

Michigan Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs
Office of Regulatory Reinvention
611 W. Ottawa Street; 2nd Floor, Ottawa Building
PO Box 30004; Lansing, MI 48909
Phone (517) 335-8658 FAX (517) 335-9512

**REGULATORY IMPACT STATEMENT
and
COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS**

PART 1: INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the Administrative Procedures Act (APA) [1969 PA 306], the department/agency responsible for promulgating the administrative rules must complete and submit this form electronically to the Office of Regulatory Reinvention (ORR) no less than (28) days before the public hearing [MCL 24.245(3)-(4)]. Submissions should be made by the departmental Regulatory Affairs Officer (RAO) to **orr@michigan.gov**. The ORR will review the form and send its response to the RAO (see last page). Upon review by the ORR, the agency shall make copies available to the public at the public hearing [MCL 24.245(4)].

Please place your cursor in each box, and answer the question completely.

ORR-assigned rule set number:

2013-111 LR

ORR rule set title:

Construction Code – Part 8. Electrical Code – R 408.30801 to R 408.30880

Department:

Licensing and Regulatory Affairs

Agency or Bureau/Division

Bureau of Construction Codes/Electrical Division

Name and title of person completing this form; telephone number:

Shannon Matsumoto, Senior Rules Analyst (517) 241-6312

Reviewed by Department Regulatory Affairs Officer:

Liz Arasim
Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs

PART 2: APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF THE APA

MCL 24.207a “Small business” defined.

Sec. 7a.

“Small business” means a business concern incorporated or doing business in this state, including the affiliates of the business concern, which is independently owned and operated and which employs fewer than 250 full-time employees or which has gross annual sales of less than \$6,000,000.00.”

MCL 24.240 Reducing disproportionate economic impact of rule on small business; applicability of section and MCL 24.245(3).

Sec. 40.

(1) When an agency proposes to adopt a rule that will apply to a small business and the rule will have a disproportionate impact on small businesses because of the size of those businesses, the agency shall consider exempting small businesses and, if not exempted, the agency proposing to adopt the rule shall reduce the economic impact of the rule on small businesses by doing all of the following when it is lawful and feasible in meeting the objectives of the act authorizing the promulgation of the rule:

(a) Identify and estimate the number of small businesses affected by the proposed rule and its probable effect on small businesses.

(b) Establish differing compliance or reporting requirements or timetables for small businesses under the rule after projecting the required reporting, record-keeping, and other administrative costs.

(c) Consolidate, simplify, or eliminates the compliance and reporting requirements for small businesses under the rule and identifies the skills necessary to comply with the reporting requirements.

(d) Establish performance standards to replace design or operational standards required in the proposed rule.

(2) The factors described in subsection (1)(a) to (d) shall be specifically addressed in the small business impact statement required under section 45.

(3) In reducing the disproportionate economic impact on small business of a rule as provided in subsection (1), an agency shall use the following classifications of small business:

(a) 0-9 full-time employees.

(b) 10-49 full-time employees.

(c) 50-249 full-time employees.

(4) For purposes of subsection (3), an agency may include a small business with a greater number of full-time employees in a classification that applies to a business with fewer full-time employees.

(5) This section and section 45(3) do not apply to a rule that is required by federal law and that an agency promulgates without imposing standards more stringent than those required by the federal law.

MCL 24.245 (3) “Except for a rule promulgated under sections 33, 44, and 48, the agency shall prepare and include with the notice of transmittal a **regulatory impact statement** containing...” (Information requested on the following pages).

[**Note:** Additional questions have been added to these statutorily-required questions to satisfy the **cost-benefit analysis** requirements of Executive Order 2011-5.]

MCL 24.245b Information to be posted on office of regulatory reinvention website.

Sec. 45b. (1) The office of regulatory reinvention shall post the following on its website within 2 business days after transmittal pursuant to section 45:

- (a) The regulatory impact statement required under section 45(3).
 - (b) Instructions on any existing administrative remedies or appeals available to the public.
 - (c) Instructions regarding the method of complying with the rules, if available.
 - (d) Any rules filed with the secretary of state and the effective date of those rules.
- (2) The office of regulatory reinvention shall facilitate linking the information posted under subsection (1) to the department or agency website.

PART 3: DEPARTMENT/AGENCY RESPONSE

Please place your cursor in each box, and provide the required information, using complete sentences. Please do not answer the question with “N/A” or “none.”

Comparison of Rule(s) to Federal/State/Association Standards:

(1) Compare the proposed rule(s) to parallel federal rules or standards set by a state or national licensing agency or accreditation association, if any exist. Are these rule(s) required by state law or federal mandate? If these rule(s) exceed a federal standard, please identify the federal standard or citation, and describe why it is necessary that the proposed rule(s) exceed the federal standard or law, and specify the costs and benefits arising out of the deviation.

These rules are required by state law; no federal rules or standards exist.

(2) Compare the proposed rule(s) to standards in similarly situated states, based on geographic location, topography, natural resources, commonalities, or economic similarities. If the rule(s) exceed standards in those states, please explain why, and specify the costs and benefits arising out of the deviation.

These rules adopt by reference the 2014 National Electrical Code (NEC) with the Michigan amendments. The NEC is a nationally recognized model code used throughout the United States as a minimum standard for electrical installations; therefore, these rules do not exceed standards in those states.

(3) Identify any laws, rules, and other legal requirements that may duplicate, overlap, or conflict with the proposed rule(s). Explain how the rule has been coordinated, to the extent practicable, with other federal, state, and local laws applicable to the same activity or subject matter. This section should include a discussion of the efforts undertaken by the agency to avoid or minimize duplication.

There are no federal, state, or local laws, rules, or other legal requirements that may duplicate, overlap, or conflict with the proposed rules.

Purpose and Objectives of the Rule(s):

(4) Identify the behavior and frequency of behavior that the proposed rule(s) are designed to alter. Estimate the change in the frequency of the targeted behavior expected from the proposed rule(s). Describe the difference between current behavior/practice and desired behavior/practice. What is the desired outcome?

R 408.30801, R 408.30813, R 408.30818, R 408.30819, R 408.30834, R 408.30838, R 408.30869, and R 408.30870 are administrative in nature and are amended to bring the administrative application of the Michigan Electrical Code rules in line with the other construction code rules. The amendments put into rule language the actual administrative practices.

R 408.30811 Under the provisions of the current code, only a registered electrical inspector could approve the installation of a concrete encased electrode. Section 80.14.4 is being added to rule 811 to allow the verification of the installation of a concrete encased electrode by either a registered electrical inspector or a building inspector.

R 408.30871 The current rule requires flexible metal gas piping (CSST) to be bonded. New products have been developed that eliminate the need for additional bonding as the current rule requires. The new proposed language in the rule allows for the installer to follow the recommendations of the manufacturer with regards to electrical bonding. There is a cost savings for the installer and the consumer when no additional bonding is necessary.

R 408.30873 An amendment is being added to clarify the changes in the 2014 National Electrical Code (NEC). This will continue the cost savings in the allowable wiring methods that can be installed and are

less restrictive than what is in the 2014 NEC.

(5) Identify the harm resulting from the behavior that the proposed rule(s) are designed to alter and the likelihood that the harm will occur in the absence of the rule. What is the rationale for changing the rule(s) and not leaving them as currently written?

R 408.30801, R 408.30813, R 408.30818, R 408.30819, R 408.30834, R 408.30838, R 408.30869, and R 408.30870 are administrative in nature and are amended to bring the administrative application of the Michigan Electrical Code rules in line with the other construction code rules. The amendments put into rule language the actual administrative practices.

R 408.30811 – There is no anticipation of harm from behavior related to the proposed rule. However, without this change there could be job site delays due to scheduling of a required inspection of the concrete encased electrode.

R 408.30871 – There is no harm anticipated from behavior related to the proposed rule. There is a likelihood that harm will occur in the absence of the proposed rule in that the cost would be more if not adopted. This is a clarification of a code change that relaxes the requirement to bond to gas piping systems and reduce the cost of the installation.

R 408.30873 – There is no harm anticipated from behavior related to the proposed rule. Without the adoption of this rule there would be more restrictive installation of this wiring and would cost more to install. This is a modification to the current code allowing for a less restrictive installation by the electrical contractor.

(6) Describe how the proposed rule(s) protect the health, safety, and welfare of Michigan citizens while promoting a regulatory environment in Michigan that is the least burdensome alternative for those required to comply.

R 408.30801, R 408.30813, R 408.30818, R 408.30819, R 408.30834, R 408.30838, R 408.30869, and R 408.30870 are administrative in nature and are amended to bring the administrative application of the Michigan Electrical Code rules in line with the other construction code rules. The amendments put into rule language the actual administrative practices.

R 408.30811 – The change to the rule will allow the building inspector to verify the required concrete encased electrode allowing the job to stay on schedule as this is one of the first inspections required at the site.

R 408.30871 – The proposed rule makes it more cost effective for contractors as well as homeowners to comply with the requirements in the code yet maintaining the intent of the code.

R 408.30873 – The change to the rule will allow a better understanding of this code section.

(7) Describe any rules in the affected rule set that are obsolete, unnecessary, and can be rescinded.

R 408.30865 is rescinded as the subject is now included within the adopted NEC code. There are no other rules in the Part 8 rule set that are obsolete, unnecessary, or can be rescinded.

Fiscal Impact on the Agency:

Fiscal impact is an increase or decrease in expenditures from the current level of expenditures, i.e. hiring additional staff, an increase in the cost of a contract, programming costs, changes in reimbursement rates, etc. over and above what is currently expended for that function. It would not include more

intangible costs or benefits, such as opportunity costs, the value of time saved or lost, etc., unless those issues result in a measurable impact on expenditures.

(8) Please provide the fiscal impact on the agency (an estimate of the cost of rule imposition or potential savings on the agency promulgating the rule).

There is no additional fiscal impact to the agency beyond the current operational cost.

(9) Describe whether or not an agency appropriation has been made or a funding source provided for any expenditures associated with the proposed rule(s).

The proposed rules will not result in additional fiscal impact on the agency. Thus there is no need for additional appropriation or funding source as a result of the changes to the rules.

(10) Describe how the proposed rule(s) is necessary and suitable to accomplish its purpose, in relationship to the burden(s) it places on individuals. Burdens may include fiscal or administrative burdens, or duplicative acts. So despite the identified burden(s), identify how the requirements in the rule(s) are still needed and reasonable compared to the burdens.

R 408.30801, R 408.30813, R 408.30818, R 408.30819, R 408.30834, R 408.30838, R 408.30869, and R 408.30870 are administrative in nature and are amended to bring the administrative application of the Michigan Electrical Code rules in line with the other construction code rules. The amendments put into rule language the actual administrative practices.

R 408.30811 – There would not be any anticipated burden on an individual as this is a required inspection. The proposed change allows a building inspector to verify the required code installation thus eliminating inspection by two different inspectors.

R 408.30871 – There would not be any anticipated burden on an individual as this is a clarification of a code requirement to bond the electrical system to gas piping. This would potentially reduce the cost of installation.

R 408.30873 – This rule is less restrictive than the 2011 NEC and would not be burdensome in any way. This would be a cost savings to the installer of this wiring method.

Impact on Other State or Local Governmental Units:

(11) Estimate any increase or decrease in revenues to other state or local governmental units (i.e. cities, counties, school districts) as a result of the rule. Estimate the cost increases or reductions on other state or local governmental units (i.e. cities, counties, school districts) as a result of the rule. Please include the cost of equipment, supplies, labor, and increased administrative costs, in both the initial imposition of the rule and any ongoing monitoring.

R 408.30801, R 408.30813, R 408.30818, R 408.30819, R 408.30834, R 408.30838, R 408.30869, and R 408.30870 are administrative in nature and are amended to bring the administrative application of the Michigan Electrical Code rules in line with the other construction code rules. The amendments put into rule language the actual administrative practices.

R 408.30811 – There is no expected increase in revenues to other state or local governmental units as a result of these rules. There may be a decrease in revenue to local enforcing agencies of \$50-\$75 per inspection (depending on the local unit of government's inspection fee) as only one inspection would now be required to verify the installation.

R 408.30871 and R 408.30873 – There is no expected increase or decrease in revenues to other state or local governmental units as a result of the proposed rule.

(12) Discuss any program, service, duty or responsibility imposed upon any city, county, town, village, or school district by the rule(s). Describe any actions that governmental units must take to be in compliance with the rule(s). This section should include items such as record keeping and reporting requirements or changing operational practices.

Inspections and record keeping would continue as required by the statute and therefore would not have any effect on State or Local governmental units.

(13) Describe whether or not an appropriation to state or local governmental units has been made or a funding source provided for any additional expenditures associated with the proposed rule(s).

R 408.30801, R 408.30813, R 408.30818, R 408.30819, R 408.30834, R 408.30838, R 408.30869, and R 408.30870 are administrative in nature and are amended to bring the administrative application of the Michigan Electrical Code rules in line with the other construction code rules. The amendments put into rule language the actual administrative practices.

R 408.30811, R 408.30871 and R 408.30873 –There is no appropriation to state or local government units required.

Rural Impact:

(14) In general, what impact will the rules have on rural areas? Describe the types of public or private interests in rural areas that will be affected by the rule(s).

The proposed rules affect the State of Michigan as a whole. There is no specific rural impact.

Environmental Impact:

(15) Do the proposed rule(s) have any impact on the environment? If yes, please explain.

The proposed rules do not have any impact on the environment.

Small Business Impact Statement:

[Please refer to the discussion of "small business" on page 2 of this form.]

(16) Describe whether and how the agency considered exempting small businesses from the proposed rules.

Small business would not be exempt from these rules. The proposed rules affect all Michigan businesses, whether large or small.

(17) If small businesses are not exempt, describe (a) the manner in which the agency reduced the economic impact of the proposed rule(s) on small businesses, including a detailed recitation of the efforts of the agency to comply with the mandate to reduce the disproportionate impact of the rule(s) upon small businesses as described below (in accordance with MCL 24.240(1)(A-D)), or (b) the reasons such a reduction was not lawful or feasible.

The proposed rules will reduce the cost as the rule change will require fewer inspections to the contractor or the rules are editorial in nature explaining changes to the code and reducing the cost of installation.

(A) Identify and estimate the number of small businesses affected by the proposed rule(s) and the probable effect on small business.

All small business will be affected in a positive way by a reduction in inspections and initial cost of installation.

(B) Describe how the agency established differing compliance or reporting requirements or timetables for small businesses under the rule after projecting the required reporting, record-keeping, and other administrative costs.

Small businesses are not expected to be adversely affected by these rules. There are no additional reporting, record keeping, or other administrative costs associated with the implementation of the proposed rules.

(C) Describe how the agency consolidated or simplified the compliance and reporting requirements and identify the skills necessary to comply with the reporting requirements.

R 408.30811—The compliance requirements are unchanged as businesses will still need to apply for and the government agency will still need to issue electrical permits for the work to be done.

R 408.30871 and R 408.30873—The rule change will make compliance with the code much simpler. There are no reporting requirements or additional skills necessary.

(D) Describe how the agency established performance standards to replace design or operation standards required by the proposed rules.

The proposed rules adopt by reference the 2014 NEC which is a nationally recognized model code. There are no design or operation standards in the proposed rules.

(18) Identify any disproportionate impact the proposed rule(s) may have on small businesses because of their size or geographic location.

The proposed rules have no disproportionate impact on small businesses because of their size or geographic location.

(19) Identify the nature of any report and the estimated cost of its preparation by small business required to comply with the proposed rule(s).

There are no reports required for small business to comply with the proposed rules.

(20) Analyze the costs of compliance for all small businesses affected by the proposed rule(s), including costs of equipment, supplies, labor, and increased administrative costs.

R 408.30801, R 408.30813, R 408.30818, R 408.30819, R 408.30834, R 408.30838, R 408.30869, and R 408.30870 are administrative in nature and are amended to bring the administrative application of the Michigan Electrical Code rules in line with the other construction code rules. The amendments put into rule language the actual administrative practices.

R 408.30811 –There is no additional cost of compliance for small businesses because of these rules.

R 408.30871 and R 408.30873 – The proposed rules will not have any compliance cost impact on small businesses as they are editorial clarifications in the 2014 NEC.

(21) Identify the nature and estimated cost of any legal, consulting, or accounting services that small businesses would incur in complying with the proposed rule(s).

There are no legal, consulting, or accounting services costs that small businesses would incur in complying with the proposed rules.

(22) Estimate the ability of small businesses to absorb the costs without suffering economic harm and without adversely affecting competition in the marketplace.

R 408.30801, R 408.30813, R 408.30818, R 408.30819, R 408.30834, R 408.30838, R 408.30869, and R 408.30870 are administrative in nature and are amended to bring the administrative application of the Michigan Electrical Code rules in line with the other construction code rules. The amendments put into rule language the actual administrative practices.

R 408.30811 – The proposed rule will not have any cost effect on small businesses, but may result in a reduction in inspection time and scheduling.

R 408.30871 – The proposed rule will not have any impact on small businesses as it is only a clarification in the 2014 NEC.

R 408.30873 – The proposed rule will not have any negative impact on small businesses as this rule is more lenient than the 2014 NEC.

(23) Estimate the cost, if any, to the agency of administering or enforcing a rule that exempts or sets lesser standards for compliance by small businesses.

The proposed rules do not exempt or set lesser standards for compliance by small businesses. There is no additional cost to the agency beyond the current operational cost.

(24) Identify the impact on the public interest of exempting or setting lesser standards of compliance for small businesses.

Exempting or setting lesser standards of compliance for small business with respect to the 2014 NEC and these rules may have a negative effect on the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of the state of Michigan.

(25) Describe whether and how the agency has involved small businesses in the development of the proposed rule(s). If small business was involved in the development of the rule(s), please identify the business (es).

The bureau involved small businesses through the rules review committee process. Small business membership on the committee included Burglar and Fire Alarm Association of Michigan (BFAAM), National Electrical Contractors Association (NECA), Michigan Home Builders Association (MHBA), and an independent Electrical Contractor.

Cost-Benefit Analysis of Rules (independent of statutory impact):

(26) Estimate the actual statewide compliance costs of the rule amendments on businesses or groups. Identify the businesses or groups who will be directly affected by, bear the cost of, or directly benefit from the proposed rule(s). What additional costs will be imposed on businesses and other groups as a result of these proposed rules (i.e. new equipment, supplies, labor, accounting, or recordkeeping)? Please identify the types and number of businesses and groups. Be sure to quantify how each entity will be affected.

There is no actual statewide compliance cost of these rules on small business or groups.

(27) Estimate the actual statewide compliance costs of the proposed rule(s) on individuals (regulated individuals or the public). Please include the costs of education, training, application fees, examination fees, license fees, new equipment, supplies, labor, accounting, or recordkeeping). How many and what category of individuals will be affected by the rules? What qualitative and quantitative impact does the proposed change in rule(s) have on these individuals?

There are no anticipated compliance costs to individuals as a result of the proposed rules.

(28) Quantify any cost reductions to businesses, individuals, groups of individuals, or governmental units as a result of the proposed rule(s).

R 408.30801, R 408.30813, R 408.30818, R 408.30819, R 408.30834, R 408.30838, R 408.30869, and R 408.30870 are administrative in nature and are amended to bring the administrative application of the Michigan Electrical Code rules in line with the other construction code rules. The amendments put into rule language the actual administrative practices.

R 408.30811 – The adoption of this rule will reduce the number of required inspections and allow projects to proceed in a timely manner.

R 408.30871 – The proposed rule is a clarification of the code and will not result in a cost reduction.

R 408.30873 – The proposed rule will reduce the cost of the job by making the installation of the proposed wiring method less restrictive than the current 2014 NEC.

(29) Estimate the primary and direct benefits and any secondary or indirect benefits of the proposed rule(s). Please provide both quantitative and qualitative information, as well as your assumptions.

R 408.30801, R 408.30813, R 408.30818, R 408.30819, R 408.30834, R 408.30838, R 408.30869, and R 408.30870 are administrative in nature and are amended to bring the administrative application of the Michigan Electrical Code rules in line with the other construction code rules. The amendments put into rule language the actual administrative practices.

R 408.30811 – The proposed rule would reduce the cost of having additional inspections performed, scheduling of inspections and allow work to progress on schedule.

R 408.30871 – The proposed rule clarifies the requirement of the code and exceptions to this requirement by product listing.

R 408.30873 – The proposed rule allows this wiring method to be installed in a less restrictive method than the current 2014 NEC. This is a cost savings to the contractor and owner.

(30) Explain how the proposed rule(s) will impact business growth and job creation (or elimination) in Michigan.

The proposed rules will not impact business growth or job creation in Michigan.

(31) Identify any individuals or businesses that will be disproportionately affected by the rules as a result of their industrial sector, segment of the public, business size, or geographic location.

The bureau does not expect any business or individual to be disproportionately affected by these proposed rules.

(32) Identify the sources the agency relied upon in compiling the regulatory impact statement, including the methodology utilized in determining the existence and extent of the impact of a proposed rule(s) and a cost-benefit analysis of the proposed rule(s). How were estimates made, and what were your assumptions? Include internal and external sources, published reports, information provided by associations or organizations, etc., which demonstrate a need for the proposed rule(s).

The bureau relied upon the rules review committee in compiling the regulatory impact statement, including determining the existence and extent of the impact of these proposed rules and the cost benefit analysis of these proposed rules.

Alternatives to Regulation:

(33) Identify any reasonable alternatives to the proposed rule(s) that would achieve the same or similar goals. In enumerating your alternatives, please include any statutory amendments that may be necessary to achieve such alternatives.

There are no reasonable alternatives to the proposed rules that have been identified that would achieve the same or similar goals.

(34) Discuss the feasibility of establishing a regulatory program similar to that proposed in the rule(s) that would operate through private market-based mechanisms. Please include a discussion of private market-based systems utilized by other states.

The proposed rules are implemented through regulatory agencies at the state and local level. There are mechanisms for third party inspections as specified in the PA 230 of 1972, the State Construction Code Act. This agency is unaware of any private market-based systems which may be utilized by other states.

(35) Discuss all significant alternatives the agency considered during rule development and why they were not incorporated into the rule(s). This section should include ideas considered both during internal discussions and discussions with stakeholders, affected parties, or advisory groups.

There were no significant alternatives presented for the bureau and rules review committee to consider.

Additional Information

(36) As required by MCL 24.245b (1)(c), please describe any instructions regarding the method of complying with the rules, if applicable.

There are no instructions regarding the method of complying with the rules.

PART 4: REVIEW BY THE ORR

Date Regulatory Impact Statement (RIS) received:

10-15-2014

Date RIS approved:	11-14-2014
ORR assigned rule set number:	2013-111 LR

Date of disapproval:	Explain:
More information needed:	Explain:

(ORR-RIS March 2014)