

April 12, 2021

Ohio House of Representatives Commerce and Labor Committee

Comments in opposition to proposed HB 107 language as of April, 2021.

Representative Baldridge,

My name is Mike Simko, president of Access Solutions, Inc., a veteran owned accessibility business based in Akron and serving northeast Ohio that opened 24 years ago.

We are opposed to the current language and intent of the proposed bill for a few reasons:

The proposed licensing requirements appear to be based solely on larger commercial elevators and their attributes. While there has been some revision with respect to residential elevators and stairlifts, we feel that the entirety of what is typically referred to as accessibility equipment (i.e., stairlifts, vertical platform lifts, incline platform lifts) should be exempt from the proposed language. This equipment all fall under A18.1 safety standard, which itself is in section A17.1.

Additionally, accessibility equipment is not "elevator equipment" With the current language, any personnel engaged in installing or servicing accessibility equipment would be required to obtain an elevator mechanic's license. Likewise, any company engaged in selling, installing and servicing accessibility would be required to obtain an elevator contractor's license. The required curriculum as mentioned in the proposed bill is focused on commercial elevators. This could be likened to anyone driving an automobile being required to obtain a CDL. This is a case of grouping "apples and oranges" together when they are, in fact two different things.

Additionally, the bill is being touted as a *public safety* measure. To date I am not aware of any data indicating statewide public safety concerns involving the accessibility industry. Current Ohio Revised Code requires that any vertical lift, stairlift or incline lift in a non-residential building have a permit application and drawings submitted to the Ohio Elevator Division for review for a permit. Once the project is complete, the equipment cannot be put into service until it has been and inspected and a weight & safety test is witnessed by the inspector for compliance with the applicable national safety code. It would appear that current regulation for this type of equipment is quite reasonable.

When evaluating whether current regulation needs to changed, Or if there is enough regulation, I would have to answer "no", it doesn't need to change in terms of requiring a full elevator mechanic's license to work in the accessibility arena and I'd have to say yes, there is currently enough regulation. If either of these questions need debated, the debate should be made and conclusions arrived at prior to moving this legislation forward.









Additionally, in terms of regulation, should this legislation end up coming to fruition, it would result in additional layers of administrative and regulatory burdens at the state level, as described in the proposed bill, yet with no real change in public safety since the current permitting and inspection regulations would not change.

Overall, it is our opinion that enacting the bill as currently written would result in the many smaller companies and employees working in the accessibility industry being put at a disadvantage. It can also be interpreted as imposing limitations on who can perform their trade in an industry they have helped establish.

It seems prudent to not vote this version into law but to allow additional discussion and revision of the language for the mutual benefit of all in the industry.

Thank you again for your time and consideration of these matters.

Regards,

Michael Simko

Access Solutions, Inc.





