



Legislation Text

File #: Res 1924-2001, **Version:** *

Res. No. 1924

Resolution calling on the appropriate committee of the City Council to hold a hearing to assess the feasibility, effectiveness and cost of requiring door restrictors in elevators in New York City.

By Council Members Oddo, Fiala, Henry, Abel and Golden; also Council Members Eisland and Linares

Whereas, On April 13, 2001, two 10 year old boys were traveling in their building's elevator when one of the boys fell to the bottom of the seven story shaft and died; and

Whereas, The incident occurred as a result of the boy stopping the elevator in between the fifth and sixth floors, prying open the elevator doors and attempting to swing onto the landing above; and

Whereas, While attempting this maneuver, the boy tragically lost his grip on the side of the car when it suddenly began to move, causing him to fall seven stories through the shaft to his death; and

Whereas, Elevator manufacturers produce a device known as a door restrictor that prevents passengers from opening elevator doors if the elevator stops between floors; and

Whereas, There are various types of door restrictors appropriate for different types of elevators; and

Whereas, Heavy-duty mechanical door restrictors mount directly on the elevator car door without the use of metal angles in the hoistway, while microprocessor-based electro-mechanical door restrictors integrate directly into an elevator's existing door system and are installed on top of the elevator door track, while collapsible door restrictors work in conjunction with a hoistway door angle to deter passengers from exiting the car outside the landing zone; and

Whereas, Elevator codes in virtually all states in the United States of America require evacuation deterrent devices on elevators; and

Whereas, In 1987, New York City adopted new design guidelines for elevators, within Reference Standard 18, which incorporate the American National Standards Institute/ American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ANSI/ASME) Safety Code for Elevators and Escalators; and

Whereas, Except for a limited number of provisions of these standards, the new guidelines were not made retroactive, meaning that elevators already installed as of 1987 are not required to meet many of the new safety standards, including door restrictor requirements; and

Whereas, As recently as 1997, New York City had over 60,000 elevators, more than triple the number of the city with the second most elevators in the United States, Los Angeles; and

Whereas, Buildings that have installed door restrictors have had varying results, ranging from the vandalization of such safety devices to the point of uselessness to positive results showing elevator related injuries dropping significantly with the installation of door restrictors; and

Whereas, Based upon available information, it is difficult to reach a satisfactory analytical conclusion regarding whether requiring door restrictors would be feasible, effective and not prohibitively costly; and

Whereas, Despite such uncertainty about the feasibility of door restrictors, it is clear that when an elevator stops between floors, tragic accidents can occur if passengers attempt to exit the car and leap to the landing; and

Whereas, Because the safest place for passengers to be until trained personnel arrive to remove them is in the elevator, door restrictors may save lives; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the appropriate committee of the City Council hold a hearing to assess the feasibility, effectiveness and cost of requiring door restrictors in elevators in New York City.

MBS-5/17/01
LS#4186