

INDIANA ELECTRICAL CODE UPDATE COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Details

Date: July 27, 2022

Time: 9:00 AM

Location: Government Center South, Conference Room 29

Member Attendance

Name	Present		Means of Participation
	Yes	No	
Michael Popich	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	In Person
Paul Meyers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	In Person
John Luppacchino	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	In Person
Tim McClintock	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	In Person
John A. Jackson III	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	In Person
Stephen Culbert	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	In Person
Mike Patarino	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	In Person
Lynn Madden	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	In Person
Randy Gulley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	In Person
Charlie Eldridge	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	In Person

Notes

Additional information may be available at the [Committee's Web Page](#).

Also in attendance:

Dustin Dyer, Director of Boards and Commissions, IDHS

1. **Call to Order** – Chairman Popich called the meeting to order at 9:12am.
2. **Roll Call and Determination of Quorum** – All were present. Quorum was met. See attendance record above.
3. **Review Code Change Proposals for Chapters 2 and 3**
 - i. **210.8 (F) Exception** – Proposal was **tabled** along with the next proposal to allow for further discussion.
 - ii. **210.8(F) – Outdoor Outlets** – This proposal was submitted timely but accidentally left off of the agenda. As there is another competing proposal on the agenda, the

Chair accepted discussion of this proposal, as individuals were informed of a competing proposal and could have been present to discuss it. Mr. Meyers informed the Committee that this section of the code was added in relation to deaths related to outdoor appliances such as air conditioning. Mr. McClintock noted that there were 29 deaths associated with air conditioning in datasets compiled by the USCPSC for the years 2016-2020. These electrocution incidents involved both persons servicing the AC units and by consumers/building occupants. Mr. Meyers wanted to be clear that there is a difference between ‘outlet’ and ‘receptacle’ and noted that the Committee should be clear on usage. Mr. Patarino asked if there was a breakdown between residents and persons working on the unit, as a person working on the unit presumably has a higher risk than a general member of the public by virtue of being more exposed to potentially hazardous equipment. Ms. Madden asked if there was any data on why the units became improperly energized, as improperly wired GFCI or grounding could cause improper energization. Mr. Eldridge challenged that assertion, stating that the GFCI would still work even if improperly grounded. Mr. Iverson, a member of the public, noted that engineering teams being sent out after this model code change have found numerous issues with units with power conversion units, but single stage units see less issues. He believes that the industry needs more time to rectify the issue without exempting single-stage units. Mr. Eldridge suggested tabling this proposal to bring back a new suggested code change to address some of the current issues. Mr. Popich asked what else is going to be included in the exemption other than HVAC equipment. Mr. Jackson suggested hot tubs, pool heaters, EV chargers. Mr. Lupacchino noted that GFCI protection for those items are in other parts of the Code. Mr. Meyers countered that the code change panels are working to move all GFCI language to 210.8(F), and Mr. Popich noted that the other areas refer back to 210.8(F). Proposal was **tabled** 6-4 to allow further discussion.

- iii. **210.52(c)(2) Island and Peninsular Countertops and Work Surfaces** – Mr. Patarino believes that this should not be a code requirement, but should be a market decision. Mr. Popich noted that the fiscal impact seems low, as it’s currently required. Mr. Meyers noted that, as written, it would leave the Indiana Code with two sections called 210.52(C)(3). Mr. Jackson expressed concern about reducing the number of required outlets. Mr. Dyer noted that there are only two more scheduled meetings for the Code Committee. Mr. Popich noted that additional meetings may be necessary. Mr. Eldridge noted that a viable alternative may be to copy the language from the 2008 NEC. Mr. Dyer reminded the Committee that, per the adopted bylaws and agenda, the submission time for new proposals for Chapter 2 are well outside the time limit. Motion to **table** was voted on. Vote was 5-5, no action taken as no majority vote. Ms. Madden **withdrew** this proposal.
- iv. **210.52(I) Dwelling Unit Receptacle Outlets – Foyers** – Mr. Eldridge noted that the 1.2m and 9.8 sq m language should be included for metric. Ms. Madden said she did not believe that there would be any fiscal impact as the language is already included in the 2020 Indiana Building Code Amendments, but Mr. Meyers noted that it would need to be compared to the NEC, not the Indiana Building Code. Mr. Popich noted that the new language is not included in the current proposal. Ms. Madden believes that there would probably be a difference of one receptacle. Mr. Lupachhino believes that the impact would be minimal. Mr. Gaylor noted that it would cost

about \$50 an opening, \$100 per home for half the homes, for a total of \$1,088,900 in savings. Metric numbers: 100 sq ft = 9.3 sq meters, 4ft = 1.2 meters. Proposal was **approved as amended** 10-0.

- v. **362.10 – Uses Permitted** – Proposal failed for lack of a second.
- vi. **362.12 – Uses Not Permitted** – Mr. Eldridge withdrew his proposal.
- vii. **406.2 – Definitions** – Mr. Meyers noted that as written the model code would have a conflict with the definition in Indiana Code. Mr. Popich indicated he was not sure what the licensing requirements were in Indiana for home-based child care, and did not want to run afoul of state statute. Mr. Popich noted that he wanted legal to weigh in on the language in the **model code** (not the proposal) to ensure that it does not conflict with statute. Proposal was **tabled** by a vote of 10-0.
- viii. **406.4(D)(4) -- Arc-Fault Circuit-Interrupter Protection** – Proposal withdrawn by proponent.
- ix. **406.4(D)(5) -- Replacements of Temper-Resistant Receptacles** – Proposal withdrawn.
- x. **406.12 -- Tamper-Resistant Receptacles** – Currently in the 2009 Indiana Electric Code. Mr. Patarino noted that, should the motion fail, it would include a fiscal impact of \$1,424,500 just for multifamily. Mr. Lupacchino and Ms. Madden noted that senior citizens sometimes have trouble plugging devices into tamper-proof plugs. Mr. McClintock noted he was opposed to the motion, and cited a 10-year study done by the USCPSC showing 24,000+ children under 10 years old were treated in emergency rooms for incidents related to electrical receptacles and acknowledged that while there are other products available on the market like protective caps, a study done by Temple University found that 100% of all 2-4 year olds were able to remove the plastic outlet cap within 10 seconds. Mr. Eldridge added that the Residential Code allows for the deletion of TR receptacles, and that the codes should read the same. Mr. Jackson noted that the residential code applies to single-family dwellings, but the NEC applies to more types of residences. Ms. Madden indicated that she believed the fiscal impact would be \$2,858,362. A member of the public indicated that he could not see how the numbers were being generated for the fiscal impact. Vote to call the question passed 10-0. Proposal **fails** 4-6.
- xi. **422.5(A)(7) – GFCI Protection** – Mr. Patarino notes that this omits dishwashers from the list of GFCI outlet requirements, as previously discussed. Mr. McClintock noted that water lines are run to dishwashers regardless of their location to the sink, and that there are electrocutions associated with dishwashers. Ms. Madden asked if there was data concerning the root cause of energization. Mr. McClintock noted that when the change was made, it was concerning end of life for the appliance which becomes more of a risk factor over time due to wear and chemical corrosion. Proposal **failed** 4-6.
- xii. **422.5(B) – (No Title Present on Submission)** – Mr. Meyers noted that there have

been several electrocutions due to non-GFCI protected sump pumps. Mr. Eldridge noted that this should be Informational Note #2 under Dishwashers, which is where Sump Pumps are located. Mr. Popich suggested moving the note under 422.5(a) under the original Informational Note, and calling the Original #1, with this one being #2. Proposal **approved as amended** 10-0.

xiii. **422.23 – Other Installation Methods** – Proposal approved 8-0.

xiv. **424.10 – Fixed Electric Space-Heating Equipment** – Proposal approved 8-0.

xv. **425.8 – General** – Proposal approved 9-0.

xvi. **425.10 – Fixed Resistance and Electrode Industrial Process Heating Equipment** – Proposal approved 9-0.

xvii. **426.14 – Fixed Outdoor Electric Deicing and Snow-Melting Equipment** – Proposal approved 10-0.

xviii. **430.22(E) – Single Motor** – Proposal passes 10-0.

4. **Other Committee Business**

i. **June Minutes** – Committee approved the minutes as amended by a vote of 10-0.

5. **Next Meeting – August 31, 2022 at 9:00am.** 302 W. Washington, Indianapolis, IN 46204. Government Center South, Conference Room 29.

Public notice and virtual/electronic meeting access details will be provided on the [Committee's Web Page](#) in advance of the meeting.

6. **Closing Comments and Adjournment** – Mr. Popich wondered whether it would be good to move the meeting to MADE @ Plainfield. Mr. Dyer indicated that the Committee meetings are small enough that we should continue to meet at the Government Center due to the greater availability of rooms. Mr. Popich indicated that the room should be reserved for potential October, November, and December meetings. Meeting adjourned at 11:40am.