DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY

CCP – EB – ~~6~~13
IEBC ~~310 Elevator Hoistway Opening Protection~~1007.2 Unsafe Conditions & 1007.3 Electrical Service Upgrade
Submitted 6/27/24. TAG supported

CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: Stephen Ubl

Email address: stephen.ubl@ci.stpaul.mn.us

Telephone number: 651-266-9021

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: City of Saint Paul

Code or rule section to be changed: 1007.2 & 1007.3

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): IEBC

Date: 06/26/2024

Model Code: 2024 IEBC

Code or Rule Section: 1007

Topic of proposal: Electrical

General Information	**Yes**	**No**
A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota?	☐	☒
B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota?	☐	☒
C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement?	☒	☐
D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem?	☒	☐
E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment?	☐	☒
F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process?	☒	☐

Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

   ☐ change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
   1311 – 2020 Minnesota Conservation Code for Existing Buildings

   ☐ change language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

   ☐ delete language contained in the model code book? If so, list section(s).

   ☐ delete language contained in an existing amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, list Rule part(s).

   ☐ add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.
   Yes
2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and ~~strikethrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

   1007.2 Unsafe conditions. Where the occupancy of an existing building or part of an existing building is changed, all unsafe electrical conditions shall be corrected without requiring that all parts of the electrical system comply with NFPA 70.

   1007.3 Electrical Service ~~upgrade~~. Where the occupancy of an *existing building* or part of an *existing building* is changed, electrical service shall ~~be upgraded to~~ meet the requirements of NFPA 70 for the new occupancy.

4. Will this proposed code change impact other sections of a model code book or an amendment in Minnesota Rule? If so, please list the affected sections or rule parts.

Need and Reason

1. Why is the proposed code change needed? Please provide a general explanation as well as a specific explanation for any changes to numerical values (heights, area, etc.)
   1007.2 charges that all unsafe conditions be corrected. If 1007.2 is satisfied, then there is no reason to upgrade the electrical service. By removing any unsafe condition, this would also mean that the service would meet the new demand requirements of NFPA 70 for the change of use.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?
   Redundancies – if unsafe conditions are removed, upgrading the service is not needed.

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?
   Cost savings are very significant with this change. Additionally, the demand in today's equipment, appliances, light fixtures, etc., are considerably more efficient than in years past, meaning, the existing services can be adequate for handling the new use.

Cost/Benefit Analysis

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain and provide estimates if possible.
   Decrease

2. If there is an increased cost, will this cost be offset by a safety or other benefit? Please explain. If the benefit is quantifiable (for example energy savings), provide an estimate if possible.

3. If there is a cost increase, who will bear the costs? This can include government units, businesses, and individuals.

4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.
   It may require an electrical engineer to assess the electrical service to determine its ability to safely function for the proposed use.

5. Will the cost of complying with the proposed code change in the first year after the rule takes effect exceed $25,000 for any one small business or small city (Minn. Stat. § 14.127)? A small business is any business that has less than 50 full-time employees. A small city is any statutory or home rule charter city that has less than ten full-time employees. Please explain.

Regulatory Analysis

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?

2. Can you think of other means or methods to achieve the purpose of the proposed code change? What might someone opposed to this code change suggest instead? Please explain what the alternatives are and why your proposed change is the preferred method or means to achieve the desired result.
   Generally, a review of the existing service by a professional engineer would be acceptable to an AHJ. If the report submitted states that there are no unsafe conditions and the service can handle the proposed demand of the new use, it would then be reasonable to accept the service without replacing it.

3. What are the probable costs or consequences of not adopting the code change, including those costs or consequences borne by identifiable categories of affected parties, such as separate classes of government units, businesses, or individuals?
   Replacing a safe and acceptable service could add tens of thousands of dollars to a project. The current code is a minimum code and requiring an upgraded service when there are no unsafe conditions found seems quite unreasonable.

4. Are you aware of any federal or state regulation or requirement related to this proposed code change? If so, please list the federal or state regulation or requirement and your assessment of any differences between the proposed code change and the federal regulation or requirement.
   No

***Note: The information you provide in this code change proposal form is considered Public Data and used by the TAG to consider your proposed modification to the code. Any code change proposal form submitted to DLI may be reviewed at public TAG meetings and used by department staff and the Office of Administrative Hearings to justify the need and reasonableness of any proposed rule draft subject to administrative review and is available to the public.

****Note: Incomplete forms will be returned to the submitter with instruction to complete the form. Only completed forms will be accepted and considered by the TAG. The submitter may be asked to provide additional information in support of the proposed code change.