



DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION
City & County of San Francisco
1660 Mission Street, San Francisco, California 94103-2414

ACCESS APPEALS COMMISSION

MINUTES

Wednesday, January 23, 2002

1:00 P.M.

City Hall

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Way, Room 416

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The regular meeting of the Access Appeals Commission was called to order by President Lim at 1:05 PM.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Ms. Enid Lim, President
Mr. Francis K. Chatillon, Vice-President
Ms. Roslyn Baltimore
Ms. Alyce G. Brown
Mr. Linton Stables III

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT: None

CITY REPRESENTATIVES: Mr. Rafael Torres-Gil, DBI, Secretary
Ms. Susan Pangilinan, DBI, Recording Secretary
Ms. Judy Boyajian, Deputy City Attorney
Ms. Doris M. Levine, Reporter

2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS:

Commissioner Stables nominated Vice President Chatillon for the position of President of the AAC. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown.

There were no other nominees. President Lim thereby noted that Vice-President Chatillon is now President of the AAC.

Commissioner Stables amended his motion at the request of President Lim to consider a 'slate vote'. He nominated Commissioner Brown for the position of Vice-President of the AAC. President Chatillon seconded the motion. Commissioner Alyce Brown was thereby elected as Vice-President of the AAC.

President Lim cited the names on the slate and indicated that the members of the AAC rotate

Access Appeals Commission Hearing: January 23, 2002

through the office of President every year. The Commissioners all voted 'Aye' in a general voice vote.

Francis K. Chatillon was elected President and Alyce G. Brown was elected Vice-President of the AAC.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT:

There were no Public Comments.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Various corrections were noted and a motion was made by Commissioner Stables to accept the minutes as corrected.

The Commissioners all voted 'Aye' in a general voice vote.

5. REVIEW OF COMMUNICATION ITEMS:

Letter from Mark Leno, Supervisor, dated 12/19/02.

R. Torres-Gil mentioned that the letter referred to an appeal scheduled for hearing on January 29, 2002.

6. NEW APPEAL:

a) 50 California Street Appeal # 02-01

Presentation of Summary by R Torres-Gil.

Presentation by Jeffery Feldman, Architect, based on his appeal package.

Commissioner Stables asked for clarification from the department regarding the type of appeal. Was it an exemption under Exception 1 or 2 – an appeal or ratification?

R. Torres-Gil stated that the UHR affirmed that the matter was one of ratification.

Commissioner Lim asked about the context of 1 California in this appeal.

Commissioner Baltimore requested extension of the earlier decision. Clearly they cannot raise the building. She wished also to express this as a motion.

Vice President Brown indicated that she agreed and also that the applicant requested a that the decision be recognized for future permit applications with certain limits but that she doesn't know what those limits would be. She is willing to ratify this hardship.

Presentation by Pat Buscovich, Structural Engineer regarding the structural details related to modifications of the garage necessary to comply with 8 foot 2 inch height.

President Chatillon asked about signage and the distance to that parking.

Access Appeals Commission Hearing: January 23, 2002

Mr. Feldman outlined the alternative locations.

Commissioner Stables stated that he supported the motion on the floor (by Commissioner Baltimore). It seems reasonable to him. Commissioner Baltimore injected that it was to repeat the same thing (the earlier AAC decision on 50 California). Commissioner Stables did not feel that the technology to hold up a 36 stories building would change in 5 years. In 10 – 15 years it might. He did not feel he wanted to hear this appeal repeatedly over the next five years.

Commissioner Baltimore asked for a passing around of the proposed sign.

R. Torres-Gil requested that Commissioner Baltimore restate her motion in light of the discussion and that the prior decision (#1 California) had elements that might not be applicable.

Ms. Boyajian indicated that the commissioners should rely on the facts of this case rather than just referring to the other decision that had different facts.

Commissioner Baltimore restated her motion that it would be prohibitively expensive for the building to accommodate a high top van and therefore that the exception be granted for five years because the technology probably would not change in five years or warrant a shorter period than five years.

Commissioner Baltimore wanted to give the other commissioners a chance to review the proposed sign before continuing with her motion regarding the sign

Commissioner Brown asked if the sign would be placed at the garage entrance.

Mr. Feldman gave details of the sign placement.

President Chatillon asked for a vote.

President Chatillon	Yes
Vice President Brown	Yes
Commissioner Baltimore	Aye
Commissioner Lim	Yes
Commissioner Stables	Aye

The motion to ratify the hardship passed with a vote of 5-0

7. COMMISSIONER TRAINING:

R. Torres-Gil introduced Richard Skaff, Deputy Director of the Mayor's Office of Disability and Jim Whipple, Building Inspector, Disabled Access Section, for presentation of disabled access training on the topic of Vertical and Inclined Lifts. The presentation was presented via Power Point slides with an associated handout and other handouts covering the following topics: California Wheelchair Lift Regulations Subchapter 6. Elevator Safety Orders, Article 15. Special Access Lifts Section 3094; California Division of State Architect – Access Policy Update, Residential Elevators in Commercial Buildings 95-5; AAC Special Access

Access Appeals Commission Hearing: January 23, 2002

Wheelchair Lift Standard Features; and California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Occupational Safety and Health, Elevator, Ride and Tramway Unit, Circular Letter E-98-1.

The Power Point presentation and discussion was followed by presentation of the Itinerary for Wheelchair Lift and Elevator Tour for review of onsite installations of wheelchair lifts at the following venues:

Site One: City Hall Polk Street Entrance – Inclined lift @ Polk Street interior stairway
Site Two: Opera House – Incline lift @ boardroom entrance
Site Three: Bill Graham Auditorium - Enclosed vertical platform lift at loge level.

8. COMMISSIONER AND STAFF COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:

There were none.

9. PUBLIC COMMENT:

Comments by Edward Evans with the Community Resources Action Project. He said that there are many seniors, frail elderly and disabled persons that at times require the use of mechanical lifts and elevators and was wondering if there could be a requirement that there be safety features-restrains in seats, so these persons would not be put in jeopardy when the lift is in use.

Mr. Skaff said that there is no requirement for seats in lifts and thinks that is a good requirement to add on. It adds minimal cost to lifts. They are fold- down devices and would make lifts more universally available.

Comments by Ms. Ellen Libert. She encountered problems with the lifts and part of the problem is that she has long legs and the base of her scooter is extended to 48". She is in the market for a new scooter and she sees them 50 and 52" that are still being used inside. Some consideration as far as the platform lift, should be made because scooters are getting bigger and they are still being used indoors- especially the ones with four wheels. Four- wheel scooters make turning 90 degrees more difficult vs. three wheel scooters.

The meeting concluded at 2:50 and the commission proceeded to the onsite training. All commissioners, AAC staff and court reporter attended the onsite training. No members of the public attended.

The onsite training concluded at 4:15 PM at which time the meeting was adjourned.

Rafael Torres-Gil, Senior Building Inspector
Department of Building Inspection
Secretary to the Access Appeals Commission