Ī	
1	STATE OF MICHIGAN
2	DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
3	BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION CODES
4	
5	PUBLIC HEARING
6	THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 2024
7	AT ABOUT 9:12 A.M.
8	
9	MICHIGAN LIBRARY & HISTORICAL CENTER
10	MICHIGAN HISTORICAL CENTER, FIRST FLOOR FORUM
11	702 W. KALAMAZOO STREET
12	LANSING, MICHIGAN
13	
14 15	RE: Administrative Rules for Construction Codes Part 5. Residential Code Rule Set 2022-16 LR
16	
17	HEARING FACILITATOR:
18	TONY WILLIAMSON
19	Bureau of Construction Codes P.O. Box 30254
20	Lansing, Michigan 48909
21	
22	
23	REPORTED BY: Lori Anne Penn, CSR-1315
24	
25	
	Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

Ī		2
1	<u>INDEX</u>	
2	Opening Statement - Tony Williamson	3
3		
4	COMMENTS:	PAGE
5	Bert Gale	5
6	Robert Williams	5
7	Joe Troutt	7
8	Greg Herman	8
9	Gerald O'Conner	8
10	David Williams	10
11	Joel Tobias	12
12	Jeffrey Bowdell	13
13	Paul Waug	14
14	Doug Scott	15
15	John Stoudt	16
16	Paul Kaiser	16
17	Jeff Yaroch	17
18	Bob Filka	21
19	Beau Burten	23
20	Chris Cleveland	25
21	Evan Detone	26
22		
23	Closing Statement - Tony Williamson	27
24		
25		
	Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com	

Lansing, Michigan

Thursday, March 21, 2024

At 9:12 a.m.

- - -

(Public hearing commenced pursuant to due notice.)

MR. WILLIAMSON: Good morning. We will
now start our public hearing.

My name is Tony Williamson, and I'm a

Department Analyst for the Bureau of Construction Codes

in the Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs. I

will be conducting the hearing today.

This is a public hearing on proposed administrative rules entitled "Part 5 Residential Code-Rule Set 2022-16 LR". We are conducting this hearing under the authority of the Administrative Procedures Act, Public Act 306 of 1969, and on behalf of the Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Construction Codes.

We are calling this hearing to order at 9:14 a.m. on March 21, 2024, at the Michigan Library & Historical Center, First Floor Forum, 702 West Kalamazoo Street, Lansing, Michigan 48915. The notice of public hearing was published in the *Michigan Register*, Issue #3-2024, on March 15, 2024, and in the following newspapers of general circulation: The Morning Sun and Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

Oakland Press on February 28, 2024, and the Mining Journal on February 26, 2024.

Please know, we are here today to receive comments or suggestions on the proposed rules. Please make sure that they relate directly to the proposed rules and reasons why the changes would be in the public interest. If you wish to speak, make sure you have signed in and have indicated that you wish to speak. We will call on speakers in the order in which names are listed on the sign-in sheet. Each speaker is limited to three minutes and only allowed one time to speak during the public hearing. We are here to receive comments only. For those making comments today, please clearly state and spell your name slowly for the record, and if you are speaking on behalf of an organization, please identify that organization as well.

If you have already submitted comments to the Department in writing or by email, those comments will be considered in the same manner as the comments made during the public hearing today. If you have written comments, you may submit them directly to me. The Department will also accept written comments postmarked or emailed until 3/21/2024 at 5:00 p.m. Thank you.

All right. Mr. Bert Gale.

Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

23

24

25

BERT GALE: Good morning. I'm Bert Gale, I'm a building official, electrical inspector for numerous jurisdictions, including two counties and cities and townships and villages, also a member of the International Association of Electrical Inspectors. I just want to support the idea that the removal of the electrical portions of, that have been in the Michigan Residential Code be removed for the next adoption -- for this new adopted Residential Code. It causes all kinds of confusion with contractors and myself and probably all my counterparts are always dealing with and have been dealing with, well, for a couple decades now, since the year 2000 when the first Michigan Residential Code was So I just want to be on record that I support the removal of the electrical sections in this proposed Residential Code.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Thank you, sir. Robert Williams.

ROBERT WILLIAMS: Hello. My name is

Robert Williams, I am here representing Sprinklers Local

704, and I am here to talk in favor of adopting and

adding in the R 408.30539a, automatic fire sprinklers.

With my background in installation and maintenance

(inaudible) --

COURT REPORTER: Okay. If you're Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

reading, please slow down.

ROBERT WILLIAMS: Oh, I'm sorry. With my background in, and in installation and maintenance of fire sprinkler systems for the last 23 years, along with being a member of the Michigan Fire Safety Board on my second term, I feel I can safely weigh in on this topic. If I was to ask somebody to tell me how long a person would have to exit a burning home, I'm guessing most people would say about five minutes, when in reality it's, it currently sits at two minutes. Anywhere between three and five minutes you would you have flashover which can read over 1,000 degrees.

With modern building materials used in today's homes, homes now burn faster and hotter and also create a toxic gas called hydrogen cyanide. From the burning — and hydrogen cyanide begins to be produced at 600 degrees Fahrenheit and can be transmitted through inhalation and dermal absorption. A person who has acute cyanide poisoning has little or no chance of survival. If a person is able to escape their home with a mild case of cyanide poisoning, there is going to be a permanent neurological disability which can lead to Parkinson's according to the National Library of Medicine. Even our first responders who go into and around home fires have the inherent risk of poisoning to which they have to

drink a substance to counter the effects of the poison, but can have longterm effects that will add costs to municipalities and to care for them.

So with all this being said, the average home in Michigan is 1,700 square feet, and the cost for sprinklers is \$1.35 a square foot, which roughly equates to \$3,000 for the cost of their next washer and dryer combo. So I ask you this: What do you think a life is worth? Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMSON:

what that cost is for, to install.

JOE TROUTT: Good morning. My name is

Joe Troutt, T-r-o-u-t-t, I'm with Local 704 Sprinkler

Fitters Detroit. I had some prepared statements, but I

Thank you. Joe Troutt.

think I'm just going to wing it here. I'm just going to stand and want to be put on record as Section R 408.30539a, that I believe that it should be not rescinded. You know, a lot of it comes down to cost and

When we take into consideration the cost of that lost home and housing shortage, that lost home affects it in twofold. (1) We lost a home in the housing supply, and (2) we have a family that is in need of a home, so we compound that by losing that home. We have an opportunity right now to go forward and make things better to where we don't have a full loss of home. With

residential sprinklers, you're going to average discharge of 11 gallons per minute, as opposed to a fire department is going to discharge 500 gallons per minute, which would effectively be a loss of the full home. Those 11 gallons per minute from the residential sprinkler are going to be directed to the fire, to the hazard, allowing for greater safety and less loss of home. I appreciate your time.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Thank you, sir. Greg Herman.

Sprinkler Fitters Local 704. I stand here today to ask that R 408.30538 -- I'm sorry -- 5039a not be rescinded. Residential fire sprinklers are a life safety device. With a residential fire sprinkler system, 80 percent less fatality rate. As mentioned before, the national average is \$1.35 per square foot. Putting a price on a person's life is not worth it. The argument that it's going to be too costly for an affordable home is a false statement. I recommend that we do not rescind this. Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Thank you, sir. Gerald O'Conner.

GERALD O'CONNER: Good morning. My name is Gerald O'Conner, and I represent Eaton Corporation.

Eaton supports Michigan to update from the 2015 edition of the Michigan Residential Code to the 2023 Michigan Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

Electrical Code which will apply the electrical requirements to the 2023 National Electrical Code.

employees at eight locations across the state, including our vehicle group headquartered in Galesburg and aerospace facilities in Jackson and Grand Rapids. Our employees develop, manufacture, and sell safe and reliable electrical equipment. Our workforce provides market-leading electrical solutions used in general construction, performing to the highest standards of safety and reliability. Many of these products are installed in homes, commercial buildings, industrial facilities, and utilities across Michigan.

We commend Michigan for moving forward with the adoption process of the 2023 edition of the NFPA 70 National Electrical Code. Current codes produce safer and more economically prosperous communities. Eaton has long supported timely and unamended adoption of the National Electrical Code by state and local jurisdictions. We believe that adoption of the most current edition of the NEC promotes a uniform and up-to-date standard of safety for all occupants in the built environment. Thank you for your time and consideration in this important matter.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Thank you, sir. David
Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

Williams.

23

24

25

DAVID WILLIAMS: Good morning. My name is David Williams, and I'm from the International Association of Electrical Contractors, Michigan Chapter, and I speak in support of the rule set that was developed by the Bureau of Construction Codes. The National Electrical Code has been published every three years since 1897, and receives thousands of public inputs to revise the Code each code cycle. The electrical industry has seen so many changes in the past decade, and the trend doesn't seem to be slowing down. New technology like digital electricity, fault-managed power, limited energy wiring installations, increased use of the medium voltage installations, the ever-changing electrical vehicle and alternative energy requirements, DC generation and distribution, and on and on. Currently there are -- currently we are on the 2015 edition of the Michigan Residential Code. That standard has electrical requirements that are based on the 2014 National Electrical Code; and the proposals to submit for the 2014 National Electrical Code had to be submitted October of 2011, so the requirements that we have in Michigan are based on technology that was 13 years ago.

I started my an electrical apprenticeship in 1974, 50 years ago, and for the first 26 years we only Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

24

25

had one electrical code in Michigan, and in 2000, we added the Michigan Electrical Code -- excuse me -- the Michigan Residential Code, and there was -- when we just had the one electrical code, there was really no confusion throughout the state. By having two electrical codes, they do not match, and in a lot of installations, there are -- the National Electrical Code covers all installations, the Michigan Residential Code does not, and it's created a lot of confusion and a lot of heartache for a lot of installers, as well as inspectors, and trying to remember which edition that you're actually either installing or enforcing makes it very difficult for all our installers throughout. So if you would have asked somebody who's building a home nowadays if they thought, felt that their home was being built according to a current standard, they would almost expect that in Michigan, and in reality, it's over 13 years old, that technology.

We have about 6,000 public inputs that occur in each code cycle, and we're three code cycles behind with residential installations. When we had the -- we had arc faults in the 20 -- 2002 and 2000 -- excuse me -- 2002 and 2005 Michigan Electrical Code, and in the 2008 code, the Home Builders Association came at the last minute and said it was going to cost so much

I	12
1	money, and in reality, after reviewing the areas that it
2	had added, it would have been less than \$137, but the
3	Home Builders Association said it would cost about
4	thousands of dollars to have arc faults in those areas.
5	COURT REPORTER: Arc faults?
6	DAVID WILLIAMS: Pardon me?
7	COURT REPORTER: Is it arc faults?
8	DAVID WILLIAMS: Arc fault circuit
9	interrupters, AFCIs for short. I think my time's up.
10	Thank you.
11	MR. WILLIAMSON: Thank you, sir.
12	DAVID WILLIAMS: I also have some
13	petitions that were signed. I'll give those to you.
14	Thank you.
15	MR. WILLIAMSON: Thank you. Joel Tobias.
16	JOEL TOBIAS: Joel Tobias, electrical
17	inspector, City of Livonia. And I also would like to
18	have the MRC electrical division part of the MRC removed
19	and go to the NEC, Michigan Residential or Michigan
20	Electrical Code. It's just way too much, and I bet half
21	of my contractors don't even have an MRC, so why have the
22	code if they don't even have the code book to go to.
23	And my second comment is that is that, on
24	a state level, I'm very disappointed. We came in here
25	today, our state flag and our national flag are on the
	Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

wrong sides, and we never took time to honor this great country. Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Thank you, sir. Jeffrey Bowdell.

JEFFREY BOWDELL: Good morning. Jeff Bowdell from the City of Farmington, a 35-year building official. I'm also the legislative person for the Code Officials Conference of Michigan, an organization with about 175 members. These comments are mine, not the Organization's.

I really don't think individual alteration requests of the Code should be taken up at this level, but rather the alterations to the Code should be done at the national level, that they have (inaudible), you know, I guess they're going up twice a year to argue about things. Nationally, the code process, you know, kind of works, it takes into account the cost implications, takes into account all the safety. There's really no good reason to rehash code changes at this level. It seems that the individual groups that I say don't get what they want at the national level come back here and push our legislature to accept something that nationally has been voted on and is already in the best interest of the general public. The, you know, why should Michigan accept a different standard, supposedly

because it's just less expensive? Do our residents deserve to have a lesser standard, and again, just because of cost?

The 2001 Code has been accepted throughout the country, you know, we're a little behind, and again, why should we be doing something different for our, the Michiganders here in our state. Not going through this process would give us the ability to stay more current in our code adoption process. And, again, the National Code is something that if you put it in code book, it's in the code book, and then we could just adopt it instead of arguing about -- I went to a code hearing 25-30 years ago, and, in Michigan, nationally, and the -they are argued for five hours about stair geometry. I mean that's ridiculous. The whole country has one stair geometry, we have a different one. Why? So I really think that all this should be done outside of this venue, and that we should have a faster code adoption process when it does come time to review the code. Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Thank you. Paul Waug.

PAUL WAUG: Yeah. Good morning, and thank you for doing this for us. Just a few comments. I'm an electrician from Farmington, and I won't repeat anything.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Sir, I'm sorry, could we Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

25

21

22

23

24

have your name.

PAUL WAUG: Yeah, Paul Waug, electrician from Farmington. I won't repeat anything, I'll just hand you this when I get done. I would like to see that the state remove the electrical requirements for the Part 5 Michigan Residential Code and incorporate by reference Part 8 Michigan Electric Code. A single electric code would reduce costs for the industry, a single electric code would enhance uniformity, application of electric safety requirements across the state for inspectors, electricians, and contractors. And the rest of my comments were already repeated, but I'll hand that to you. Put it on file, please.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Thank you.

PAUL WAUG: Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Doug Scott.

DOUG SCOTT: Name is Doug Scott, I'm an electrical inspector in multiple jurisdictions. I'm up here just to announce that I would like to have the 2023 National Electrical Code adopted and used as one code for the State of Michigan, get rid of the MRC, you know, code on that and, you know, get up to the current standards with the Michigan Residential Code; usually that lags years behind in technology that's out there today for the electrical codes, and the up-to-date electrical codes are

usually standard with what's going on out there in the field. That's all I have to say.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Thank you. John Stoudt.

JOHN STOUDT: Good morning. Thank you

for doing this. My name is John Stoudt, I'm a registered

electrical inspector, also serve on the International

Association of Electrical Inspectors Board. And I would

like to see the MRC removed and the NEC be adopted.

There's no reason for us to have a separate standard than

the rest of the nation. Well, thank you.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Thank you, sir. Paul Kaiser.

PAUL KAISER: Good morning. My name is
Paul Kaiser, K-a-i-s-e-r. I work for Schneider Electric,
I'm here on behalf of Schneider, as well as I serve on
the Board for the IEEI. I am in support of removing Part
5 of the MRC, electrical section of the MRC and referring
back to using one code, the NEC.

First of all, I want to commend the State of Michigan for adopting the 2023 National Electric Code. There's two main reasons I think, compelling reasons to remove the electrical section; one being, as already stated, there are technologies that we have developed and we are designing, installing, and energizing today that were not around in the 2014 cycle, so the MRC doesn't

speak to the, some of the technologies and equipment that we are installing and energizing today in Michigan. And the second reason, as also noted by others, I think there's substantial value for all of us in having one code, one governing rule set for consistency in the State of Michigan. Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Thank you. Jeff Yaroch.

JEFF YAROCH: Good morning. My name is

Jeff Yaroch, I'm a former fire fighter with 27 years of
experience in (inaudible) fire services as a battalion

chief. I'm also an attorney, and I served in the state
legislature for six years as a state representative
representing my area.

I'm here to support keeping the residential fire sprinkler requirements in the code. For all the reasons that have been offered for the fact of supporting having this lifesaving equipment in, I support, and so I'm not going to reiterate those points.

I do want to comment on some of the opposition statements I've heard. It has been noted in some of those opposing fire sprinklers that fire deaths and casualties occur in old housing with inadequate or nonfunctioning smoke detectors. We should not lose sight of the fact that the old housing they speak of was once new housing, and had it we required these older homes to

have been built years ago with sprinklers, the research 1 would support that many of those fire deaths would not 2 have happened. 3 4 As a former state representative, I 5 understand that there are many facets to issues. I 6 realize we have a housing crisis shortage. The housing 7 shortage has been cited as a reason to not require residential (inaudible) --8 9 COURT REPORTER: Please slow down. 10 JEFF YAROCH: (Inaudible.) COURT REPORTER: I didn't even understand 11 12 what you just said. 13 JEFF YAROCH: May I reclaim my time? 14 sorry, but I don't want to lose time in the --15 MR. WILLIAMSON: Yes. 16 COURT REPORTER: But I have to write you 17 down. 18 JEFF YAROCH: Okay, I appreciate that. 19 As a former state representative, I 20 understand that there are many facets to issues. I 21 realize we have a housing shortage. The housing shortage 22 has been cited as a reason not to require residential 23 sprinklers. While increased construction costs has been 24 cited as having an effect on the housing shortage, my 25 research finds that there are far more issues, such as Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

population growth, increased cost of land, labor shortages, material shortages, et cetera; and one of the most significant issues in -- is high interest rates.

Just yesterday the Federal Reserve Board voted to not lower interest rates. If we want to make an issue of what really is affecting the housing shortage, maybe we should be reaching out to the federal government on this. It is absurd to think that whether we include the lifesaving equipment or not is going to drastically change the landscape of our housing shortage.

While I am a fire service professional, and I would like to see full residential fire sprinkler requirements adopted, drawing on my legislative experience, again, I've learned that half a loaf is better than no loaf. During the 2021-22 legislative session, I introduced House Bill 6304. House Bill 6304 requires sprinklers in each path of egress from the dwelling, included -- including, but not limited to, hallways and stairwells as the minimum requirement for residential sprinklers. My life experience has been that we often found fire victims in the path of egress attempting to escape the fire. Also, hallways and stairways are the most likely pathway for fire to spread through a dwelling. From a pragmatic sense, it would cut the cost of installation to roughly in half, while

maintaining sprinklers in the most critical locations.

As I said, I understand that we can find a common ground between all the parties on this.

attorney, I would say life is priceless, and I consider my two daughters and my wife priceless, but when we talk about wrongful death, wrongful death claims are about a million dollars or more per life. So in my home, my \$300,000 home, there's \$4 million of, over, of life value. So -- and every year I spend \$600 in home insurance to protect my \$300,000 value. It seems reasonable to spend two -- \$1.50 per square foot to protect for a lifetime that's \$4 million worth of value.

Again, I hope that we can find common ground on this and maintain residential sprinklers in the Code. Thank you for your consideration. (Handing paperwork to reporter.)

COURT REPORTER: That would be great, because I only got half of what you said.

JEFF YAROCH: I understand. I only get three minutes.

COURT REPORTER: I know, but I have to write it. I'm going to use this.

MR. WILLIAMSON: I will email you a copy of it.

(Yaroch paperwork taken by Mr. Williamson.)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WILLIAMSON: Thank you. Bob Filka.

BOB FILKA: Good morning. I'm Bob Filka, CEO of the Home Builders Association of Michigan. Just a couple quick things to respond to a couple of the folks that have spoke so far.

On sprinklers, sprinkler requirements have been in the model codes for a long, long time. State of Michigan, democrat and republican administrations have rejected them, only two states in the country require them throughout the entire house, so to suggest somehow that it's something that should automatically be adopted is a false statement.

I would also say the electrical folks that have testified today, they're lobbying to the wrong group. They need to get the law changed. The state legislature approved a law requiring a combined Michigan Residential Code that combines all of the various codes into one document for use by the residential construction industry. Lobby the legislature. Through an administrative process, you can't change the law.

LARA has proposed code changes that violate state law, it has failed to provide statutorily required answers in its regulatory impact statement for this rule set. In fact, it's failed to provide the very Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

same information it demands from someone proposing a modification here today. If you haven't read LARA's RIS, they handed it out today. You'll only see explanations and some attempt to answer these questions as it relates to Chapter 11, the energy efficiency section of the MRC. What about the other 43 chapters in the MRC that are being modified? LARA says essentially nothing about these other significant changes. And as people have already testified here today, obviously sprinklers and AFCIs are a significant change. These requirements, like I said, were removed by previous administrations, yet LARA provides no explanation whatsoever as to why now they've been included.

In two of our proposed changes we are submitting today, you will see new data that not only reiterates what other prior administrations took as fact, but new research showing that tripping incidents from AFCIs are a major problem and arguably increase dangers in a household.

Lastly, in our stack of materials we've also proposed a change to include the actual electrical related changes in the text of the MRC. Your draft only includes it an as a reference. This again fails to comply with state law.

Thanks for your time today. And I would Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com

just simply lastly say that by calling this a public hearing does not make it so. One of the other things LARA has done is it has failed to comply with the APA. Simply because you used this process for other codes that have recently been adopted and no one objected doesn't make it legal. You violated the APA, and we actually recommend that you start over and follow the guidance and the law as the legislature intended. Thanks.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Thank you. Beau Burten.

BEAU BURTEN: Beau, B-e-a-u, Burten. I'm
here representing the Detroit Electrical Industry

Training Center, IBEW Local 58 out of Detroit, as well as
the Southeast Chapter of, Southeast Michigan Chapter of
the National Electrical Contractors Association. All
three of these organizations stand in support of removing
Part 5 from the Michigan Residential Code and would like
to incorporate by reference Part 8 of the Michigan

I would also like to stand against any attempt to rescind Article 210.12 of the National Electric Code as adopted into the Michigan Electric Code. This is a requirement for arc fault circuit interrupters, which are a known lifesaving device. They are generally being opposed by only one organization in this state, which is the Michigan Home Builders Association, for

Electrical Code in replacement of that.

23

24

25

really what amounts to some nuisance tripping. previously stated, I find that to be much less of a nuisance than losing a child, a loved one, or somebody else in this state. So to have a little bit of nuisance tripping, which did occur early on when these were first adopted in 1999, which have since been rescinded in the State of Michigan, we are one of two states that does not require arc fault circuit interrupters, leaving ourselves and our homes really in danger for the leading cause of fires, which is arcing electrical faults. It's estimated we could eliminate about 50 percent of the electrical fires with the arc fault circuit interrupter. We're talking about 25,000 fires each year between the years 2017 and 2019, hundreds of deaths, thousands of injuries, and a billion dollars in property. We could possibly cut that in half with the use of arc fault circuit interrupters.

Many of the problems associated with the arc fault is the Michigan Home Builders' poor installation practices, that they were pushing it too fast. If they'd actually install it properly, they would not have the problems they do with the device. A properly trained installer will not have the nuisance tripping that an improperly trained installer would have. Thank you for your time today.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WILLIAMSON: Thank you. Cleveland.

CHRIS CLEVELAND: Good morning. Chris Cleveland, C-h-r-i-s, Cleveland, just like the city. I am the current president of the International Association of Electrical Inspectors, Michigan Chapter, and an electrical inspector for the University of Michigan. I support removing the electrical requirements in the Michigan Residential Code; they are outdated and incomplete.

The Michigan Electrical Code is the National Electrical Code by reference, as stated in Part 8 Electrical Code Rule 801.1. The National Electrical Code is the most widely used code in the United States. It is the installation code used in all 50 states and all U.S. territories, and is used in numerous other countries. A uniform code was the catalyst of the very first National Electrical Code.

Article 90.2 in the National Electrical Code, 2a, says practical safeguarding, and states that the purpose of the Code is the practical safeguarding of persons and property from hazards arising from the use of electricity. That is the very least we can allow in the State of Michigan. Our labor force, our first responders, and all of our citizens and visitors deserve

2

3 4

5

7

6

8

9

11

10

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

practical safeguarding from the dangers arising from the use of electricity.

I support removing the electrical rules from the Michigan Residential Code, and I ask for your support, too. I also have several signatures of professionals in the electrical industry in Michigan that also support removing those rules. Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Thank you. Evan Detone.

EVAN DETONE: Good morning. My name is Evan Detone, E-v-a-n D-e-t-o-n-e, and I'm here on behalf of myself, a Michigan resident from Lake Orion, Michigan. I want to be on record supporting the removal of the electrical requirements from Part 8 of -- or Part 5 of the Michigan Residential Code, and I want to incorporate by reference the Part 8 Michigan Electrical Code.

I think having a unified electrical code across all buildings throughout the state is the way to The current setup of having two different codes is confusing and potentially dangerous. With new emerging technologies such as electrical vehicles, solar, and all sorts of other things like wind, the newer electrical codes, you know, the new National Electrical Codes that come ouch each, you know, every three years incorporate these new technologies, whereas now we're looking at, you know, old codes pointing to, you know, even older codes,

it just becomes confusing and potentially dangerous. So I think the state should remove the two separate codes and have one unified code for the state. Thank you very much. MR. WILLIAMSON: Thank you. If there are no further comments at this time, I hereby declare this hearing closed. The record will remain open until 3/21/2024 at 5:00 p.m. for any other comments you may wish to share about the proposed rules. Thank you for attending. (Public hearing concluded at 9:54 a.m.)

I	
1	STATE OF MICHIGAN)
2	COUNTY OF MACOMB)
3	I, Lori Anne Penn, certify that this
4	transcript consisting of 28 pages is a complete, true,
5	and correct record, to the best of my ability, of the
6	Public Hearing held in the captioned matter on Thursday,
7	March 21, 2024.
8	I further certify that I am not
9	responsible for any copies of this transcript not made
10	under my direction or control and bearing my original
11	signature.
12	I also certify that I am not a relative
13	or employee of or an attorney for a party; or a relative
14	or employee of an attorney for a party; or financially
15	interested in the action.
16	
17	
18	March 28, 2024 Date Lori Anne Penn, CSR-1315
19	Notary Public, Macomb County, Michigan My Commission Expires June 15, 2025
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	Penn Reporting, LLC - lori.penn@yahoo.com