



## CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: James Weaver

Date: 10/2/2024

Email address: james.weaver@state.mn.us

Model Code: A17.3

Telephone number: (651) 600-9400

Code or Rule Section: 1.4 elevator personnel

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI

Topic of proposal: Definitions: elevator personnel

Code or rule section to be changed: 1.4 elevator personnel

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): 1307 Elevator

### General Information

**Yes**    **No**

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

### Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- 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.

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 ~~striethrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

**elevator personnel:** persons who have been trained in the construction, maintenance, repair, inspection, or testing of equipment-, and maintains an elevator constructors license issued by the state of Minnesota.

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.

NO

### **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.)

The proposed change will clarify the difference between “authorized personnel” and “elevator personnel.”

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?

The proposed change simply clarifies what is already in statute.

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

### **Cost/Benefit Analysis**

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

The proposed change will not affect cost and doesn't propose any substantive change.

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.

The proposed change will not affect cost and doesn't propose any substantive change.

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

The proposed change will not affect cost and doesn't propose any substantive change.

4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.

The proposed change will not affect cost and doesn't propose any substantive change.

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.

The proposed change will not affect cost and doesn't propose any substantive change.

## **Regulatory Analysis**

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

The proposed change will not affect cost and doesn't propose any substantive 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.

The proposed change will not affect cost and doesn't propose any substantive change.

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?
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.

The proposed change will not affect cost and doesn't propose any substantive change.

\*\*\*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.



## CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: James Weaver

Date: 10/2/2024

Email address: james.weaver@state.mn.us

Model Code:

Telephone number: (651) 600-9400

Code or Rule Section: 1307.0027

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI

Topic of proposal: Definitions

Code or rule section to be changed: 1307.0027

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): 1307 Elevator

### General Information

**Yes**   **No**

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

### Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to: **Add two definitions to 1307.0027**

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- 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.

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 ~~striketrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

elevator personnel: persons who have been trained in the construction, maintenance, repair, inspection, or testing of equipment, and maintains an elevator constructors license issued by the state of Minnesota.

Installation: In this chapter, Installation means any of the following: passenger elevators, freight elevators, hand-operated, elevators, dumbwaiters, escalators, moving walks, vertical reciprocating conveyors, stage and orchestra lifts, mechanical parking garage equipment, endless belt lifts, platform lifts, stairway chairlifts, and other related devices.

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.

NO

### **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.)

Adding these two definitions will provide clarification of the words throughout chapter 1307 and model codes adopted by reference.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?

The change is for the purpose of clarification.

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

### **Cost/Benefit Analysis**

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

Adding these definitions will not have any effect on cost.

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.

Adding these definitions will not have any effect on cost.

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

Adding these definitions will not have any effect on cost.

4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.

Adding these definitions will not have any effect on cost.

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.

Adding these definitions will not have any effect on cost.

## **Regulatory Analysis**

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

Adding these two definitions will not introduce any substantive 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.

NO

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?

Adding these two definitions will not introduce any substantive change.

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.



## CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: James weaver

Date: 10/2/2024

Email address: james.weaver@state.mn.us

Model Code:

Telephone number: (651) 600-9400

Code or Rule Section: 1307.0010

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI

Topic of proposal: Purpose and scope

Code or rule section to be changed: 1307.0010

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): 1307 Elevator

### General Information

Yes    No

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

### Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:
  - change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
  - 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.
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 ~~striethrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

The provisions of parts 1307.0010 to 1307.0110 are to safeguard life, limb, property, and public welfare by establishing minimum requirements relating to the design, construction, installation, alteration, repair, removal, and operation and maintenance of passenger elevators, freight elevators, hand-~~operated~~ powered elevators, dumbwaiters, escalators, moving walks, vertical reciprocating conveyors, stage and orchestra lifts, mechanical parking garage equipment, endless belt lifts, ~~platform wheelchair~~ platform wheelchair lifts, stairway chairlifts, and other related devices. The requirements for the enforcement of these provisions are established by this chapter, and by municipal option, according to Minnesota Statutes, section 326B.184, subdivision 4.

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.

NO

### **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.)

The change is intended to harmonize language in rule with the model codes. The change also adds equipment that are already governed by 1307 due to statute or another part of the rule.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?

The change is editorial in nature and doesn't suggest any substantive change.

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

### **Cost/Benefit Analysis**

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

The change will not have any effect on const.

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.



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?

The change is editorial in nature and doesn't propose any substantive 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.

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?

The change is editorial in nature and doesn't propose any substantive change.

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.



## CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: James Weaver

Date: 10/2/2024

Email address: james.weaver@state.mn.us

Model Code:

Telephone number: (651) 600-9400

Code or Rule Section: 1307.0027

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI

Topic of proposal: Definition of Dormant Elevator

Code or rule section to be changed: 1307.0027 Subp. 12

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): 1307 Elevator

---

### General Information

**Yes**    **No**

- |  |                                     |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota?                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota?            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement?                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem?  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment?               | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

### Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- 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.

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 ~~striketrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

Subp. 12. **Dormant elevator, dormant dumbwaiter, or dormant escalator.** "Dormant elevator," "dormant dumbwaiter," or "dormant escalator" means an installation placed out of service as specified in ASME A17.1/CSA B44-2016, 8.11.1.4. and elevator boring, where applicable, is sealed in accordance with MN Rules Chapter 4725, Wells and Borings.

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.)

The change clarifies what is already in another rule. Reading the current 1307 language it is not clear MN Rules Chapter 4725 Wells and Borings requires a boring associated with a dormant elevator is an "unused boring" and is required to be sealed. This will help avoid elevators being put into dormant status and the owner having surprise expenses.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?

The change is editorial in nature and doesn't introduce any substantive change.

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

### **Cost/Benefit Analysis**

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

The change will not have any effect on cost.

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.

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?

The change is editorial in nature and doesn't suggest any substantive 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.

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?

The change is editorial in nature and doesn't suggest any substantive change.

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.



## CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: James weaver

Date: 10/2/2024

Email address: james.weaver@state.mn.us

Model Code:

Telephone number: (651) 600-9400

Code or Rule Section: 1307.0030 Subp. 1

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI

Topic of proposal: Permits

Code or rule section to be changed: 1307.0030 Subp. 1

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): 1307 Elevator

### General Information

Yes   No

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

### Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- 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.

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 ~~striketrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

Subpart 1. **Permits required.** It is unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation to hereafter install any new passenger elevators, freight elevators, hand-operated elevators, dumbwaiters, escalators, moving walks, vertical reciprocating conveyors, stage and orchestra lifts, mechanical parking garage equipment, endless belt lifts, platform lifts, stairway chairlifts, ~~passenger elevators, freight elevators, handpowered elevators, moving walks, escalators, dumbwaiters, wheelchair lifts, endless belt lifts, vertical reciprocating conveyors, stage and orchestra lifts,~~ or any other related device, or make alterations or repairs to or remove any existing of the same without having first obtained a permit for the work from the authority having jurisdiction. Alterations, modifications, and practical difficulties will be done in keeping with the rules of the Department of Labor and Industry.

Permits for repairs are required by the Department of Labor and Industry for the following ASME A17.1/CSA B44-2016 sections: 8.6.2.3 repair of speed governors; 8.6.2.4 repair of releasing carrier; 8.6.3.3 suspension means fastenings and hitch plates; 8.6.3.4 replacement of governor rope; 8.6.3.6 replacement of speed governor; 8.6.3.9 replacement of releasing carrier; and 8.6.3.10 replacement of hydraulic jack plunger; cylinder, tanks, valve, and anticreep leveling device.

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.

NO

### **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.)

The proposed change is intended to harmonize language in rule with the model codes. The change also adds equipment that are already governed by 1307 due to statute or another part of the rule.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?

The change is editorial and doesn't propose any substantive change.

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

### **Cost/Benefit Analysis**

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

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

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.

NO

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

NA

4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.

NO

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.

NO

### **Regulatory Analysis**

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

The proposed change is editorial and doesn't propose any substantive 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.

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?

The change is editorial in nature and doesn't propose any substantive change.

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.







## CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: James Weaver

Date: 10/2/2024

Email address: james.weaver@state.mn.us

Model Code:

Telephone number: (651) 600-9400

Code or Rule Section: 1307.0030 Subp 4 & 5

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI

Topic of proposal: Certificate of operation

Code or rule section to be changed: 1307.0030 Subp 4 & 5

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): 1307 Elevator

---

### General Information

**Yes**    **No**

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

### Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:
  - change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
  - 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.
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 ~~striketrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

Subp. 4. **Certificate of operation required.** It is unlawful to operate equipment governed by this code ~~ASME A17.1/CSA B44-2016, ASME A17.3-2015, and ASME A90.1-2015~~ without a current Certificate of Operation issued by the authority having jurisdiction. The certificate will be issued upon payment of prescribed fees and the presentation of a valid inspection report indicating that the conveyance is safe and that the inspections and tests have been performed according to this code. A certificate will not be issued when the conveyance is posted as unsafe.

Subp. 5. **Application for certificate of operation.** Application for a certificate of operation shall be made by the owner, or an authorized representative, for equipment governed by this code. ~~ASME A17.1/CSA B44-2016, ASME A17.3-2015, and ASME A90.1-2015~~. The application shall be accompanied by an inspection report. Fees for the Certificate of Operation shall be as specified by the administrative authority.

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.

NO

### **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.)

The proposed change is intended to make the rule easier to read and comprehend. This change eliminates unnecessary jargon and simplifies the language.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?

The proposed change is editorial and doesn't propose any substantive change.

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

### **Cost/Benefit Analysis**

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

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

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.

NO

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.

NO

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.

NO

### **Regulatory Analysis**

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

The proposed change is editorial and doesn't propose any substantive 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.

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?

The proposed change is editorial and doesn't propose any substantive change.

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.



## CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: James Weaver

Date: 10/2/2024

Email address: james.weaver@state.mn.us

Model Code:

Telephone number: (651) 600-9400

Code or Rule Section: 1307.0035 Subp. 1, 2 & 3

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI

Topic of proposal: Certificate of operation

Code or rule section to be changed: 1307.0035 Subp. 1, 2 & 3

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): 1307 Elevator

---

### General Information

**Yes**    **No**

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

### Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:
  - change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
  - 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.
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 ~~striketrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

Subpart 1. **Approval of plans.** Any person, firm, or corporation desiring to install, relocate, alter, or remove any installation ~~governed covered~~ by this ~~code chapter~~ shall obtain approval for doing so from the authority having jurisdiction. Two sets of drawings and/or specifications, or PDF files containing the same information if submitted electronically, showing the installation, relocation, alteration, or removal shall be submitted as required by the authority having jurisdiction. A corporation desiring to install, relocate, alter, or remove any installation ~~governed covered~~ by this ~~code chapter~~ shall obtain approval for doing so from the authority having jurisdiction. Two sets of drawings and/or specifications showing the installation, relocation, alteration, or removal shall be submitted as required by the authority having jurisdiction.

Subp. 2. **Inspections and tests.** No person, firm, or corporation may put into service any installation ~~governed covered~~ by this ~~code chapter~~ whether the installation is newly installed, relocated, or altered materially, without the installation being inspected and approved by the authority having jurisdiction. The installer of any equipment ~~governed by this code shall included in this chapter must~~ request inspections by notifying the authority having jurisdiction to schedule a date and time for inspection. The authority having jurisdiction shall require tests as described in the applicable ASME Code to prove the safe operation of the installation.

Subp. 3. **Approval.** A certificate or letter of approval shall be issued by the authority having jurisdiction ~~for equipment governed by ASME A17.1/CSA B44-2016, ASME A17.3-2015, ASME A90.1-2015, and ASME B20.1-2015~~ when the entire installation is completed and complies in conformity with this code.

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.

NO

### **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.)

The proposed change is intended to make the rule easier to read and comprehend. This change eliminates unnecessary jargon and simplifies the language.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?

The proposed change is editorial and doesn't propose any substantive change.

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

### **Cost/Benefit Analysis**

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

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

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.

NO

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.

NO

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.

NO

### **Regulatory Analysis**

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

The proposed change is editorial and doesn't propose any substantive 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.

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?

The proposed change is editorial and doesn't propose any substantive change.

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.



## CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

*Author/requestor:* James Weaver

*Date:* 10/2/2024

*Email address:* james.weaver@state.mn.us

*Model Code:*

*Telephone number:* (651) 600-9400

*Code or Rule Section:* 1307.0040 Accidents

*Firm/Association affiliation, if any:* DLI

*Topic of proposal:* Accidents

*Code or rule section to be changed:* 1307.0040 Accidents

*Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"):* 1307 Elevator

### General Information

**Yes**    **No**

- |  |                                     |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota?                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota?            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement?                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem?  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment?               | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

### Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:
  - change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
  - 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.
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.

### 1307.0040 ACCIDENTS.

Subpart 1. **To be reported.** The owner or person in control of an installation governed by this code shall notify the authority having jurisdiction when an accident involves injury or death to a person on, about, or in connection with an installation.

The owner or person in control of an installation governed by this code shall notify the authority having jurisdiction when an accident involves damage to equipment or apparatus on, about, or in connection with an installation.

Notification may be given to the authority having jurisdiction by telephone or verbally. The notification must also be confirmed in writing. Notification must be made within one working day of the accident. Failure to provide the proper notification may be considered a violation as described in Minnesota Statutes, section 326B.178.

~~The owner or person in control of an elevator or other installation covered by this code shall notify the authority having jurisdiction of any accident involving personal injury or damage to equipment covered in this chapter to a person or apparatus on, about, or in connection with an elevator or other installation, and shall allow the authority having jurisdiction reasonable access to the equipment and the opportunity to take statements from employees and agents of the owner or person in control for investigating the accident and the resultant damage. Notification may be given to the authority having jurisdiction by telephone or verbally. The notification must also be confirmed in writing. Notification must be made within one working day of the accident. Failure to provide the proper notification may be considered a violation as described in Minnesota Statutes, section 326B.178.~~

Subp. 2. **Investigation.** The owner or person in control of the installation involved in an accident shall allow the authority having jurisdiction reasonable access to the equipment and the opportunity to take statements from employees and agents of the owner or person in control for investigating the accident and the resultant damage.

The authority having jurisdiction shall make or cause to be made an investigation of the accident. A report of the investigation must be placed on file in its office. The report must give in detail the cause or causes, so far as can be determined. The report must be available for public inspection subject to the requirements of the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, Minnesota Statutes, chapter 13.

~~The authority having jurisdiction must make or cause to be made an investigation of the accident, and the report of the investigation must be placed on file in its office. The report must give in detail the cause or causes, so far as can be determined, and the report must be available for public inspection subject to the requirements of the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, Minnesota Statutes, chapter 13.~~

Subp. 3. **Operation discontinued.** When an accident involves the failure or destruction of a part of the installation or the operating mechanism, the elevator or other installation must be taken out of service and Shall may not be used again until it has been made safe and the reuse approved by the authority having jurisdiction. The authority having jurisdiction may, when necessary, order the discontinuance of operation of any such elevator or installation until a new certificate of operation has been issued.

Subp. 4. **Removal of parts restricted.** No part of the damaged installation, ~~construction, or operating mechanism~~ may be removed from the premises until permission is granted by the authority having jurisdiction.



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.

NO

### **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.)

The intent of this code change proposal is to simplify the language and make it easier to read and provide clarity. The proposed change is editorial, there is not any substantive change.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?

The proposal is editorial and there is not any substantive change.

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

### **Cost/Benefit Analysis**

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

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

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.

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

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

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

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.

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

### **Regulatory Analysis**

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

The proposed change is editorial, there is not any substantive 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.

The proposed change is editorial, there is not any substantive change.

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?

The proposed change is editorial, there is not any substantive change.

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.



## CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

*Author/requestor:* James Weaver

*Date:* 10/2/2024

*Email address:* james.weaver@state.mn.us

*Model Code:*

*Telephone number:* (651) 600-9400

*Code or Rule Section:* 1307.0047 Subp.1

*Firm/Association affiliation, if any:* DLI

*Topic of proposal:* Special Provisions Scope

*Code or rule section to be changed:* 1307.0047 Subp.1

*Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"):* 1307 Elevator

### General Information

**Yes**    **No**

- |  |                                     |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota?                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota?            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement?                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem?  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment?               | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

### Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
  
- 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.

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 ~~striketrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.  
1307.0047 SPECIAL PROVISIONS.

Subpart 1. **Scope.** The special provisions in this part apply to the design, construction, and installation of equipment governed by this code. ~~ASME A17.1/CSA B44 2016 and ASME A17.3-2015.~~

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.

No

### **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.)

The proposed change simplifies the language making it easier to read. Also, the current language is incorrect.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?

The proposed change is editorial and does not propose any substantive change.

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

### **Cost/Benefit Analysis**

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

The proposed change will not affect cost.

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.

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?

The proposed change is editorial and does not propose any substantive 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.

NO

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?

The proposed change is editorial and does not propose any substantive change.

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.



## CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: James Weaver

Date: 10/2/2024

Email address: james.weaver@state.mn.us

Model Code:

Telephone number: (651) 600-9400

Code or Rule Section: 1307.0047 Subp. 9

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI

Topic of proposal: Safety Bulkhead

Code or rule section to be changed: 1307.0047 Subp. 9

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): 1307 Elevator

---

### 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).
- 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.

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 ~~striethrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

Subp. 9. **All work required for compliance with ASME A17.1/CSA B44-2022 16-8.6.5.8 Safety Bulkhead ~~Material Transfer Device~~.** Elevators shall not be converted to a material transfer device (vertical reciprocating conveyor) without meeting the requirements of ASME A17.1/CSA B44-2022 16-8.6.5.8, Safety Bulkhead. ~~A material transfer device shall comply with ASME B20.1-2015.~~

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.)

The intent of the proposed change is to simplify the language and make it easier to read.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?

The proposed change is editorial and does not propose any substantive changes.

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

### **Cost/Benefit Analysis**

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

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

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.

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

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

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

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.
6. The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

### **Regulatory Analysis**

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

The proposed change is editorial and does not propose any substantive changes.

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.

NO

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?

The proposed change is editorial and does not propose any substantive changes.

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.





## CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: James Weaver

Date: 10/2/2024

Email address: james.weaver@state.mn.us

Model Code:

Telephone number: (651) 600-9400

Code or Rule Section: 1307.0047 Subp. 15

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI

Topic of proposal: Special Provisions

Code or rule section to be changed: 1307.0047 Subp. 15

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): 1307 Elevator

### General Information

Yes    No

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

### Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- 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).

1307.0047 Subp. 15

- add new language that is not found in the model code book or in Minnesota Rule.

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 ~~striketrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

~~Subp. 15. ASME A17.3-2015 2.2.4 Temperature control. Machine rooms shall be provided with natural or mechanical means to avoid overheating of the electrical equipment and to ensure safe and normal operation of the elevator.~~

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.  
NO

### **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.)

The language is in the model code, ASME A17.3. It is not needed as an amendment in 1307

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?

The language is in the model code, ASME A17.3-2023. It is not needed as an amendment in 1307

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

### **Cost/Benefit Analysis**

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

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

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.

he proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

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

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

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.

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

### **Regulatory Analysis**

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

None

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.

NO

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?

The proposed change will net have any effect on cost.

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.



## CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: James Weaver

Date: 10/2/2024

Email address: james.weaver@state.mn.us

Model Code:

Telephone number: (651) 600-9400

Code or Rule Section: 1307.0090 Subp. 2

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI

Topic of proposal: Existing Installations

Code or rule section to be changed: 1307.0090 Subp. 2

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): 1307 Elevator

### 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).
- 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.

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.  
NO

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.

Subp. 2. **Conditions for continued operation.** All existing installations of equipment governed by ASME A17.1/CSA B44-20~~22~~24, ASME A17.3-20~~23~~15, and ASME A90.1-20~~23~~15 may be continued in service as long as they are properly maintained and are, in the opinion of the authority having jurisdiction, installed and maintained in a safe condition. The authority having jurisdiction shall order the installation of the following basic safety devices: ~~automatic noncontact door reopening devices; top of car, under car lights, and pit lights, with ground fault interrupter outlets; pit ladder; emergency door unlocking device; and emergency lock box complying with part 1307.0067, subpart 9. All hand-powered elevators and hand-powered dumbwaiters shall be equipped with a broken rope safety device. Elevator machine room lighting shall meet the requirements of ASME A17.1/CSA B44-2016 2.7.9.1 to provide 19 footcandles of illumination at the floor level. The installation of these safety devices does not require compliance with ASME A17.1/CSA B44-2016.~~

- Automatic noncontact door reopening devices.
- Lighting and duplex GFCI receptacle on the top of car.
- Lighting and duplex GFCI receptacle on the underside of car.
- Lighting and duplex GFCI receptacle in the Pit.
- Emergency door unlocking device at the top and bottom floor unless hoistway access is provided.
- Key locks for any emergency door unlocking device above the bottom landing.
- Emergency lock box complying with part 1307.0067, subpart 9.
- All hand-powered elevators and hand-powered dumbwaiters shall be equipped with a broken rope safety device.
- Elevator machine room lighting shall meet the requirements of ASME A17.1/CSA B44-2022 2.7.9.1 to provide 19 footcandles of illumination at the floor level.

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.  
NO

### 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.)

The intent of the proposed change is to simplify the language for inspectors and owners. It will make it easier for an inspector to cite a violation and easier for the owner to know what needs to be done. Also the proposed language is formatted in a list similar to the way the model codes do.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?

The proposed change is editorial and does not propose any substantive changes.

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

## **Cost/Benefit Analysis**

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

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

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.

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

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

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

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.

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

## **Regulatory Analysis**

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

None

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.

NO

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?

The proposed change will net have any effect on cost.

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.



# CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: James Weaver

Date: 10/2/2024

Email address: james.weaver@state.mn.us

Model Code:

Telephone number: (651) 600-9400

Code or Rule Section: 1307.0090 Subp 4 though 7

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI

Topic of proposal: Existing installations

Code or rule section to be changed: 1307.0090 Subp 4 though 7

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): 1307 Elevator

## General Information

**Yes**    **No**

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

## Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- 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.

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 ~~striketrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

Subp. 4. **Unsafe conditions.** When an inspection reveals an unsafe condition, the inspector ~~must~~ **shall** immediately file with the owner and the authority having jurisdiction a full and true report of the inspection and the unsafe condition. The authority having jurisdiction shall shut down any piece of equipment governed ~~covered~~ by this code chapter, that, in the opinion of the authority having jurisdiction, is dangerous to life, limb, or adjoining property, and the equipment shall not be put back into operation until the unsafe condition has been corrected and approved by the authority having jurisdiction. When an unsafe condition is determined by the authority having jurisdiction, the inspector shall place a notice, in a conspicuous location, on the elevator, escalator, or moving walk that the conveyance is unsafe. The owner shall ensure that the notice of unsafe condition is legibly maintained where placed by the authority having jurisdiction. The authority having jurisdiction shall issue an order in writing to the owner requiring the repairs or alterations to be made to the conveyance in compliance with the applicable ASME code and its associated state amendments. A posted notice of unsafe conditions shall be removed only by the authority having jurisdiction when satisfied that the required repairs or alterations have been completed.

Subp. 5. [Repealed, 31 SR 935]

Subp. 6. **Other requirements.** Existing installations governed ~~covered~~ by subpart 2 shall conform to the requirements of: ASME A17.1/CSA B44-2016 Part 1, and 5.10, 8.1, 8.6, 8.7, 8.8, 8.9, 8.10, and 8.11 as amended by this and other sections of this chapter. Alterations shall conform to the requirements of ASME A17.1/CSA B44-2016, Part 8.7, or ASME A17.3-2015, whichever is more restrictive.

Subp. 7. **Compliance schedule.** The authority having jurisdiction shall notify the owner of an existing elevator of the applicable ASME code and its associated state amendments (1) at the time of adoption or (2) following an inspection of an elevator not in compliance with the applicable ASME code and its associated state amendments. The following applies to elevators or related devices upon the owner receiving notification:

A. Where noncompliance with the applicable ASME code and its associated state amendments creates an imminent danger to persons or property, correction must be initiated immediately and the unit may not be placed into service until the correction is made or approval is granted by the authority having jurisdiction.

B. Where noncompliance with the applicable ASME code and its associated state amendments does not create an imminent danger, the owner or manager of the property shall submit for review and approval a time schedule for compliance with the authority having jurisdiction within 60 calendar days of receipt of notification by the authority having jurisdiction.

Any compliance schedule submitted for an existing elevator shall result in compliance with the code requirements within five years of submission of the compliance schedule. The authority having jurisdiction, acting under Minnesota Statutes, section 326B.175, is authorized to take an elevator that is not in compliance with the code requirements within five years of submission of the compliance schedule out of service.

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.

NO

### **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.)

The intent of this change proposal is to make the language consistent throughout the chapter. The change is editorial and does not propose any substantive change.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?

The change is editorial and does not propose any substantive change.

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

### **Cost/Benefit Analysis**

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

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

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.

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

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

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

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.

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

## **Regulatory Analysis**

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

The change is editorial and does not propose any substantive 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.

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

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?

The proposed change will not have any effect on cost.

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.



## CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: James Weaver

Date: 10/2/2024

Email address: james.weaver@state.mn.us

Model Code:

Telephone number: (651) 600-9400

Code or Rule Section: 1307.0090 Subp 8

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI

Topic of proposal: Existing Installations

Code or rule section to be changed: 1307.0090 Subp 8

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): 1307 Elevator

### 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).
- 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.

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 ~~striketrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

Subp. 8. Removal of existing elevators, dumbwaiters, escalators and moving walks.

A. **Electric Traction elevator.**

1. When an electric elevator is being replaced, elevator related equipment, that will not be reused on the new installation, shall be removed by elevator personnel.
2. When removal of an electric elevator is part of building demolition, the elevator car and counterweights shall be safely landed at the lowest landing by elevator personnel.
3. When an electric elevator is removed and hoistway is not reused for elevator equipment, the elevator shall be made dormant or removed by elevator personnel.

~~Prior to a new installation, elevator personnel shall remove all elevator related equipment, that will not be reused on the new installation. If removal of the equipment is part of building demolition or the hoistway is not reused for elevator equipment, elevator personnel shall remove the equipment from service by safely landing the elevator and counterweights at the lowest landing.~~

B. **Hydraulic elevator.**

1. When a hydraulic elevator is being replaced, elevator related equipment, that will not be reused on the new installation, shall be removed by elevator personnel.
2. If a hydraulic elevator is to be removed for building demolition the following apply:
  - a. All hydraulic oil shall be removed by elevator personnel in accordance with rules of the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency.
  - b. Elevator borings shall be sealed by a licensed Well Contractor or a licensed Elevator Boring Contractor. Permits for this work are issued by the Minnesota Department of Health
3. When a hydraulic elevator is removed and hoistway is not reused for elevator equipment, the following apply:
  - a. Elevator equipment shall be made dormant or removed by elevator personnel.
  - b. Elevator borings shall be sealed by a licensed Well Contractor or a licensed Elevator Boring Contractor. Permits for this work are issued by the Well Management Section at the Minnesota Department of Health

~~Prior to a new installation, elevator personnel must remove all elevator related equipment that will not be reused on the new installation. If a hydraulic elevator is to be removed for building demolition, elevator personnel must remove all hydraulic oil in accordance with rules of the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency. A company licensed to seal wells and borings in accordance with the Minnesota Department of Health, parts 4725.3850 and 4725.3875, must seal the boring into the earth and provide proof of the sealing to the authority having jurisdiction.~~

### C. Dumbwaiters.

1. When a dumbwaiter is being replaced, elevator related equipment, that will not be reused on the new installation, shall be removed by elevator personnel.
2. When a dumbwaiter is part of building demolition, the dumbwaiter car and counterweights shall be safely landed at the lowest landing by elevator personnel.
3. When a dumbwaiter is removed and hoistway is not reused for elevator equipment, the elevator shall be made dormant or removed by elevator personnel.
4. If hydraulic, elevator boring rules apply and shall be sealed by a licensed Well Contractor or a licensed Elevator Boring Contractor. Permits for this work are issued by the Well Management Section at the Minnesota Department of Health

~~Prior to new installation, elevator personnel shall remove all dumbwaiter-related equipment that will not be reused on the new installation. If removal of the equipment is part of building demolition or the hoistway is not reused for dumbwaiter equipment, elevator personnel shall remove the equipment from service by safely landing the dumbwaiter and counterweights at the lowest landing.~~

### D. Escalators and moving walks.

1. When an escalator or moving walk is replaced, all escalator or moving walk related equipment that will not be reused on the new installation, shall be removed by elevator personnel.
2. When an escalator or moving walk is part of building demolition, the unit shall be removed from service by elevator personnel by permanently securing the steps and drive chains to prevent unintentional motion of the escalator or moving walk.

~~Prior to a new installation, elevator personnel shall remove all escalator or moving walk-related equipment that will not be reused on the new installation. If removal of the equipment is part of building demolition, elevator personnel shall remove the unit from service by safely removing power and permanently securing the steps and drive chains to prevent unintentional motion of the escalator or moving walk.~~

**E. Dormant elevator, dormant dumbwaiter, or dormant escalator.** A dormant elevator, dormant dumbwaiter, or dormant escalator shall be placed out of service in accordance with ASME A17.1/CSA B44-2016 8.11.1.4. For hydraulic elevators, where applicable, elevator boring shall be sealed by a licensed Well Contractor or a licensed Elevator Boring Contractor. Permits for this work are issued by the Well Management Section at the Minnesota Department of Health.

**F. Temporarily dormant elevator, temporarily dormant dumbwaiter, or temporarily dormant escalator.** A temporarily dormant elevator, temporarily dormant dumbwaiter, or temporarily dormant escalator shall have its power disconnected by removing fuses, where applicable, and placing a seal on the mainline disconnect switch in the "OFF" position. The car shall be parked and the hoistway doors left in the closed and latched position. A wire seal and notification shall be installed on the mainline disconnect switch by an authority having jurisdiction. This installation shall not be used until it has been put in safe running order and is in condition for use. ~~Annual inspections shall continue for the duration of the temporarily dormant status by an authority having jurisdiction.~~ The temporarily dormant status ~~shall be reviewed on an annual basis, and~~ shall not exceed a three-year period. The inspector shall file a report with the supervising authority having jurisdiction describing the current conditions. The wire seal and notification shall not be removed for any purpose without permission from the authority having jurisdiction. When the elevator, dumbwaiter, or escalator has exceeded the three-year temporarily dormant status, the unit shall be made

compliant with this code and returned to service or made dormant. ~~placed out of service according to ASME A17.1/CSA B44-2016 8.11.1.4.~~

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.

NO

### **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.)

The intent of this code change proposal is intended to simplify the language to make it easier to read and understand. This change is editorial and does not propose substantive change.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?

This change is editorial and does not propose substantive change.

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

### **Cost/Benefit Analysis**

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

The proposed change will not affect cost.

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.

The proposed change will not affect cost.

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

The proposed change will not affect cost.

4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.

The proposed change will not affect cost.

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.

The proposed change will not affect cost.

## **Regulatory Analysis**

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

This change is editorial and does not propose substantive 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.

This change is editorial and does not propose substantive change.

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?

This change is editorial and does not propose substantive change.

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.





## CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: James Weaver

Date: 10/2/2024

Email address: james.weaver@state.mn.us

Model Code:

Telephone number: (651) 600-9400

Code or Rule Section: 1307.0092

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: DLI

Topic of proposal: Referenced Standards

Code or rule section to be changed: 1307.0092

Intended for Technical Advisory Group ("TAG"): 1307 Elevator

---

### General Information

**Yes**    **No**

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

### Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
- 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.

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 ~~striketrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.

~~**1307.0092 REFERENCED CODES, STANDARDS, AND SPECIFICATIONS.**~~

~~**Section 9.1 ASME A17.1 referenced documents.** References to NFPA 13-1985 shall be deleted and replaced with references to NFPA 13-2016.~~

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.

NO

**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.)

The reference to NFPA 13 has been corrected in the ASME A17.1-2022 edition. This language is no longer needed.

2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?

The reference to NFPA 13 has been corrected in the ASME A17.1-2022 edition. This language is no longer needed.

3. What other factors should the TAG consider?

**Cost/Benefit Analysis**

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

The deletion will not affect cost and does not propose any substantive change.

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.

The deletion will not affect cost and does not propose any substantive change.

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

The deletion will not affect cost and does not propose any substantive change.

4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.

The deletion will not affect cost and does not propose any substantive change.

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.

The deletion will not affect cost and does not propose any substantive change.

## **Regulatory Analysis**

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

The deletion will not affect cost and does not propose any substantive 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.

NO

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?

The deletion will not affect cost and does not propose any substantive change.

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.



## CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

*Author/requestor:* Ryan Parkos

*Date:* October 1, 2024

*Email address:* r.parkos@local9.com

*Model Code:* A17.1-2022

*Telephone number:* 763-772-6908

*Code or Rule Section:* 2.8.7

*Firm/Association affiliation, if any:*

Elevator Constructors Local 9

*Topic of proposal:*

Not permitting ERRC to be installed in hoist way and machine rooms

*Code or rule section to be changed:*

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

### General Information

**Yes**    **No**

- |  |                                     |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota?                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota?            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement?                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem?  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment?               | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

### Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

- change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).
  
- 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). A17.1-2022 2.8.7
  
- 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.

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 ~~striethrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.
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.  
2.14.1.9.1 (g)

### **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.) Elevator hoist ways and machine rooms are for the trained elevator personnel only, allowing untrained individuals is a safety concern
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution? Adding equipment, antennas, cables and piping will be a hazard to elevator personnel working in those areas
3. What other factors should the TAG consider? There are other ways to achieve this goal.

### **Cost/Benefit Analysis**

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain and provide estimates if possible. It could have a slight increase because of installation.
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.  
The increased cost is/would be offset by safety concerns of elevator personnel.
3. If there is a cost increase, who will bear the costs? This can include government units, businesses, and individuals. Installers of the equipment would bear the cost increase.
4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain. None, would they even inspect this equipment anyway?
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.  
N/A

### **Regulatory Analysis**

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

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. No
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? Safety concerns, modernization concerns, repair concerns, elevator operation concerns from a signal side and physical side.
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 instructions 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.



## CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: David Griefenhagen

Date: 10/02/2024

Email address: dgriefenhagen@iuec.org

Model Code:  
ASME A17.1/CSA B44-2022

Telephone number: 651-246-4732

Code or Rule Section: 2.14.7.1.4

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: IUEC

Topic of proposal: Car top  
Receptacle

Code or rule section to be changed: 2.14.7.1.4

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

---

### General Information

**Yes**    **No**

- |  |                                     |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| A. Is the proposed change unique to the State of Minnesota?                            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Is the proposed change required due to climatic conditions of Minnesota?            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Will the proposed change encourage more uniform enforcement?                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| D. Will the proposed change remedy a problem?  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| E. Does the proposal delete a current Minnesota Rule, chapter amendment?               | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| F. Would this proposed change be appropriate through the ICC code development process? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

### Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

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

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.

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.  
No

3. Provide *specific* language you would like to see changed. Indicate proposed new words with underlining and ~~striethrough~~ words proposed for deletion. Include the entire code (sub) section or rule subpart that contains your proposed changes.  
2.14.7.1.4 Each elevator shall be provided with lighting and a duplex receptacle fixture on the car top for the exclusive use by elevator personnel. The lighting shall be permanently connected, fixed, or portable, or a combination thereof, to provide an illumination level of not less than 100 lx (10 fc) measured at the point of any elevator part or equipment, where maintenance or inspection is to be performed from the car top. All lighting shall be equipped with guards. The light switch shall be accessible from the landing when accessing the car top.
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.  
No

### **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.)  
The current code language does specifically prevent non elevator related devices from utilizing the car top receptacle.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?  
It provides clarity that the car top receptacle is intended to be provided for elevator personnel for use during maintenance, repairs, and replacements.
3. What other factors should the TAG consider?  
If additional outlets or circuits are needed for additional devices such as air purifiers they should remain independent from the "service" receptacle.

### **Cost/Benefit Analysis**

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain and provide estimates if possible.  
No change to a typical installation
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.  
No
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.



No

## **Regulatory Analysis**

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?  
The proposed code change could affect third party vendors.
  
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.  
It is already a requirement to have a car top receptacle. The proposal just adds clarity to an industry assumption.
  
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?  
The consequences are the possible overloading of the circuit or not have the "service" receptacle available when needed by elevator personnel.
  
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.  
I am not aware of any

\*\*\*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.



## CODE CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM

(Must be submitted electronically)

Author/requestor: David Griefenhagen

Date: 10/02/2024

Email address: dgriefenhagen@iuec.org

Model Code: ASME A17.1-2022/CSA B44:22

Telephone number: 651-246-4732

Code or Rule Section: 2.2.3

Firm/Association affiliation, if any: IUEC

Topic of proposal: Guards Between Adjacent Pits

Code or rule section to be changed: 2.2.3.1, 2.2.3.2, and the addition of 2.2.3.3

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

---

### General Information

**Yes**    **No**

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

### Proposed Language

1. The proposed code change is meant to:

change language contained the model code book? If so, list section(s).  
ASME A17.1-2022/CSA B44:22 Section 2.2.3

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.

2. Is this proposed code change required by Minnesota Statute? If so, please provide the citation.

No

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.

~~2.2.3.1 Where there is a difference in level between the floors of adjacent pits, a metal guard, unperforated, or perforated with openings that will reject a ball 50 mm (2 in.) in diameter, shall be installed for separating such pits. Where cars are located adjacent to each other in multiple elevator hoistways, guard(s) shall be provided between adjacent elevator pits. The guard(s) shall be of noncombustible material. The guard(s), if of openwork material, shall reject a ball 50 mm (2 in.) in diameter and be made from material equal to or stronger than 1.110 mm (0.0437 in.) diameter wire. The guard(s) shall be so supported that when subjected to a force of 450 N (100 lbf) applied over an area of 100 mm x 100 mm (4 in. x 4 in.) at any location, the deflection shall not reduce the any running clearances as defined. The Gguard(s) shall extend not less than 2 000 mm (79 in.) above the level of the sill of the lowest hoistway door or the level of the working platform if provided. higher pit floor and a self-closing access door shall be permitted.~~

~~2.2.3.2 Where the difference in level is 600 mm (24 in.) or less, a standard railing conforming to 2.10.2 shall be permitted to be installed in lieu of the guard. Where a separate pit access door is provided (see 2.2.4.5), walkway access opening through the guard of at least 550 mm (22 in) wide by 2000 mm (78 in) high and no greater than 600 mm (24 in) wide by 2030 mm (80 in) high shall be permitted between adjacent pits.~~

~~2.2.3.3 The guards are permitted to be omitted where~~

- ~~(a) the bottom car clearance when resting on a fully compressed buffer to the pit floor, or working platform if provided, is not less than 2 130 mm (84 in.) and~~
- ~~(b) a separate pit access door is provided (see 2.2.4.5) for the multiple hoistway.~~

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.  
I am not sure of the impacts to the MN Building Code

### **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.)  
This change would bring a significant safety enhancement to the elevator industry. There have been multiple deaths and many injuries to elevator personnel that could have been prevented had this safety enhancement been in place.
2. Why is the proposed code change a reasonable solution?  
Administrative controls and control circuitry have not been able to prevent fatalities. This provides an engineered solution.
3. What other factors should the TAG consider?  
This solution has consensus support from the elevator industry and is expected to be added to the 2025 edition of ASME A17.1.

### **Cost/Benefit Analysis**

1. Will the proposed code change increase or decrease costs? Please explain and provide estimates if possible.  
This proposal will increase costs, however it is difficult to quantify because there is no requirement for the type of material that must be used to achieve the separation of adjacent pits.

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.  
This change would bring a significant safety enhancement to the elevator industry. There have been multiple deaths and many injuries to elevator personnel that could have been prevented had this safety enhancement been in place.
3. If there is a cost increase, who will bear the costs? This can include government units, businesses, and individuals.  
The person or business who purchases elevators with adjoining hoistways would bear the costs.
4. Are there any enforcement or compliance cost increases or decreases with the proposed code change? Please explain.  
I don't believe so, the elevator installation already requires an inspection before being placed into service.
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.  
The cost should not exceed \$25,000

### **Regulatory Analysis**

1. What parties or segments of industry are affected by this proposed code change?  
The elevator personnel, installation company, and the inspection authority.
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.  
Alternatives have been discussed within the elevator industry for several years. This is the best consensus solution.
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?  
The costs will be the continued injuries and possible loss of life for not adding engineered protection.
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.