

Summary of BSR E1.62 Public Review with Resolutions

Referenced document: BSR E1.62, Minimum specifications for mass-produced portable platforms, ramps, stairs, and choral risers for live performance events (document number FL/2017-8012r4a)

ANSI public review period: 10 August through 24 September 2018

Question: Do you recommend that the standards committee accept BSR E1.62, Minimum specifications for mass-produced portable platforms, ramps, stairs, and choral risers for live performance events (document number FL/2017-8012r4a), as an American National Standard, that its requirements are not too lax, too onerous, or too vague, nor that it would unreasonably negatively impact materially affected parties in the entertainment industry? Please indicate "Yes" (accept it), "Yes with comments," or "No with reasons" (don't accept it).

Responses:

Person	Representing	Yes	Yes with comments	No with reasons
Michael Wells	XSF			X
Nicholas D. Holmberg	PSAV		X	

Comments and reasons with resolutions approved at the 5 October 2018 Floors Working Group meeting:

#	Person	Clause	Comment or reason	Resolution
1	Wells	6.3	<p>In Section 6.3, regarding proof testing and examination, and in an effort to match what has been written in recent standards, language should be added as to who is approved to do the testing and examination, i.e. a Qualified Person.</p> <p>Example: "Proof testing shall be carried out by a qualified person when Load and Resistance Factor..." and "After the proof test, the tested Portable Unit shall be examined by a qualified person to determine if the testing procedure..."</p>	<p>Added “. . . by a Qualified Person” to 6.3.3.1.1 the design clause. These portable units often will go into installations where the AHJ will insist on documentation that shows a “Qualified Person” has designed the units.</p> <p>Proof testing is not difficult and should not require an advanced degree. A competent person can do the work.</p>
2	Wells	4	Qualified Person should be added in section 4 - Definitions	Accept.

#	Person	Clause	Comment or reason	Resolution
3	Holmberg	7.2	No specification listed for width of ramps. I recomend adding: 7.2.1 - A minimum clear width of 36" between leading edge of handrails shall be maintained - per ADA 405.5.	Add "The minimum width should be 36 inches (91 cm) for wheelchair access," to 7.2. We already have a maximum slope that <u>should</u> be observed for wheelchair access. Narrower or steeper could be okay for some situations where wheelchair access is not needed.
4	Wells	7.3	Is there a minimum number of steps required that would require handrails? In other words, as written, it could be interpreted that a single step up of 8" would require a handrail - is that the intention? Or should it read "Multi-step stair units and ramps..." in the first sentence like it is in the second?	The working group considered the possibility that a step might be so low that no handrail would be ever be needed, and decided that no such cases exist. There are various local codes that might require a handrail on a single step. A risk assessment for a particular event might show that a handrail on a single low step might be needed. As a result, the standard requires that there be a way to provide a handrail, but does not require that a handrail always be used.
5	Wells	8.2.1	8.2.1 and 8.3.1 - Suggest adding qualified person to these sections as well. Examples for 8.2.1 include - "Audience Railings shall be designed by a qualified person to support a..." "Intermediate rails (all those except the top rail) shall be designed by a qualified person to withstand..." with the same changes in 8.3.1	The language added to 6.3.3.1.1 says the design shall be by a Qualified Person. That is sufficient.
6	Wells	8.3.1	8.2.1 and 8.3.1 - Suggest adding qualified person to these sections as well. Examples for 8.2.1 include - "Audience Railings shall be designed by a qualified person to support a..." "Intermediate rails (all those except the top rail) shall be designed by a qualified person to withstand..." with the same changes in 8.3.1	The language added to 6.3.3.1.1 says the design shall be by a Qualified Person. That is sufficient.

#	Person	Clause	Comment or reason	Resolution
7	Wells	A.6.3.2.2	"The text is in German, but it is not particularly difficult German, and the illustrations are easy to understand." If I remember correctly, the requirements for writing ANSI standards include that they be written in English. I understand that this is a reference to another standard for proof testing but requiring persons to reference a standard written in German will eliminate the majority of the market that this standard is intended for. Is there an English version of this standard that could be referenced, or could we include an interpreted version of Section A of the DIN standard?	<p>Make no change. The cited clause is in an informative appendix; there is no requirement that would need a person to be able to understand the non-English text. It is simply offered as useful information so that one does not have to invent what has already been invented.</p> <p>The German text can be understood by looking at the pictures. If that is not enough, Google Translate and DeepL render a free translation. A list of paid translation services is available on the NIST website at https://tsapps.nist.gov/notifyus/data/translation/translation.cfm. We could attempt to get the rights to translate the DIN standard, but it is not likely to be worth the cost.</p> <p>ANSI does not require American National Standards to be written in English.</p>