

**OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY  
AND HEALTH STANDARDS BOARD**

2520 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 350

Sacramento, CA 95833

(916) 274-5721

FAX (916) 274-5743

Website address [www.dir.ca.gov/oshsb](http://www.dir.ca.gov/oshsb)**ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

Proposed Amendments for Title 8, California Code of Regulations, Construction Safety Orders,  
Sections 1504, 1637 and General Industry Safety Orders, Section 3622

**Scaffold Plank Design Requirements**

September 2 & 3, 2009  
Sacramento, California

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, George Hauptman, Senior Engineer, Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board (Board) at 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday, September 2, 2009. The Chair was assisted by Leslie Matsuoka, Standards Board Associate Governmental Program Analyst. The Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Division) was represented by Senior Safety Engineers, Patrick Bell and Mike Donlon, Research and Standards Safety Unit. The Chair welcomed committee members and asked for self-introductions.

The Chair reviewed the Board's policy and procedures concerning the goals, objectives and use of advisory committees. The Chair explained that the committee role is to advise the Board. The Board will then consider the committee recommendations usually accepting them, sometimes modifying them and less frequently rejecting the recommendations if for example, the committee's recommendations would not be at least as effective as federal OSHA standards, or would be considered as decreasing rather than increasing the level of safety afforded by the existing standards.

The Chair explained that this rulemaking action was initiated by the Division in its memorandum to the Board dated December 22, 2006, with attachments and a request for revisions to the safety orders addressing scaffold planking. The Division noted an increased use in engineered and manufactured types of scaffold planking, particularly planks made from laminated veneer lumber (LVL). The Construction Safety Orders (CSO) standards addressing scaffold planking focus primarily on solid sawn Douglas fir planking or equivalent and do not adequately address scaffold planking made from products other than solid sawn lumber. The Chair stated the amendments the committee would review are based on recommendations from the Division with some edits and modifications from Board staff's evaluation and discussions with the Division and other stakeholders.

For example, the Chair noted from discussions with stakeholders that Southern Pine is the predominant species of lumber used on the west coast for solid sawn scaffold grade plank and consequently, the proposal in Section 1504 defines other types of solid sawn scaffold planking products that are acceptable. The Chair stated that the scope of this rulemaking action is to address a

level of acceptance for manufactured/engineered planking especially the LVL plank. The Division has noted that some LVL products, especially those coming from overseas, have been substandard with respect to their bonding and adhesive effectiveness and do not provide a suitable level of safety for scaffold grade planking. The Chair referred the committee to several product advisory alerts from lumber inspection agencies that indicate poor adhesive and low bending performance of certain LVL scaffold plank products.

The Chair noted that Title 8 scaffold safety standards as a whole may need a more extensive and ambitious future rulemaking in order to address other provisions that may need updating. Amendments that may include revisions to multiple provisions in the scaffold standards or the CSO would be reserved for the future and this rulemaking action would primarily focus on the provisions related to scaffold planking.

The Chair then asked the committee about problems that have been experienced with manufactured planking. John Warlikowski, Kennison Forest Products, stated that about 3 years ago he was president of a local chapter of the Scaffold Industry Association (SIA) and he started getting compliant calls about certain LVL scaffold plank products from China that were defective and in one case had caused a serious accident in South Dakota. After multiple complaints continued on a regular basis related to LVL products he contacted Cal/OSHA's staff and worked with Mariano Kramer (Research and Standards Unit) on the issues and concerns. Mr. Warlikowski also traveled to China to meet with LVL manufacturers and stated he was unable to find a manufacturer that had established effective quality control procedures.

Joel Guth, Masonry Technology, Inc., indicated that with many years of experience he has never experienced or known of scaffold planking breaking or failing. David Glabe, DH Glabe & Associates, and (SIA rep), responded that may be in part because of the design safety factor for scaffold planks but also that responsible employers regularly inspect their scaffolding. However, he commented that there are incidences throughout the U.S. where defective planks have failed and caused accidents.

Tomas Meler, Energetic Companies Inc., added that in the inspection process one must remove delaminated planks as well as planking with splits that effect the integrity of the plank. The committee members discussed several methods including visual inspection for identifying defective planking and that guidelines published by SIA are effective tools for scaffold inspections. Patrick Bell, Division, added that the lumber inspection grading agencies also have publications that are useful for scaffold planking inspection.

The Chair stated that the Division requested the committee discuss the CSO, Appendix C, Plate C-17 to determine if this suggested method of field testing scaffold plank should be retained as an effective method of inspecting planking. One committee member indicated that the testing method worked for solid sawn products but was not suitable for LVL planks which do not react the same way with respect to cracking sounds that may be an indicator of a defective plank. Several members expressed that the illustration does not provide guidance in that it shows two-persons on the plank but omits the weight factor so that a plank could be overloaded in the testing process. Several other committee members indicated that from an engineering perspective, the test is subjective and further, if the workers bounce too hard on the plank depending on their weight they

could exceed the accepted deflection factor and maximum intended load for scaffold planks. Bruce Wick, California Professional Association of Specialty Contractors (CALPASC), added that appropriate labeling of a scaffold plank combined with visual inspections should be satisfactory assurance of the condition of planking. The committee consensus was to delete Plate C-17.

Mike Donlon, Division, stated that visual inspection of scaffold planking is very important, and he had a concern that Section 1637(h) requires inspection of scaffold lumber in general but the employer may not read that as meaning that scaffold planking requires inspection. Because subsection (f) deals specifically with scaffold planking, the committee discussed the merits of including a new subsection that would require visual inspection of all scaffold planking before and during use [see proposed Section 1637(f)(6)].

There also was general discussion about whether a definition for “plank” was necessary. The committee did not reach a consensus that would cover the wide variety and types of planking. However, Section 1504 adequately describes solid sawn scaffold grade wood planking and proposed Section 1637(f)(3)(A) provides an inclusive description of manufactured planking. David Glabe added that within the scaffold industry, any planking that is cut from the tree and milled without further process is considered “solid sawn” planking. Any other type of planking whether it is glued, laminated, pinned together, composite materials etc., would be engineered or (manufactured) planking. Patrick Bell stated a preference for the use of the term “manufactured” planking [as shown in proposed Section 1637(f)(3)(A)] for reference to planking other than solid sawn.

The Chair noted several comment letters and e-mails that were received prior to the meeting. The committee read a letter from Walter Davis, Brand Energy Services, and reviewed suggested revisions to the proposal from Bruce Wick, CALPASC. The Chair also discussed an e-mail received from Mike Gilleran, McCausey Lumber, and noted that the committee should read and be aware of these comments as they relate to the proposal. Greg McClland, Ironworkers Workers’ Compensation Program, asked if the proposal would be applicable to temporary flooring used in structural steel erection work. The Chair responded that provisions for structural steel erection activities are provided in the CSO Section 1710 and related standards and that this proposal is specific to scaffold planking.

The committee began review of the proposed text. The Chair pointed out the additional definitions for southern pine scaffold plank and other solid sawn planking species were added to the definitions in Section 1504, because the existing standards focus primarily on Douglas fir planking which is not as common as it used to be for use as scaffold planking. Patrick Bell stated that the standards in Section 1637(b) likely would permit the use of other wood species planking equivalent to Douglas fir but noted for clarity that the inclusion of a definition specific to southern pine as outlined in the proposal would be warranted.

The committee also discussed proposed Section 1504 lumber definition noted as (C) 3. [under the definition for “structural plank”]. The Chair indicated its purpose was to permit the use of other species of wood such as spruce that have been approved for use as scaffold plank by an agency approved by the American Lumber Standards Committee (ALSC).

Brad Shelley, West Coast Lumber Inspection Bureau (WCLIB), explained that essentially 100 percent of the structural lumber used in the U.S. is under the ALSC accreditation program. It is a balanced committee representing all aspects of the lumber producing, consuming and design industry. Members of the committee are appointed for 5-year terms by the Secretary of Commerce. One of the main functions of the ALSC is its Board of Review which acts as an accrediting agency to review the design values for grading rules used by the various approved agencies such as the Southern Pine Inspection Bureau (SPIB) or WCLIB and ensure that appropriate consensus standards were used in establishing the design values. A list of accredited agencies and ALSC policies and procedures can be downloaded on their website at [www.alsc.org](http://www.alsc.org). The Board of Review also regularly audits and monitors the performance of accredited agencies.

There was discussion in regards to Section 1504 “Structural Plank” (C) 3., regarding other species of wood used for planking as to whether the definition should include an “equivalent” approval program to that of ALSC. Several members indicated that it is problematic to determine what an equivalent program is. Mike Donlon stated it is not only difficult for the Division to determine equivalency; it is also difficult for the employer or end users. Brad Shelley mentioned that overseas manufacturers can use ALSC accredited agencies to grade their products or they can apply for accreditation with ALSC so they are not excluded from marketing in the U.S. The committee eventually reached consensus to retain the language as proposed in the definitions of Section 1504 “Structural Plank” (C) 3.

The committee began discussion of the scope of Section 1637(f) which pertains to scaffold planking. Kevin Bland, Granado Bland, representing framing contractors, opened the discussion stating that employers can inspect planking for defects and proper labeling but employers have no control over the design and construction of scaffold planks noted in the proposal. He suggested that “labeling requirements” should replace the term “minimum design” in the first sentence of subsection (f).

David Glabe responded that retaining language for the design provisions is important to prevent overloading and felt it is necessary wording. For example, design provisions are included in subsection (f)(2) related to planking loading and span limitations and the typical qualified person need not be an engineer to follow the span charts. Mike Donlon also responded to contractor concerns that they would be held accountable to verify the manufacturer’s design and/or information on the label. He noted the Division would not expect the employer to verify the manufacturer’s labeled information, but that they could rely on that information in most cases when purchasing suitable planking products.

Bruce Wick suggested inserting the word “labeling” and retaining the minimum design requirement language. Additional discussion on behalf of contractors/employers represented that the labeling would give them some assurance that the planking includes the appropriate design criteria. The committee reached agreement to include “labeling” provisions in the scope (first sentence) of subsection (f). However, concerns were identified that if a label or seal wore off in time, that citations may be possible even though the planking was originally stamped or embossed as scaffold grade. The Chair noted that it was the intent of the standard for employers to verify initially when they purchase scaffold planking from the supplier that it has the appropriate identification as scaffold grade and not to cite employers several years later should the marking not be legible. Steve Phetteplace, scaffold safety consultant, stated that marking for LVL planking typically includes the

date and the name of the manufacturer/supplier and tends to be quite durable. John Warlikowski agreed that LVL marked planks maintain legibility for a significant period of time and that when the employer maintains records of purchases, the date on a plank can verify the supplier and planking purchased.

One member added that once planking is integrated into an employer's inventory, it becomes difficult to trace it back to an invoice that would verify its scaffold grade designation. He agreed there was merit to the marking/labeling at the initial time of purchase and then should the marking become illegible over time that the frequent required inspections would remove defective or damaged planking.

Mike Donlon stated there may be merit to focusing on the labeling/marketing requirement at the time of purchase. That puts the manufacturer on notice of what is required so that the employer has some assurance of the products quality as scaffold grade. He stated compliance personnel should focus on the condition of the planks during inspections and not specifically just looking for a label/marketing.

Bob Browder, Southern Pine Inspection Bureau (SPIB), stated that at some point there must be a requirement for labeling/marketing/certification of the planking. Otherwise there is no assurance that the planking manufacturer had any type of third party quality control program in place. Mr. Browder felt in light of the issues/problems discussed regarding legibility of markings with use and over time that there was merit to the concept that the labeling/marketing on the planking should be required prior to initial use. However, David Glabe stated concerns that SIA has been grappling with the scaffold grade stamp issue for 15 years with the dilemma that the grade stamp is a great idea for the purchaser but they can wear off over time. He felt that ultimately reliance on inspections of the planking is necessary to ensure its safe condition for use. Rudy Lopez, County Line Framing, concurred that inspection is the key for ensuring safe scaffold planks.

Mike Donlon stated that the labeling provisions are intended to help employers ensure that the products they buy meet appropriate production/planking standards. Further, it gives the manufacturer guidance for what is expected and would allow the Division to better pursue any manufacturers with stamps or markings that have no tested validity (e.g. those mentioned in the lumber inspection agency's LVL China imported plank alert document).

Colby Hubler, Mill Direct, stated that the provisions in proposed subsections (f)(4) & (5) [of the invitation package draft] are nearly verbatim to those in the ANSI-A10.8-2001 scaffold standard. He noted from at least 2001, manufacturers should have already been providing the labeling/marketing and third party quality assurance for LVL planking and the certification or grade stamp for solid sawn planks.

John Warlikowski stated that if a manufacturer is marketing substandard knock-off LVL planking and is not following industry accepted standards, it is his experience that Cal/OSHA (meaning the Division) has a difficult time to correct that situation because there are no provisions to enforce. The Chair noted that according to the Division, one of the primary reasons for this rulemaking was to establish design criteria to address the marketing in recent years of substandard LVL planking in California, most of which is produced overseas. The Chair asked what standards or manufacturing processes would ensure a suitable LVL planking product according to accepted and reasonable

industry standards. John Warlikowski stated that all legitimate manufacturers would be primarily following the ASTM D 5456-09a standard which covers the evaluation and specifications for structural composite lumber. This standard already is in place and would give the Division the design criteria to require a suitable LVL planking product.

The Chair stated that the ASTM D 5456-09a standard requires procedures such as product random sampling, mechanical and physical tests, covers materials used, references adhesive requirements for structural composite lumber (SCL) in ASTM D 2559 and also requires quality assurance monitoring from an independent third party. The Chair asked if SCL includes LVL scaffold planks.

John Warlikowski stated the standard is for LVL, and he stated that if planking is designed to that criteria for horizontal/flat use, there is little chance for failure. Colby Hubler added that ASTM D 5456-09a is for LVL lumber in general, but is not specific to scaffold planking; so he had a concern that the ASTM standard alone may not be enough. If one adds the requirement for a nationally recognized inspection agency oversight/seal such as is required by the ANSI A10.8 scaffold standard, then the inspection agency will ensure the LVL lumber product is suitable for scaffold planking. Mr. Warlikowski added that there is no consensus standard specific for LVL scaffold planking. The ASTM D 5456 standard is for all types of LVL products. However, he noted that LVL manufacturers use the standard because it is currently the most effective guideline. If LVL lumber is manufactured for flat use, intended for scaffold planking, and manufactured in accordance with the ASTM D 5456 standard, Mr. Warlikowski felt the design criteria is sufficiently covered by an existing standard in place today addressing the design issues.

Kevin Cheung, Western Wood Products Association, stated that with respect to LVL scaffold plank design, he would have no objection to referencing the ASTM D 5456 standard. However, since that standard is intended for general LVL lumber products, the missing link would be an additional reference to the ANSI A10.8 standard requirements that are specific for scaffold plank. He opined that the proposal should reference appropriate consensus standards to establish the minimum acceptable design factors for LVL planking so that Cal/OSHA establishes what is acceptable.

Several contractor/employer committee members expressed concerns that by including design/manufacturer criteria in the regulation that they would be held accountable to prove that criteria to the Division. However, Patrick Bell and Mike Donlon of the Division reiterated that the employer is not expected to prove design criteria but rather the labeling/marketing specifications would be for the manufacturer and the end users/employers so the parties know what is expected and have a level of assurance that the planking being purchased is suitable for its intended use on scaffolds.

Discussion continued regarding whether provisions would ensure a suitable LVL product. Colby Hubler commented that the regulation should require compliance with ASTM D 5456 and also refer to ANSI/ASSE A10.8-2001, Section 5 (which requires an independent, nationally recognized inspection agency to certify that LVL scaffold planks are compliant with the design criteria in the ANSI/ASSE A10.8 standard). Mike Donlon stated that there should be an effective date so that existing LVL scaffold grade planking without some designation/label could continue being used.

The committee was receptive to the above concept. However, Kevin Bland expressed concerns that any label/markings verifying the above specifications that was missing or worn could result in citations. He suggested that an informational “NOTE” might clarify the issue regarding employer responsibilities. There were additional discussions about the potential for citations over time should a label or seal/markings become illegible. Mike Donlon stated that Division personnel would be trained to look at the condition of the plank. He further stated that the manufacturer is responsible for providing the durable label/markings on products, equipment and machinery and many Title 8 regulations have these requirements for markings to ensure the product is suitable for its intended use. The regulations do not say the employer is responsible for maintaining the label/markings on an ongoing basis. Further discussion regarding a possible informational note for subsection (f)(4) was continued on the second day of the meeting [see pages 9 and 10].

The Chair stated that proposed subsection (f)(4) for LVL planking was nearly verbatim to that of ANSI A10.8-2001, Section 5.2.10 and it read “All laminated planks shall bear the seal of an independent, nationally recognized inspection agency certifying compliance with the design criteria contained in this section.” The Chair asked who these inspection agencies are and what entity approves and lists them. Brad Shelley stated that the International Accreditation Service (IAS) is the national organization for accrediting testing agencies and laboratories associated with laminated/glued lumber and other products. The ALSC, discussed earlier, is the appropriate accreditation/oversight organization for agencies inspecting solid sawn lumber products including scaffold planking. Mr. Shelley further stated that the IAS is affiliated with the International Code Council which writes the national building code. Kevin Cheung suggested that a reference to IAS, which is a recognized and well-known agency, should be made for clarification in subsection (f)(4). The committee agreed to add the IAS reference for subsection (f)(4).

This concluded the first day’s discussion.

#### Day 2, September 3, 2009

The Chair summarized the previous day’s meeting, noting that the definitions on page 1 remain as proposed. The Chair indicated that there was substantial discussion on day one about labeling and that the committee had agreed to include “labeling” in the scope section of Section 1637(f). For subsection (f)(1), the committee agreed to include the term “solid sawn” for clarity. Kevin Cheung stated that the definitions added to Section 1504 permit other types of solid sawn scaffold planking. He noted the span chart in Section 1637(f) is okay for Douglas fir and southern pine but he asked whether the span chart would be applicable to planking other than those wood species. The committee confirmed that southern pine and Douglas fir meet the span chart requirements and concurred with David Glabe’s suggestion to make it clear that the span chart is specific to southern pine and Douglas fir.

Colby Hubler stated that approximately 95 percent of the solid sawn scaffold planking in California is now made of southern pine so the other species of wood is representatively small. After discussion the committee agreed to add a provision that the maximum permissible spans allowed for other wood species of scaffold planking shall be determined by a registered engineer [see proposed Section 1637(f)(2)(B)].

The Chair stated that he had compared the span charts in Section 1637(f)(2) with the counterpart federal provisions located in 29 CFR 1926, Subpart L, Appendix A. The Chair noted that the federal chart in non-mandatory Appendix A has slightly different values and terminology for the maximum spans allowed than California. However, Appendix A of the federal standard also permits the option to meet the allowable spans outlined in Section 5 of the ANSI A10.8-1988 Scaffolding Safety Requirement standard. Table 1 of that ANSI standard would not conflict with Section 1637(f)(2) span values. David Glabe added that the federal chart may be based on lower bending stress values than California permits for Douglas fir which would also account for the difference.

The committee then discussed proposed subsection (f)(3) related to manufactured planking requirements (e.g. other than solid sawn). Mike Donlon felt that subsection (f)(3) as proposed in the committee draft text was unclear and left too much of the plank's design/strength requirements to the manufacturer's discretion. He stated the proposed subsection references back to the requirements of Section 1637(b). However, that could be problematic or confusing since Section 1637(b) refers to the total scaffold system while the proposed rulemaking is specific to scaffold planking. Therefore, he suggested omitting the cross-reference to Section 1637(b) and list the requirements for manufactured planking within subsection (f)(3). He recommended that one of the key design requirements for manufactured scaffold planking is that it can support 4 times the maximum intended working (live) load and that it should be stated so within the subsection. The committee discussed and agreed to that rationale [see proposed subsection (f)(3)(A)].

Mike Donlon also asked the committee if the chart in Section 1637(f)(2) should be applicable to all planking and not just solid sawn planking. David Glabe responded that there are too many different types of manufactured/fabricated planks that cannot be combined for a span chart and that only LVL wood planks might have similar values. The Chair stated the chart in (f)(2) addresses solid sawn planks, the intent of subsection (f)(3) is to provide acceptable strength criteria for a performance standard that could be applicable to other manufactured type planking.

The committee also discussed that the term "manufactured scaffold planking" for subsection (f)(3)(A) would adequately describe other types of scaffold plank that is not solid sawn. The committee also agreed that various manufactured planking has different span requirements so the proposal should include a provision that the planks be used in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications [see proposed Section 1637(f)(3)(C)]. In proposed Section 1637(f)(3)(B), Board staff retained existing language that currently requires manufactured planks with spans in excess of 10 feet to be labeled to indicate the maximum safe working load.

The Chair noted that the committee partially discussed labeling/marketing provisions for subsections (f)(4) and (5) on day one but that the committee would need additional discussion on those subsections later in the day. Moving on, it was agreed that subsection (f)(6) in the committee's draft proposal addressing safety factors for planking was duplicative to consensus language agreed upon for subsection (f)(3)(A) and could be omitted. The committee agreed to insert a new subsection (f)(6) that would require visual inspection of all scaffold planking before and during use.

The committee next discussed proposed language that is necessary for equivalency with the federal standard in 29 CFR 1910.451(f)(16) that requires scaffold platforms not deflect more than 1/60 of the span when loaded. The committee felt there were clarity issues with the federal standard and

after discussion agreed on the proposed language best located in Section 1637(w) that would address the deflection requirements for scaffold platforms/planking.

The committee began additional review of proposed Section 1637(f)(4), specific to LVL planking as the Chair had clarity concerns with the language as modified on day one. John Warlikowski discussed LVL production processes/practices and recommended language and appropriate references to standards that ensure LVL products are suitable for their intended use as scaffold planks. The committee again discussed the International Accreditation Services (IAS) as the appropriate organization that oversees inspection agencies for LVL products. The committee further discussed the ASTM D 5456-09a standard as the appropriate guideline for the production of suitable LVL products and that a reference in the subsection to ANSI A10.8-2001, Section 5.2.10 would ensure that the LVL planking products are inspected and monitored for quality assurance for use as scaffold planking.

The Chair asked Mr. Warlikowski if manufacturers would be burdened with new production costs if the subsection referenced the aforementioned ASTM and ANSI standards. Mr. Warlikowski stated that all legitimate scaffold plank manufacturers whether in the U.S. or overseas are already following those consensus standard procedures and there should not be any new production or cost impact. However, a manufacturer that produced the type of LVL planking that was mentioned in the inspection agency alert bulletins with inferior bonding and adhesive qualities would need to improve its procedures/production processes to meet the minimum acceptable standards.

Mike Donlon recommended language similar to that proposed by Mr. Warlikowski for Section 1737(f)(4). The committee agreed to language for subsection (f)(4) similar to that in the attached proposal. The Division representatives and the Chair discussed that the intent of this subsection is to provide guidance to manufacturers and reasonable assurance to employers that the product is suitable for its intended use as scaffold planking. It is not intended that the employer must verify the manufacturer's information on the label or maintain the label/markings in legible condition indefinitely after purchase.

In post committee evaluation of the proposal, Board staff determined the informational note for Section 1637(f)(4) that would state that the employer is not responsible for maintaining the label in legible condition would be problematic in the regulatory review and approval process. Consequently, note that subsection (f)(4) requires the label for LVL planking "prior to being placed into service." Similar language is proposed for subsection (f)(5) for solid sawn planks.

The committee also discussed that the ANSI A10.8 scaffold standard has required similar provisions to that proposed in subsection (f)(5) for solid sawn plank scaffold grade stamp designation or certification since at least 1988, and therefore, an effective date was unnecessary. This concluded review of Section 1637(f).

Next the Chair stated that the General Industry Safety Orders, Section 3622 "General Requirements" contains provisions related to scaffold planking for mobile work platforms such as ladder stands and mobile scaffolds. It was noted that the existing language of Section 3622(f) specifies certain types of materials for scaffold plank use. However, the existing language lacks clarity and omits certain types of manufactured planks. For consistency with the proposed amendments of Section 1637, the

committee reached consensus for the language shown in ~~strikeout~~/underline and agreed that this section would require “scaffold platforms” to meet the requirements of CSO Section 1637. This concluded review of the proposal.

The Chair asked the committee if the proposed language would result in new costs to employers or manufacturers keeping in mind that the provisions addressing LVL planking would require the seal and essentially the approval of an independent inspection agency. It was expressed by several committee members, including manufacturer representatives, that the revisions are clarifying changes and that manufacturers producing suitable scaffold planking already follow the provisions specified in the proposal. Bob Browder, Southern Pine Inspection Bureau, provided examples showing that manufacturer’s costs incurred for third party inspection and certification of scaffold grade planking are considered somewhat nominal.

The Chair explained the follow up rulemaking activities for the proposal. There being no further questions or comments, the Chair thanked the committee members for their participation and adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.