

OKLAHOMA UNIFORM BUILDING CODE COMMISSION

ELECTRICAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRIES BOARD/UNIFORM BUILDING CODE COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM

2401 NW 23RD STREET, SUITE 2F

OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73107

SEPTEMBER 12, 2018 - 1:30 P.M.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

David Adcock, Ross Barrick, Jack Bradley, Steve Nievar (arrived at 1:35 p.m.), James Sorenson, and John Staires

ALTERNATE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Derric Pruitt and Larry Rogers

ALTERNATE COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Samuel Haberman and Anthony Stewart

OTHERS PRESENT:

Kathy Hehny (Staff - OUBCC), Lindsay Heinrichs (Staff-OUBCC)

CALL TO ORDER:

Mr. John Staires called the meeting of the Oklahoma Uniform Building Code Commission (OUBCC), Electrical Technical Committee (ETC) to order at 1:31 p.m. in the Construction Industries Board/Uniform Building Code Commission Board Room at Shepherd Mall, 2401 NW 23rd St., Suite 2F, Oklahoma City, OK 73107.

CONFIRMATION OF ALTERNATES:

Mr. Staires asked Ms. Heinrichs to identify any alternates present and if they would be able to vote. Ms. Heinrichs noted Mr. Derric Pruitt was in attendance but would not have an ability to motion and vote as Mr. Jack Bradley was present. Mr. Larry Rogers was in attendance and would have an ability to motion and vote since Mr. Steve Nievar was absent.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS:

Discussion and possible approval of the August 14, 2018 technical meeting minutes

Mr. Staires stated the first item was the approval of the August 14, 2018 minutes. He gave the committee a few minutes to review the minutes. Mr. Staires noted Mr. Steve Nievar arrived.

MR. DAVID ADCOCK MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. JAMES SORENSON TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 14, 2018 MEETING MINUTES

VOTING AYE: David Adcock
 Ross Barrick
 Jack Bradley
 Steve Nievar
 James Sorenson

VOTING NAY: None

ABSENT: Samuel Haberman
Anthony Stewart

ABSTAIN: John Staires

Discussion and possible action on the review of Chapter One of the 2017 National Electrical Code®

Mr. Staires stated the committee would discuss ETC #2 first, then ETC #1.

Discussion and possible action on ETC SCF#2, Article 110.12 (B) - Integrity of Electrical Equipment and Connections

Mr. Staires stated he authored both of the comment forms in the previous committee. He added there wasn't any language in the 2014 NEC® about the reuse of reconditioned electrical equipment. He noted there was a little bit of information in the 2017 NEC® in Article 110 about reconditioned equipment which required people with reconditioned equipment to put a label on the equipment indicating who reconditioned it. He added the National Electrical Manufacturer's Association (NEMA®) along with Underwriters Laboratories (UL) published a guide for reuse and reconditioning of water damaged electrical equipment and recently published one for the reuse and reconditioning on fire damaged electrical equipment. He noted both guides stated which type of equipment could be reused and reconditioned and which could not. He stated the reason he added the language before was for water damaged switch gears in buildings which was both time consuming and expensive to tear out. He added circuit breakers could not be reconditioned. He noted the problem with the guides was they did not include any code language because the word "shall" was not in them, and could not be enforced.

Discussion and possible action on ETC SCF #1, Article 100, Definitions - Nationally recognized testing laboratory

Mr. Staires stated in the last committee the attorney from the Attorney General's Office requested the definition of "Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory" be inserted in Article 100 because someone outside of the industry would not understand the term. Mr. Staires opened up discussion for the committee over the two comment forms. Mr. Derric Pruitt stated he had received phone calls wondering if they were able to use reconditioned equipment and how they would go about doing it. He added the language was needed. Mr. Staires added in the NEC® there was more information on reconditioning electrical equipment and there was an association which covered the reconditioning of electrical equipment. He stated the association was trying to put a few proposals to submit to the NEC® which would require testing of the equipment. There was discussion on the time it took to order a new part verses a reconditioned part. Mr. Staires stated he would entertain a motion. Mr. James Sorenson asked if the NEMA® references should be added for an informational note. Mr. Barrick stated the committee should table these two comment and Mr. Staires could submit modified comment forms. Mr. Staires asked the committee was there any discussion covering Chapter 1. The committee did not have further discussion covering Chapter 1.

Discussion and possible action on the review of Chapter Two of the 2017 National Electrical Code®

Discussion and possible action on ETC SCF #3, Article 210.19 (A) (4) – Other Loads

Mr. Staires stated the language, which was added to the 2014 NEC® was based on the values given for circuit calculations in Article 220 in the NEC®. The comment was based on 180VA per outlet as given in Article 220 at no more than 80% load on the branch circuit which was what the math worked out to. The committee discussed the mathematics regarding Article 210.19 (A) (4), how the information was in the NEC®, but a person would have to do the mathematics, and the information in the comment form was not needed. Mr. Staires stated he would entertain a motion to strike the added language.

MR. DAVID ADCOCK MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. JAMES SORENSON TO STRIKE THE ADDED LANGUAGE IN SCF# 3

VOTING AYE: David Adcock
Ross Barrick
Jack Bradley
Steve Nievar
James Sorenson
John Staires

VOTING NAY: None

ABSENT: Samuel Haberman
Anthony Stewart

ABSTAIN: None

Mr. Staires asked if the committee had any more discussion covering Chapter 2 of the NEC®. The committee discussed the differences in circuits and voltage for charging stations for electrical cars. Mr. Staires stated he would entertain a motion to approve Chapter 2 of the NEC®.

MR. DAVID ADCOCK MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. STEVE NIEVAR TO APPROVE CHAPTER 2 WITHOUT THE AMENDMENT

VOTING AYE: David Adcock
Ross Barrick
Jack Bradley
Steve Nievar
James Sorenson
John Staires

VOTING NAY: None

ABSENT: Samuel Haberman
Anthony Stewart

ABSTAIN: None

Discussion and possible action on ETC SCF #4, Article 505.7 (A) - Implementation of zone classification system

Discussion and possible action on ETC SCF #5, Article 506.7 (A) - Implementation of zone classification system

Mr. Staires stated he was combining SCF#4 and SCF#5 in one discussion because it was the same language. He added 505.7 dealt with flammable gas and vapors and 506.7 dealt with combustible dust. Mr. Barrick stated he had written both comment forms with a former representative of the NEMA. He added a comment form was brought forward to the NFPA® and was turned down. He stated the definition of a qualified person in NFPA 70 E® was a person who understood how to operate in a safe manner and how it worked, but not how it was designed. He noted the last committee had agreed it should be a registered professional engineer to engineer and design, and select the equipment and wiring methods for classification areas. He noted the change allowed for the installation of the equipment, wiring methods and inspections to be performed by qualified persons. Mr. Staires stated this was referring to hazardous locations and he would have felt more comfortable with a stamped set of plans. There was discussion on how important it was to have an engineer and how the inspector or contactor could rely on the stamped set of plans and the differences between European and American use of Classification “zones” verses classification “divisions”. Mr. Sorenson stated he had been dealing with this for years and even some of the engineers had struggled with the issue and making sure they had the right equipment and the right spaces. Mr. Barrick stated the comment form started in the 2011 NEC®, two code cycles go. Mr. Staires stated the committee hadn’t reviewed Chapter 5, but could motion and vote on the current comment forms.

MR. STEVE NIEVAR MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. DAVID ADCOCK TO APPROVE ETC SCF # 4 ARTICLE 505.7 AND ETC SCF# 5 ARTICLE 506.7

VOTING AYE: David Adcock
Ross Barrick
Jack Bradley
Steve Nievar
James Sorenson
John Staires

VOTING NAY: None

ABSENT: Samuel Haberman
Anthony Stewart

ABSTAIN:

Discussion and possible action on ETC SCF #6, Article 511.2 – Major Repair Garage

Mr. Staires stated the comment form was from the Alternative Fuels Committee and asked Mr. Barrick to discuss the form. Mr. Barrick stated the reason for the modification was from the NFPA® Hydrogen Code because of the open flame and cutting in a repair garage which was not just a spark. Mr. Staires asked if he had a muffler shop would that fall under the definition of a major repair garage. Mr. Barrick stated it would not. Mr. Staires stated he didn’t know how much the committee could change because the comment form was from the Alternative Fuels Committee. Mr. Barrick stated if the committee did not approve it then the comment form would

have to go back to the Alternative Fuels Committee. Mr. Staires stated if the committee did not have any other comments and he would entertain a motion.

MR. DAVID ADCOCK MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. STEVE NIEVAR TO APPROVE ETC SCF # 6 ARTICLE 511.2

VOTING AYE: David Adcock
Ross Barrick
Jack Bradley
Steve Nievar
James Sorenson
John Staires

VOTING NAY: None

ABSENT: Samuel Haberman
Anthony Stewart

ABSTAIN: None

Mr. David Adcock noted the SCF #5 and SCF #6 were backwards, but had the correct sections on the comment forms. Ms. Heinrichs stated the OUBCC staff would correct the numbers.

Discussion and possible action on ETC SCF #7, Article 680.23 (A) (4) Voltage Limitations

Mr. Staires stated he had submitted the comment form during the adoption of the 2014 NEC®. He added it limited the swimming pool lighting to operate at or below the low voltage contact limit as defined in Article 680.2. He added there was so many products on the market that there was no reason to use anything above the low voltage limit. There was discussion on providing safety from electrocutions and the need for lights to be changed to a low voltage light. The committee agreed except for relamping. Mr. Staires asked the committee if the comment form needed extra language stating if the pool light goes bad then the person would need to change to a low voltage light. The committee agreed because if the language was not in there the contactor would put the same light in the pool. Mr. Staires stated he would add some language to the comment form for the next meeting. The item was tabled.

Discussion and possible action on public comment forms received to date, if any:

There were no submitted written public comment forms.

Assignment to review for the October 17, 2018 meeting

Mr. Staires stated he would send the modified comment forms and assigned the committee review to Chapters 3 and 4.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

There was no public comment.

ADJOURNMENT: 2:26 p.m.

MR. DAVID ADCOCK MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. STEVE NIEVAR TO ADJOURN

VOTING AYE: David Adcock
Ross Barrick
Jack Bradley
Steve Nievar
James Sorenson
John Staires

VOTING NAY: None

ABSENT: Samuel Haberman
Anthony Stewart

ABSTAIN: None

Minutes approved in Committee Meeting on the 17th day of October, 2018

JOHN STAIRES

Mr. John Staires, Chairman
Electrical Technical Committee

PREPARED BY: LINDSAY HEINRICHS

Ms. Lindsay Heinrichs, Administrative Assistant
Oklahoma Uniform Building Code Commission

Official Copy: Original with signatures in office file