



Harnesses over or under?

In early September we published photographs on Vertikal.Net of the new 103 metre Wumag WT1000 from Europlatform in Basle. Within an hour we justifiably had complaints that the operator was not wearing a harness. Shocked that we might have missed this as we had checked that those going up were wearing them, we double checked and found that he was wearing his harness under his heavy jacket. In fact if you looked carefully you could just see the lanyard in the original photo. We promptly pointed this out on the web and had a number of responses that open a debate on whether best practice is better one way or another.

First to spot the camouflaged harness was Mark Butler.

Then the letter/email that best set the scene for a discussion.

Hi Leigh,

The new Wumag looks very impressive I have to say and am looking forward to having a go!!! What's really impressed me is the carefully concealed safety harness of the operator.

Regards,

Mark Butler

Director

Zenith Aerial Platforms Limited

Dear Sir,

Surely the operator of the new Wumag 103 would be well advised to wear his safety harness OVER his coat!

Given the well versed arguments ie arrest vs restraint, correct unhindered deployment would, in any event, be recommended.

Discussion welcome!

Yours truly,

Paul Woodhead

UK Training Services

On another harness point a reader makes a very valid and increasingly important point.

We would appreciate your comments and input on this point.

Dear Sir,

I could not help but notice that the photos from your Vertikal Days preview story shows many boom operators without harnesses and one shot of the operator of the Genie telehandler not wearing a seat belt.

It is hard to get operators to comply with the regulations when the manufacturers own employees do not. We must set good examples as we never know when a camera might be capturing us on film.

Yours Sincerely,
Jeff Balanchuck

Many of the photos used in this article came from this year's Platformers Days, where as we have already reported manufacturers had improved immeasurably when it came to the use of harnesses in booms and other examples of good practice. However there were still some notable exceptions and the telehandler issue, given that it is a closed cab might spark an interesting debate. Ed

The Editor, Dear Sir,

Reference Article Heavy Lifting."The Road to Recovery"

May I draw your attention to the last paragraph of the article. I think that the author may have confused the amounts of stone required to build the temporary access road and that spilled out of the derailed wagons.

Did he mean 20,000 Tonnes or Cubic Metres for the access road ?

I am aware that the Rail Freight industry uses high capacity hopper wagons, I believe these have a payload capacity of 100 Tonnes which would mean axle loads of around 30 tonnes per axle. On that basis 11 wagons would represent a total of around 1,100 tonnes. To have dumped between 20,000 and 40,000 tonnes into the River Ouse would need each wagon to be carrying between 1,818 and 3,636 tonnes, or between 200 and 400 wagons! Possibly the Author meant Cubic Metres although I think you will find that one Cubic metre probably weighs one tonne.

With kind regards

David H Armsden.

Well spotted. The 20,000 tonnes was the amount of stone imported to build up the road and support platform for the crane. When full, the wagons weighed just 50 tonnes. Ed

Polls update:

Since the last issue we have continued to run the poll on the use of harnesses on scissor lifts. With more than 1,200 votes, it seems to have settled at around 80 percent against the use of harnesses on vertical lifts and 20 percent who believe that they should be worn.

Letters to the editor

Please send letters to the editor: Cranes&Access: PO Box 6998, Brackley NN13 5WY, UK. We reserve the right to edit letters for length. We also point out that letters are the personal views of our readers and not necessarily the views of the Vertikal Press Ltd or its staff.