



# ELECTRICAL CODE UPDATE COMMITTEE MEETING

Minutes for the July 17, 2024 Meeting

---

## MEETING DETAILS

**Date:** July 17, 2024

**Time:** 9:00am

**Location:** Indiana Government Center South, Conference Room C

---

## Member Attendance

---

Name	Present		Means of Participation
	Yes	No	
Stephen Culbert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	In Person
Charlie Eldridge	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	In Person
Randy Gulley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	In Person
John Jackson III	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	In Person
John Lupacchino	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	In Person
Lynn Madden	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	In Person
Paul Meyers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	In Person
Mike Patarino	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	In Person
Michael Popich	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA
Rod West	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	In Person

---

### 1. Call to Order

Director Dyer called the meeting to order at 9:06am.

### 2. Roll Call

Roll call was taken. Mr. Popich was absent. Quorum met.

### 3. Review April Meeting Minutes

Minutes approved with correction: 'Agenda' in heading should read 'Minutes'.

### 4. Review Code Change Proposals

a. **361 – 201.8 – Ground-Fault Circuit-Interrupter Protection for Personnel** – Mr. Meyers asked about the (d) exception and whether a water faucet is distinguishable from a spigot used to connect a washer/dryer. Mr. Patarino asked whether there was potentially better language that could be used to avoid confusion amongst inspectors. Mr. Jackson believes that water faucet is appropriate. Public comment was heard that it would be easier to simply define the 'kitchen' area. Mr. Patarino noted that such a definition would be difficult to utilize from a practical design standpoint with modern design. Additional public comment was had that GFCI protection can be done on a branch circuit or at the breaker level, making the cost impact negligible. Code was changed due to real incidents of electrocutions when servicing appliances and when children play around appliances. Substantial additional discussion was had on definitions of adjacent areas and what is allowed to be on a protected branch circuit under 210. **Motion to Approve with Amendment:** Change 201 to 210. Mr. Eldridge **withdrew** this motion as he realized that it would not include sump pumps and potential other items and noted that the issue of inaccessible GFCI outlets are not allowed by the code, as they must be installed. Ms. Madden moved to **approve** in his stead. Mr. Patarino amended to remove item D. Mr. Meyers asked if Mr. Patarino would be amendable to adding "water source" to the amendment as a final item under 6 and 11. Hand vote taken, **passed** 8-1.

b. **399 – 210.12(B) – Arc-Fault Circuit Interrupter Protection, Dwelling Units (Untimely Submission)** – Ms. Madden's proposal with Mr. Popich's permission. Mr. West noted that these are required under the residential code, and this would take the two codes out of alignment. Given the language in the proposal, it's unclear where the modification would be taking place or what specifically this applies to since the exception seems to override the rule. Some discussion of amending the language was had. Mr. Patarino suggested tabling while new language is explored. Public comment was had that we should be matching the codes to the residential code. Public comment was had that no substantiated fires have occurred on an AFCI circuit and that today's new homes are tomorrow's older homes, so additional protections future-proof against fires. Motion effectively eliminates AFCI protection in dwelling units through the state. **Tabled.**

Committee went to break from 10:35 to 10:45.

c. **265 – 210.12(E) Branch Circuit Wiring Extensions, Modifications, or Replacements** – Tabled.

d. **305 – 215.18(a) – Surge Protection Device** – Withdrawn.

e. **236 – 215.18 (A) (1) – Surge-Protective Device** – Mr. Eldridge noted that requiring surge protection at feeders doesn't make sense to him. Public comment was had that there are four different types of surge protection that range from those built-in to a device to those hardwired to electrical distribution. Mr. Patarino still feels that this should be a business decision on the part of the owner, Mr. Culbert countered that some pieces of equipment are critical and should be protected regardless of owner wishes. Mr. Jackson asked if this aligns with the residential code,

as this seems concerned with property and less with life safety. **Approved.**

f. **306 – 225.42 (A) – Surge Protection Device** – Withdrawn.

g. **237 – 225.42 (A)(1) – Surge-Protective Device** – As 236 but for branch circuits. Removing multifamily fiscal impact as it does not apply to multifamily. **Tabled** 5-4.

h. **307 – 230.67(A) – Surge-Protective Device** – Withdrawn.

i. **239 – 230.67 (A)(1) – Surge-Protective Device** – As before but on service conductors. Fiscal impact is incorrect as it does not apply per unit but per building. Mr. Culbert noted that danger goes up significantly when removing these devices. Withdrawn.

j. **312 – 230.67 (D) – Surge Protection Replacement** – Mr. Eldridge believes that this should be removed as the NEC is an installation code, not a maintenance code. 5-4.

k. **308 – 406.12 – Tamper-Resistant Receptacles** – Mr. West noted that seven children a day are electrocuted by sticking items into receptacles. Mr. Patarino and Ms. Madden believe that the receptacles are harder to use. Several committee members noted that the UL standard for tamper resistant and non-tamper resistant receptacles are the same, and that using non-UL listed receptacles are a different concern. Public comment was noted that plastic plugs, suggested as an alternative, get lost or replaced, which compromises their usefulness as safety devices. Nationally accepted and known risk in every state for relatively minor cost. Motion to approve. Failed 2-7. **Denied** 6-3.

l. **321 – 547.1 – Scope** – **Tabled** until Tyler can review for legality.

m. **324 – 680.26 (B)(1) – Conductive Pool Shells** – **Tabled.**

n. **325 – 680.26 (B)(2) – Perimeter Surfaces** – **Tabled.**

o. **170 – 706.7 (C) – Regulation of Utility Scale Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS)** –  
Change the body of the text to read ‘See Ind. Code 22-14-8.’ Go under 760.1 Scope under  
subsection B. Regulation of Utility Battery Energy Storage Systems.

## 5. Other committee business

No other committee business was brought forward.

## 6. Closing Comments and Adjournment

Next meeting August 21, 2024 at 9:00am in Conference Rooms 4&5.