requiring a permit to actually be pulled beforehand, and then requiring the inspection, with the appropriate fees, of course.

But if there's concern about the unit or the installation or the signage that sometimes unnecessarily accompanies it, I would recommend -- I don't know if the burden would be to the Elevator Unit -- but considering requiring a permit fee pulled for an alteration to install these.

MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN FOX: Yes, sir?

MR. JACKSON: Thomas Jackson, assistant chief elevator inspector.

In pulling a permit with our department -- and maybe I should have let Mike take care of this -- but in pulling a permit with our department, it would actually change the elevator number. If we list it as a special inspection, then it is -- where we would be notified under a special inspection, but a new permit wouldn't have to be pulled and the state number wouldn't have to be changed, it would be like a jack replacement; whereas, when an underground jack is replaced, the elevator company calls us, and we actually go out and perform a special inspection to verify that everything that has been changed meets code. Therefore, I don't really recommend pulling a permit as much as making it simplified by just making a special inspection.

MR. LaPORTE: Vic LaPorte, again.

That's why I qualified that with not sure it's a burden to the Elevator Unit. That makes sense, but it certainly accomplishes what you are looking to do.

MR. JACKSON: Yes.

MR. HALE: David Hale for Mr. Jackson or Mr. McPherson, either one.
50,000 hours of testing, as Vic put in, putting it in a maintenance control program to where it is routinely checked, they stay on top of the handrails anyhow. I don't understand all the effect of UV rays, but there's a limit to how much -- I don't know the terminology -- how much, let's say, ray force is put onto that handrail. And I think there's a limit like -- you can't go over, like, 280 of whatever this measurement is. And the UV devices that the elevator companies are requesting to install is that measurement or under. So it's not going above to where it should be damaging the handrails. But in answering your question, I really think that their main concern is -- okay, they're putting a device on here that's got UV rays; what's it going to do to the material? And since we found the research saying 50,000 hours is good, if we added in a maintenance control program to where the elevator contractor is routinely checking the handrails to make sure that no damage is being -- no exposure is damaging the handrails, then I think we're going to be in pretty good shape. And if we find out it's damaging the handrails, then somebody is going to say, okay, we're going to have to get these things off, because the cost of changing these handrails out is astronomical. So I hope that answers your question.

MS. O'CONNOR: T.J., this is Kelly O'Connor. I have a question on this, just out of curiosity's sake. Are owners looking at this as a temporary measure during the COVID pandemic? And when vaccines come out and are widely used, are these going to be dis-installed? I mean, are we going to get rid of this, or is this permanent technology that they plan on keeping for the life of the technology or the life of the escalator?

MR. JACKSON: Thomas Jackson, assistant chief elevator inspector. I would probably say that once these are installed, they're not going to come off. Escalator handrails are nasty. I mean, everybody touches it. Anybody that gets on that escalator -- and we want them to touch it, because the accidents or when people fall on escalators, is because they've got their hands full and they're not holding onto the handrails. So that handrail is there to keep them from falling, and they are super nasty. So I'm going to say that once these are installed, they're going to stay, because it is eradicating the bacteria and the viruses.

MR. LaPORTE: Vic LaPorte. I can tell you, too, Ms. O'Connor, that the studies that were done -- and, I think, T.J., that the study that you're talking about with the 50,000 hours was actually done by EHC, Escalator Handrail Company, that supplies probably 80 percent of the handrails throughout the -- throughout North America. And the test is done on all germs, bacteria, and viruses, including but not limited to the coronavirus. And unfortunately, after corona, we're probably going to have more viruses down the road. So yeah, this is being looked at as a permanent solution. As T.J. said, handrails are really nasty. Nobody realizes it, but everybody is touching them. So it looks like a really good piece of technology for environmental health.

Thanks, Vic. That's what I thought was the situation and what I was hoping for, but I was just curious about that.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Robbie Fox.

Any other discussion?

MR. POPE: Mr. Fox?

CHAIRMAN FOX: Sir?

MR. POPE: I would like to say one thing at this time. I think we're about done and ready for adjournment, but I would just like to acknowledge the passing of Assistant Commissioner Tom's wife and extend my deepest and most sincere condolences.

CHAIRMAN FOX: I would concur in that, sir.

MR. HERROD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Any other discussion?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRMAN FOX: Hearing none, roll call vote.

Mr. LaPorte?

MR. LaPORTE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Mr. Hale?

MR. HALE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Mr. Moore?

MR. MOORE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Mr. Moorer?

MR. MOORER: Aye.
CHAIRMAN FOX: Mr. Pope?

MR. POPE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Ms. O'Connor?

MS. O'CONNOR: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Thank you-all very much. Motion carries.

Okay. Mr. Herrod, anything else under open discussion items that we need to address?

MR. MOORE: This is Larry Moore. I do have one question for everyone out there. And I'll be really brief, Robbie. But, you know, we don't think this corona is going away, and like Mr. LaPorte said, to expect something to follow that. Has -- Mike, Thomas, or Vic, have you-all heard of, you know, any new pieces of material or equipment that is going to be placed in elevators for, like, the key pads, things of that nature, that everyone touches, the hall stations, an ultraviolet light there? And if so, do we think that this will actually be something to follow that. Has -- Mike, Thomas, or Vic, have you-all heard of, you know, any new pieces of material or equipment that is going to be placed in elevators for, like, the key pads, things of that nature, that everyone touches, the hall stations, an ultraviolet light there? And if so, do we think that this will actually be something to follow that. Has -- Mike, Thomas, or Vic, have you-all heard of, you know, any new pieces of material or equipment that is going to be placed in elevators for, like, the key pads, things of that nature, that everyone touches, the hall stations, an ultraviolet light there? And if so, do we think that this will actually be something to follow that.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Robbie Fox.

MR. LaPORTE: This is Vic LaPorte. There are a couple of different products out there now. There are replaceable covers for buttons that have some type of germ-killing coating on them. There's antibacterial handrails for escalators, not just -- or just bacteria, not virus. There's also cabin air sanitizers for elevator cabs. However, they are so widely different, Larry. Just, for example, these cabin air sanitizers, some just simply take the air from the elevator shaft, bring it in the vents, and it goes through a HEPA filter and goes up back in the elevator shaft. Which I don't understand what that does, other than nothing. So recirculate and have actual UV lighting in a contained unit that kills the germs, there's so much different variances out there. I don't know that you could just approve something broadly. Just like these handrail sanitizers for the escalators, I think some units the State is going to look at favorably, and some, not so much.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Robbie Fox.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Any other comments?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRMAN FOX: Hearing none, we will move along to Item Number 10, announcement of the next meeting.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Fox -- this is Larry Moore -- did we need to vote? I think it was motioned and seconded, but did we actually do the vote? I believe we did, didn't we?

CHAIRMAN FOX: Yes, we did.

MR. MOORE: Okay. I'm going to take my Geritol and shut up.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Okay. Moving on to Item Number 10, announcement of next meeting, the first one will be March the 2nd, 2021; the next one will be June the 1st, 2021. And I sure hope that we get to meet in person at that point. The next one will be September 14th, 2021, and the next one will be December 7, Pearl Harbor Day of 2021.

And I would entertain a motion for adjournment, at this point.

MS. O'CONNOR: Kelly O'Connor.

I'll make a motion to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN FOX: Ms. O'Connor, thank you.

Mr. Pope, I think you were trying to make one.

MR. POPE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FOX: All right. We are adjourned, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you-all very, very much. Good meeting.
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