

Interpretation: 1-78

Subject: ANSI/ITSDF B56.1-2005, Section 4.2.3, Modifications, Nameplates, Markings, and Capacity and Section 7.5.9, Nameplates and Markings

Date Issued: March 13, 2006

Question (1): Section 4.2.3 states that “If a truck is equipped with front end attachments...”, does this include an attachment that is provided with the fork truck by the manufacturer?

Answer (1): Yes.

Question (2): Would this attachment be an attachment other than the standard equipped tines?

Answer (2): Yes. Forks are not considered to be an attachment.

Question (3): If an off the shelf attachment is purchased to use on the standard tines and the fork lift manufacturer says that the attachment purchased will not affect the capacity or the safe operation of the truck, does the fork truck require a second nameplate?

Answer (3): Another nameplate would not be required if it does not affect capacity, stability, or safe operation.

Question (4): Is section 7.5.9 referring to removable attachments, does the fork truck require a nameplate if the attachment does not affect the capacity or the safe operation of the truck?

Answer (4): Removable attachments that do not affect capacity, stability, or safe operation do not require a nameplate.

Interpretation: 1-79

Subject: ANSI/ITSDF B56.1-2005, Section 7.37.1 (g), Platforms: Elevating

Date Issued: March 18, 2006

Question (1): Section 7.37.1 (g) refers to a safety factor of 3 to 1 on the minimum yield strength of materials used for all load supporting structural elements and platform attachment means. Does this refer to the forks or does it include the overhead guard if workers are attaching to it via self-retracting lifeline?

Answer (1): Section 7.37 is about elevating platform type of trucks with elevated operators. The 3:1 safety factor in (g) would apply to all elements of the truck design that would support the load while the forks and platform are elevated. It would include the forks, the part of the platform that supports the forks, the part of the structure that supports the platform, (cylinders, mast rollers and mast beams that hold the load up). The overhead guard

is not part of the load supporting structure and therefore would not have the 3:1 requirement. The overhead guard is for falling objects protection and has strength requirements as stated in section 7.29. The dynamic test requirements for testing the overhead guard would exceed the dynamic requirements for testing of the operators fall protection as stated in section 7.37.1 (d) 2 (f). Therefore, the 3:1 strength requirement is not the determining strength factor for either the overhead guard or the tether attachment point.

Interpretation: 1-80

Subject: ANSI/ITSDF B56.1-2005, Section 4.2.3, Modifications, Nameplates, Markings, and Capacity and Section 7.5.9, Nameplates and Markings

Date Issued: May 12, 2006

Question (1): Why must the truck have twice the capacity needed to lift the work platform?

Answer (1): Rational statements are not included in the B56 Standards and record retention policies do not provide access to meeting minutes of the earlier discussions of elevated platform requirements. The present language reflects the coordinated experience of the Committee members as well as those reflected in State Codes standard development bodies. Suggested improvements in the applicable values will be considered so long as they add to the Committee's safety objectives without impairing the vehicle utility. The Committee's overall experience with the present requirements does not indicate a deficiency in elevated platforms built to B56.1 requirements.

Question (2): Would a truck that has a capacity rating of 4000 lbs. with the center of the load (c.g.) at a distance of 24 in. along its forks meet the ANSI/ITSDF B56.1-2005 requirements to lift a fully loaded work platform that weighs 2000 lbs. but has its c.g. at a distance of 36 in. along the forks (one foot further away from the truck) since the truck capacity rating is twice the fully loaded weight of the work platform?

Answer (2): No. Capacity is not just the weight to be carried, but also involves the load center. The capacity of the truck at a 36 inch load center would be less than 4000 pounds. The truck manufacturer needs to be contacted to determine the capacity and to obtain a new rating.

Interpretation: 1-81

Subject: ANSI/ITSDF B56.1-2005, Section 7.5, Nameplates and Markings

Date Issued: December 15, 2006

- Question (1): Are fork tines considered to be an attachment?
- Answer (1): No. In Part IV, Glossary of Commonly Used Words and Phrases, the definition of attachment is given and states, in part, that an attachment is a device other than conventional forks.
- Question (2): Is the length of the fork tines required to be annotated on the nameplate?
- Answer (2): No, but as stated in section 7.27 each fork shall be clearly stamped with its individual load rating. Consult your operator manuals and ANSI/ITSDF B56.1 for additional instructions on capacity and handling loads properly.

Interpretation: 1-82

Subject: ANSI/ITSDF B56.1-2005, Section 5.4.5, Loading

Date Issued: April 4, 2007

- Question (1): If a chain attached to a high lift industrial truck is used to pull a pallet from a rack and while being pulled the chain partially elevates the pallet, is it considered a suspended load as in section 5.4.5.
- Answer (1): As stated in section 5.4.5, a load should never be dragged horizontally. If the load was being lifted with a chain vertically using a crane boom or other device, the load would be considered a suspended load as soon as the load can introduce dynamic forces.

Interpretation: 1-83

Subject: ANSI/ITSDF B56.1-2005, Section 7.29.2(4) and 7.29.2(5), Test Procedures (Overhead Guard)

Date Issued: October 9, 2007

- Question (1): Section 7.29.2(4) requires the permanent deformation of the overhead guard and its mounting after impact to be measured between a horizontal plane tangent to the underside of the guard at the operator's position and a horizontal plane tangent to the upper surface of the steering wheel. From what point is this measurement to be taken if there is no steering wheel?
- Answer (1): The intent of the wording in the standard is to ensure an operator has enough room to escape entrapment in the event an overhead guard is deformed to the maximum allowable extent. At one time, all sit down rider controlled trucks were steered with a steering wheel and the steering wheel was typically that part of the truck most likely to prevent further movement away from the overhead guard during this type of deformation of the overhead guard. Steering technology that does not

include the use of a steering wheel is not addressed by the standard currently.

Interpretation: 1-84

Subject: ANSI/ITSDF B56.1-2005, Section 7.39, Fork Extensions

Date Issued: December 19, 2008

Question (1): Are products such as drum grippers, trailer spotters, and multiple pipe lifters that attach with fork pockets to existing truck forks considered fork extensions?

Answer (1): No. The glossary (Part IV) defines a fork extension as a lift truck attachment that is added to the truck fork to increase the fork's effective length for handling oversized uniformly distributed loads.

Fork extensions fit over the existing forks, maintain the approximate shape of the forks, extend their length, and are not part of another device or object.

Question (2): Are there specific requirements or calculation formulas that are required for design factor, size, and rating the rated load center for other attachments such as booms, fork beams, and rug ram extensions?

Answer (2): The B56.1 standard applies to industrial trucks. With the exception of fork extensions, design requirements for attachments are not addressed in the standard.