

IEEE SA SCC18

Time: 1:00 pm ET/12:00 pm CT/11:00 am MT/10:00 am PT

Attendance:

[illegible]

IEEE SA SCC18
Public Input Open Forum Meeting Minutes - November 07, 2017

Agenda:

- a) Call to order, Chair's remarks
 - 1:03
 - The intent is to solicit additional input to the NFPA/NEC process for SCC18. That is to expand the participation of IEEE members into the input of positions for the NEC. Over 3500 Public Inputs to the NEC. For those panels that IEEE has an External Representative, the Committee will be expected to develop a position for any First Revisions in March 2018.
- b) Approval of agenda
 - Paul Myers moved for approval of the agenda
 - Chad Jones seconded
 - Motion Approved
- c) Public Inputs submitted for discussion
 - None submitted
 - Request for PIs to be reviewed went from the Chair to several individuals.
 - One attendee has a list but did not submit it yet to the Chair. This will be reviewed at the next meeting.
- d) External Representative updates
 - The following notes are not separated by speaker. As comments were presented they were captured as best as possible. The individual ERs will use this input to assist in representing IEEE on individual PIs.
 - Paul Myers CMP-8
 - i. 3484 - For busways that are not manufactured any more there are shops that can produce a piece - requirement for listing would complicate this. Proposals from UL tend to get favorable response. Perhaps add a point for new busways to allow for maintenance of older systems. Perhaps add a cut in date so that it is not just suddenly turned on. Also, voltage levels might be a good idea. 600 Volts and below since UL standard is only up to 600 V. Perhaps contact other bus manufacturers for their opinions. C37.23 is 1000 Volts up to 38 kV.
 - ii. 4090, 4092 - Needs to be a documented hazard or problem that we are addressing. Would want to know from people in the industry that there is an issue to actually be addressed here. If no real issue would not support.
 - iii. Other thoughts
 - 1. UL tends to drive toward listing without any qualifications for what value we get from that.

IEEE SA SCC18

Public Input Open Forum Meeting Minutes - November 07, 2017

2. How do we keep positions that are not necessarily based on good science (more on economics) from becoming enshrined in the Code? IEEE is one voice and can express concern over positions that have technical flaws. However, in the end, it is a panel of multiple opinions and the vote will determine the outcome.
- Kurt Clemente CMP-18
 - i. 2150 – Attempt to add a definition of high efficacy. High efficacy luminaires have had LEDs driving that process. If we define High Efficacy as 60 lumens per watt does that wind up in the building code and mean that a luminaire of 59 lumens per watt. Slippery Slope. Does this really belong in the NEC? More of ASHRAE / Energy Code. If there is no need for the definition in the NEC (i.e. – the term is used for Code language) it does NOT need to be included.
 - ii. 2718 – Came up in the 2017 code cycle. To ensure that 50% of receptacles are controlled similarly to controlled lighting. Highly despised idea. Trying to develop a way to indicate to individuals that controlled receptacles will turn off when the room is unoccupied. Using a symbol with the word “CONTROLLED”. One attendee’s company recently revamped a building and now has these in the building and the information does change depending on the orientation of the receptacle (ground up vs. ground down). The symbol is good, but the word might be upside down. One thought was that one would want this on the cover plate but there is resistance from the inspectors group. Another attendee’s company has been installing and has done the control via a timeclock as opposed to an occupancy sensor. Concerns about safety as individuals avoid use of the controlled units and use power strips to expand the uncontrolled receptacles.
 - iii. 1720 – height of luminaires in closets. Large walk-in closets and the owners want chandeliers but that would violate 410. So, owners are installing surface mount luminaires for inspection and then installing different luminaires in apparent violation of 410. Large walk-ins are different from what was originally envisioned and don’t normally have clothes in close proximity to luminaires. Thus, the intent is to allow different luminaires to meet the code requirement. There appears to be little support for this as the luminaire is a heat source that should be kept away from the flammable materials. Worry that while clothes might not be in proximity to the luminaire now, future changes in use could cause problems.
 - iv. 1066 – Systems furniture. Pre-wired furniture systems. Code currently permits the use of multiple circuits (could even be from different panels) such that one circuit could trip due to overload with other circuits still energized. The PI asks for use of a three-pole circuit so that all trip. One comment was that perhaps three single pole breakers with a handle tie would be more appropriate. If there is the potential for this to originate

IEEE SA SCC18
Public Input Open Forum Meeting Minutes - November 07, 2017

from different panelboards, should reject shared neutrals. One comment - would prefer that NO circuits have shared neutrals. Problem is that the electricians in the field are sharing neutrals. The multi-wire branch circuits need reviewed.

e) Next meeting--date and location

- November 21 at 1:00 – 3:00 Eastern
- ERs from CMPs 7, 13, 16, 6 have committed to be in attendance.
- Discuss items to be submitted by one of today's attendees

f) Adjourn

- 2:21