

OUBCC Electrical Technical Committee

Accepted Public Comment Forms

The following sections were submitted on public comment forms and after deliberation were approved for inclusion in the 2009 IRC.

Section E3402.2 submitted by Ron Deaton regarding an incorrect reference of another section in the code. Section E3402.2 references section R317.3 and the correct reference section should be R302.4.1

Motion to accept PCF submitted by Ron Deaton by Hawkins. 2nd by Norman

Motion passes 7-0

E3402.2 Penetrations of fire-resistance-rated assemblies.

Electrical installations in hollow spaces, vertical shafts and ventilation or air-handling ducts shall be made so that the possible spread of fire or products of combustion will not be substantially increased. Electrical penetrations through fire-resistant-rated walls, partitions, floors or ceilings shall be protected by approved methods to maintain the fire-resistance rating of the element penetrated. Penetrations of fire-resistance-rated walls shall be limited as specified in Section ~~R317.3.~~ R302.4.1

Commentary: This was necessary to correct an editing oversight in the code.

Section 3403.3 submitted by John Staires regarding listing and labeling. John indicated that there is no requirement in the NEC that all electrical materials are to be listed. He is requesting that "in accordance with NFPA 70" be inserted into the text of the section.

Motion to **accept** PCF submitted by John Staires by Ridgell. 2nd by Walker

Motion passes 5-0

E3403.3 Listing and Labeling. Electrical materials, components, devices, fixtures and equipment shall be listed for the application in accordance with NFPA 70, shall bear the label of an approved agency and shall be installed, and used, or both, in accordance with the manufacturer's installation instructions.

Commentary: It was the consensus of the committee that the NEC does not require all materials utilized in an electrical installation to be listed and as such made this section more stringent than the National Electrical Code. The NEC allows alternate methods for approval.

Justification: 2008 NFPA 70: 90.4 and 90.7 "Definitions", and 110.2 and 110.2 Fine Print Note (FPN) "Approval".

Section E4002.14 submitted by John Staires regarding tamper resistant receptacles. John requested that this section be amended to reflect the new language in the 2011 NEC. Motion to **accept** PCF submitted by John Staires by Hawkins. 2nd by Norman
Motion passes 5-0

E4002.14 Tamper- resistant receptacles. In areas specified in Section E3901.1, 125-volt, 15- and 20-ampere receptacles shall be listed tamper-resistant receptacles.

Exception: Receptacles in the following locations shall not be required to be tamper-resistant:

- (1) Receptacles located more than 1.7m (5 1/2 ft) above the floor.
- (2) Receptacles that are part of a luminaire or appliance.
- (3) A single receptacle or a duplex receptacle for two appliances located within dedicated space for each appliance that, in normal use, is not easily moved from one place to another and that is cord-and-plug connected.
- (4) Non-grounding receptacles used for replacement.

Commentary: Review of the 2011 NEC revealed that the requirement for Tamper Resistant receptacles had been amended after three (3) years of applying the 2008 NEC requirements. The 2011 NEC amendments to Tamper Resistant receptacles are less stringent than the 2008 NEC by the addition of the exceptions, and the committee agreed that it is a more practical approach. Public comment forms that were officially received but not reviewed due to incomplete submittal formatting, thus ultimately not taken into consideration; were in opposition to any requirement of tamper resistant receptacles. The committee recognizes that Tamper Resistant receptacles are necessary for safety to children. It was the consensus of the committee that deviating from the requirements of the NEC would only create confusion among qualified electrical personnel due to conflicting code documents (2008 NEC vs. 2011 NEC).

Justification: 2008 NFPA 70: 406.11 compared to 2011 NFPA 70: 406.12 and 406.12 Exceptions.

OUBCC Electrical Technical Committee

The following appendices were deliberated and were accepted in their entirety in the 2009 IRC.

(The provisions contained in these appendices are not mandatory unless specifically referenced in the adopting ordinance of each independent jurisdiction)

Appendix E

Motion to accept by Ridgell. 2nd by Walker

Motion passes 5-0

Appendix G

Motion to accept by Norman. 2nd by Ridgell

Motion passes 5-0

Appendix J

Motion to accept by Hawkins. 2nd by Norman

Motion passes 5-0

Appendix K

Motion to accept by Ridgell. 2nd by Norman

Motion passes 5-0

Appendix M

Motion to accept by Walker. 2nd by Ridgell

Motion passes 5-0

Appendix Q

Motion to accept by Hawkins. 2nd by Norman

Motion passes 5-0

*Commentary: The committee recognizes and accepts the wording of the aforementioned Appendices and their placement location in the 2009 IRC as printed. In keeping with the intent of the 2008 NFPA 70, the committee's recognition of the 2009 IRC Appendices is only to allow jurisdictions to adopt the Appendices on the local level as needed. It is **not** the committee's recommendation to adopt the appendices as requirements in the Oklahoma IRC.*

Justification: Header Notes to 2008 NFPA 70 Annex A through Annex H, which states: "Annex ___ is not a part of the requirements of this NFPA document and is included for informational purposes only". Annex H also states that it: "is informative unless specifically adopted by the local jurisdiction adopting the NEC".

OUBCC Electrical Technical Committee

Denied Public Comment Forms

The following sections were submitted on public comment forms and after deliberation were denied for inclusion in the 2009 IRC.

Section E3601.6.2 submitted by Patrick Copeland regarding service disconnect location. Patrick is requesting that additional text be added establishing a clear guideline for the location of service disconnect.

Motion to **deny** PCF by Patrick Copeland by Ridgell. 2nd by Norman
Motion passes 5-0

Commentary: This request was to place specific guidelines for the location of the service disconnect to not exceed 24 inches horizontally and 60 inches vertically. It was the consensus of the committee that this requirement would be too restrictive given the intangibles that can be encountered in the field.

Justification: 2008 NFPA 70: 230.70 "Service Equipment Disconnecting Means" and 404.8 "Switches".

Section E3609.3 submitted by John Staires regarding bonding for other systems. John's concern was that even if the electrical code required the bonding that there are no requirements for other trades to utilize that bond.

Ross requested a motion to accept the requested change. No motion was made and the request failed for lack of a motion.

Commentary: This request indicated that there is no requirement for other service providers such as phone, CATV, satellite, etc., to attach to an intersystem bonding fitting and that to require it was no guarantee that it would be utilized. Currently those service providers bond to the grounding electrode, service mast, meter cans, or service panel to establish ground. The concern of the committee was that conversely there is no requirement for electricians to reattach those multiple ground conductors installed by other service providers when affecting a repair or replacement of electrical service equipment and that installing an intersystem bonding fitting would eliminate multiple grounding points and reduce the loss of ground to other services.

Justification: 2008 NFPA 70: 250.94 "Bonding For Other Systems".

Section E3702.3 submitted by Patrick Copeland regarding fifteen and 20 ampere branch circuits. Patrick is requesting that additional text be added for a more practical approach to ensure circuits do not exceed 80% of the circuit rating.

Motion to **deny** PCF by Patrick Copeland by Ridgell. 2nd by Hawkins

Motion passes 5-0

Commentary: It was the consensus of the committee that this request created unnecessary redundancy in the code and that a qualified electrician has the ability to calculate the circuit load under the current requirement. It was further reinforced by the committee that any "unqualified" person not having the ability to properly calculate the loads shall contact a qualified electrician.

Justification: 2008 NFPA 70: 210.3 "Branch Circuit Ratings-Circuits" and 210 -II "Branch Circuit Ratings-Conductors".

Section E3706.3 submitted by John Staires regarding panelboard overcurrent protection. John requested that section E3601.7 be added as a reference section and "not used as service equipment" be added to the section.

Motion to **deny** PCF submitted by John Staires by Hawkins. 2nd by Ridgell

Motion passes 5-0

Commentary: A conflict existed in the NEC prior to the 2008 edition when a lighting or appliance panelboard was used as service equipment. Section 408.36 of the NEC required a main breaker in, or ahead of, a lighting or appliance panelboard, while section 230.71 of the NEC allowed up to six service disconnects in a single enclosure with no main breaker. There is a concern that in a small residential structure that only has six circuits or less, that under the NEC it would not require a main breaker be installed. Section E3601.6 requires a means of disconnect from service conductors and Section E3601.7 limits the maximum number of service disconnecting means to not more than six switches or circuit breakers in a single enclosure. The committee was concerned in allowing a panelboard with no means of disconnect other than pulling the meter or cutting the service wires in the event of a fire or other catastrophe.

Justification: 2008 NFPA 70: 230 – VI "Service Disconnecting Means".

Section E3802.7 submitted by John Staires regarding raceways in wet locations above grade. The code would not allow for NM cable to be used in a wet location but there is not documented failure of NM cable due to installation outdoors.

Motion to **deny** PCF by John Staires by Ridgell. 2nd by Walker

Motion passes 7-0

Commentary: NM cable contains conductors in a paper wrapping and when installed in a wet location has the ability to wick moisture into the outer sheathing. That moisture has the ability to create mold and bacteria inside the outer sheathing that can lead to the deterioration of the insulation of the conductors and result in a failure. It was also noted that the NEC does not recognize NM cable as listed or approved in a wet location and would therefore be in direct conflict with Johns request to amend section E3403.3 inserting "in accordance with NFPA 70", which was approved by this committee. The NEC recognizes that not only the exterior of the exposed raceway is considered a wet location, but the interior of the raceway is also considered a wet location.

Justification: 2008 NFPA 70: 334.12 "Non Metallic Sheathed Cable—Uses Not Permitted".

Section E3902.3 submitted by Patrick Copeland regarding outdoor receptacles. Patrick is requesting that additional text be added to the exception for receptacles above 7 feet used for holiday lighting.

Motion to **deny** PCF by Patrick Copeland by Hawkins. 2nd by Norman

Motion passes 5-0

Commentary: This request was to exempt outdoor receptacles from GFCI requirements if provided above 7 feet in height. It was the consensus of the committee that these receptacles presented an excessive risk to the user given they are outdoor, located in a damp or wet location, and susceptible to use in wet weather.

Justification: 2008 NFPA 70: 210.8(a) (3) "Branch Circuits-GFCI Protection".

Section E3902.7 submitted by Patrick Copeland regarding laundry, utility, and bar sink receptacles. Patrick is requesting additional text be added establishing more specific language for corded appliances.

Motion to **deny** PCF by Patrick Copeland by Hawkins. 2nd by Ridgell
Motion passes 5-0

Commentary: This request was to exempt GFCI receptacles for corded appliances that are not readily movable and are within 6 feet of a wet location. The committee determined this would create a direct conflict with the NEC and would be confusing to electricians having contradictory code requirements.

Justification: 2008 NFPA 70: 210.8(a) (7) "Branch Circuits – GFCI Protection".

Section E4206.5.1 submitted by Patrick Copeland regarding servicing. Patrick is requesting additional text be added establishing a guideline for locating wet-niche luminaries.

Motion to **deny** PCF submitted by Patrick Copeland by Ridgell. 2nd by Norman
Motion passes 5-0

Commentary: This request was to place a specific restriction on the location of wet-niche luminaries in pools. Currently the code states that the luminaries shall be removable from the water for inspection or maintenance and that the cord allow the shell to be placed on the deck for such and that it shall not require entering or going into the pool water. The committee consensus was that adding a specific length of 24 inches to the bottom of the luminary from the deck was too restrictive, and the proposed length could present the potential for the person performing work or maintenance on the luminaire to fall into the pool.

Justification: 2008 NFPA 70: 680.23 "Underwater Luminaires".