

Minutes
Electrical Power Working Group Teleconference Meeting
Wednesday, 22 September 2010
Noon to 14:00 EDT

Presiding chairman:

Mitch Hefter; Entertainment Technology (Royal Philips Electronics), representing USITT; P; U

Recording secretary: Karl G. Ruling; ESTA

Members attending:

William Drake; Marinco (Actuant Corporation); A; MP
George Long; Aggreko Event Services (Aggreko); P; DR
Elizabeth E. (Lizz) Pittsley; I; U
Ed Garstkiewicz; Harting Inc., North America (Harting KGAA); A; G
Edwin S. Kramer; I.A.T.S.E. Local 1; P; U [In attendance from 13:00 to 13:30]
Roger Lattin; I.A.T.S.E. Local 728; P; U
Ken Vannice; Leviton Manufacturing Co., Inc.; P; MP
Tyrone Mellon Jr.; Lex Products Corp.; A; CP
Louis Bradfield; I; U
W. G. Krokaugger, P. E.; Mole-Richardson Co.; P; CP
Vincent J. Cannavale; Motion Laboratories; P; CP
Jerry Gorrell; Theatre Safety Programs; P; U

Visitors: None

1 Opening remarks

Mitch Hefter called the meeting to order at 12:05.

2 Attendance and membership

2.1 Introduction of those present and taking attendance

2.2 Determination of quorum

A roll call was read, and 12 members were found to be present. Hefter announced that we have a quorum. (Eddie Kramer phoned in later, making the count 13 for a while, but had to leave to return to work before the meeting concluded.)

2.3 Recognition of alternate voting members

There were no cases of two members for one voting entity being on line. Nevertheless, Hefter reminded those on the conference call that only there is only one vote per company or organization.

2.4 Requirements for membership

Mitch Hefter reminded those on the call of the requirements for membership:

"Membership is open to all who are affected by the work of the group. Voters who would be in the designer or dealer/rental company interest category in particular are encouraged to become members. Voting members are required to attend meetings and to vote on letter ballots. Voting members and their alternates may not miss three consecutive meetings or three consecutive letter ballots without a loss of voting status."

2.5 Changes to observer status

Members who have missed the previous two meetings and who will not have met the minimum attendance requirement for voters if this meeting is missed:

None

2.6 Processing of new membership requests

Kevin O'Brien; Bestek Lighting & Staging; Observer; User
(See KevinO'BrienApplication.pdf)

Roger Lattin moved that O'Brien's application be accepted. The motion was seconded and then approved by a unanimous voice vote.

2.7 Consensus body

The full consensus body, including those not present, was:

Name	Company	Representing	Voting status	Int. cat.
James Davey	AC Power Distribution Inc.	AC Power Distribution Inc.	P	CP
Greg Mayberry	AC Power Distribution Inc.	AC Power Distribution Inc.	A	CP
Jeff deRecat	Marinco	Actuant Corporation	P	MP
William Drake	Marinco	Actuant Corporation	A	MP
George Long	Aggreko Event Services	Aggreko	P	DR
Wendy Holt	AMPTP/CSATF	Alliance of Motion Picture and Television Producers	P	G
Nathan Leonard	Bender Group	Bender GmbH & Co. KG	P	MP
Joe Boardman	Bender Inc.	Bender GmbH & Co. KG	A	MP
Torsten Gruhn	Bender Inc.	Bender GmbH & Co. KG	A	MP
Steve Terry	Electronic Theatre Controls	Electronic Theatre Controls, Inc.	P	MP
Elizabeth E. (Lizz) Pittsley	Elizabeth Pittsley	Elizabeth Pittsley	I	U
Ian Foulds	IATSE Local 873	Entertainment Electrical Safety Committee of Ontario	P	G
Art Wanuch	Entertainment Electrical Safety Committee of Ontario	Entertainment Electrical Safety Committee of Ontario	A	G
Jody Williquette	Harting Inc., North America	Harting KGAA	P	G
Ed Garstkiewicz	Harting Inc., North America	Harting KGAA	A	G
Edwin S. Kramer	I.A.T.S.E. Local 1	I.A.T.S.E. Local 1	P	U
Roger Lattin	I.A.T.S.E. Local 728	I.A.T.S.E. Local 728	P	U
R. Bruce Prochal	IATSE Local 728	I.A.T.S.E. Local 728	A	U
Patric J. Abaravich	I.A.T.S.E. Local 728	I.A.T.S.E. Local 728	A	U
Alan M. Rowe	IATSE Local 728	I.A.T.S.E. Local 728	A	U
Ken Vannice	Leviton Manufacturing Co., Inc.	Leviton Manufacturing Co., Inc.	P	MP
Bill Grande	Leviton Manufacturing Co., Inc.	Leviton Manufacturing Co., Inc.	A	MP
Bob Luther	Lex Products Corp.	Lex Products Corp.	P	CP
Tyrone Mellon_Jr.	Lex Products Corp.	Lex Products Corp.	A	CP
Sean Sloat	Lex Products Corp.	Lex Products Corp.	A	CP
Louis Bradfield	Louis Bradfield	Louis Bradfield	I	U
W. G. Krokaugger, P. E.	Mole-Richardson Co.	Mole-Richardson Co.	P	CP
Alex Yoon	Mole-Richardson Co.	Mole-Richardson Co.	A	CP
Vincent J. Cannavale	Motion Laboratories	Motion Laboratories	P	CP
Peter Herrmann	Motion Laboratories	Motion Laboratories	A	CP
David Herrmann	Motion Laboratories	Motion Laboratories	A	CP
Ron Bonner	PLASA	PLASA	P	U
Michael Lay	Philips Strand Lighting	Royal Philips Electronics	P	MP
Michael Scudday	SSRC, Inc.	SSRC, Inc.	P	CP
Jerry Gorrell	Theatre Safety Programs	Theatre Safety Programs	P	U

Name	Company	Representing	Voting status	Int. cat.
Mitch Hefter	Entertainment Technology (Royal Philips Electronics)	USITT	P	U
		Total votes	21	
		Votes by interest categories	5	CP
			5	MP
			1	DR
			7	U
			3	G
			0	DE

3 Approval of the minutes from the previous meeting

See the draft minutes of the Friday, 23 July 2010 minutes, EPmin07-2010.pdf

Roger Lattin moved that the draft minutes of the previous meeting be accepted. The motion was seconded. The motion was approved with one abstention, and the rest "Yes."

4 Reading of the call for patents

Hefter read the following statement aloud to the meeting participants:

"ESTA intends not to publish any standard that contains protected intellectual property, unless that information can be licensed by anyone for a reasonable fee. ESTA uses a process of open patent and copyright disclosures to implement its intent. ESTA does not conduct patent or copyright searches and does not warrant that its standards contain no protected intellectual property.

"In keeping with the open disclosures policy, I ask if anyone present wishes to notify this working group of the existence of a patent or copyright or other intellectual property that might protect material in a standard being developed by this working group. You need not be the holder of the patent or copyright to notify this working group of its existence."

No notifications were offered.

5 Reading of the anti-trust statement

Hefter read the following statement aloud to the meeting participants:

"The ESTA Board of Directors, the Technical Standards Committee, and the leadership of this working group will reject or nullify any actions that unlawfully restrain trade. Anyone who feels that such an action is being or has been taken is requested to bring that matter to the attention of the chair immediately. Anyone who feels that actions in restraint of trade have been taken and not properly annulled is requested to notify the TSC chair or ESTA president immediately.

"ESTA legal counsel has informed us that violations of the anti-trust laws can have serious consequences. Individuals engaged in certain unlawful conduct can be found criminally liable. An individual convicted of a criminal violation of the Sherman Act may be fined as much as \$1,000,000 and imprisoned for up to ten years. An easy to read pamphlet describing restraint of trade issues is available from the Technical Standards Manager."

No restraint of trade issues were brought to the attention of the assembly.

6 Approval of agenda

Roger Lattin moved that the draft agenda be approved. The motion was seconded and then approved with a unanimous voice vote.

7 Old business — Continued work resolving votes on the comment resolutions for BSR E1.18 portable feeder cable selection and use

Work continued on considering the votes on the comment resolutions for which there were comments or reasons offered. During the two hour meeting, work was completed on document E1-18-1NonYes42thru72.doc. The results of that work are appended to the PDF version of these minutes. Votes

were taken by voice. Abstentions or disagreements were solicited, with the understanding that dissenters must speak up to assure that the votes would establish the required supermajority support or lack of it.

Work on the other documents—E1-18-1NonYes73thru128.doc, E1-18-1NonYes129thru155.doc, E1-18-1NonYes156thru190.doc, and E1-18-1NonYes191thru226.doc—will be covered in subsequent meetings.

8 Schedule for future meetings

Hefter announced that the next two meetings are teleconference meetings scheduled for 29 September 2010, noon to 14:00 EDT; and 1 October 2010 noon to 14:00 EDT.

The consensus was that these next two meetings will be one meeting, with a recess of two days.

The next face-to-face working group meeting is scheduled for Friday 22 October 2010, from 19:00 to 23:00, at the Las Vegas Hilton hotel.

9 Adjournment

Jerry Gorrell moved that the meeting adjourn. The motion was seconded. Hearing no objections, Mitch Hefter declared the meeting adjourned at 14:05.

Working Group Membership and Contact Information as of 23 September 2010

Name	Company	Representing	Voting status	Int. cat.
James Davey	AC Power Distribution Inc.	AC Power Distribution Inc.	P	CP
Greg Mayberry	AC Power Distribution Inc.	AC Power Distribution Inc.	A	CP
Jeff deRecat	Marinco	Actuant Corporation	P	MP
William Drake	Marinco	Actuant Corporation	A	MP
George Long	Aggreko Event Services	Aggreko	P	DR
Kenny Delahoussaye	Aggreko	Aggreko	O	DR
Richard L. Eberth_Jr.	North Shore Safety	Airpax Corporation	O	MP
Wendy Holt	AMPTP/CSATF	Alliance of Motion Picture and Television Producers	P	G
Mike Skinner	CBS Studio Center	Alliance of Motion Picture and Television Producers	O	U
André Broucke	André Broucke	André Broucke	O	G
Arnold Tang	Arnold Tang Productions	Arnold Tang Productions	O	G
Jiantong Wu	Beijing Special Engineering Design & Research Institute	Beijing Special Engineering Design & Research Institute	O	G
Nathan Leonard	Bender Group	Bender GmbH & Co. KG	P	MP
Joe Boardman	Bender Inc.	Bender GmbH & Co. KG	A	MP
Torsten Gruhn	Bender Inc.	Bender GmbH & Co. KG	A	MP
Kevin O'Brien	Bestek Lighting & Staging	Bestek Lighting & Staging	O	U
Lee J. Bloch	Bloch Design Group, Inc.	Bloch Design Group, Inc.	O	G
Marty Lazarus	Chicago Spotlight, Inc.	Chicago Spotlight, Inc.	O	DR
Eric Bouchard	Cirque du Soliel	Cirque du Soliel	O	CP
Wayne Kowalski	Coleman Cable Inc.	Coleman Cable Inc.	O	MP
Ford Sellers	Cornell University	Cornell University	O	U
Don Earl	Earl Girls, Inc.	Earl Girls, Inc.	O	DR

Name	Company	Representing	Voting status	Int. cat.
Edward R. Condit	Edward R. Condit	Edward R. Condit	O	U
Steve Terry	Electronic Theatre Controls	Electronic Theatre Controls, Inc.	P	MP
Elizabeth E. (Lizz) Pittsley	Elizabeth Pittsley	Elizabeth Pittsley	I	U
Ian Foulds	IATSE Local 873	Entertainment Electrical Safety Committee of Ontario	P	G
Art Wanuch	Entertainment Electrical Safety Committee of Ontario	Entertainment Electrical Safety Committee of Ontario	A	G
Jody Williquette	Harting Inc., North America	Harting KGAA	P	G
Ed Garstkiewicz	Harting Inc., North America	Harting KGAA	A	G
Trevor Forrest	Helvar Lighting Control	Helvar Lighting Control	O	MP
Kirk D. Keen	Hollywood Lighting Services, Inc.	Hollywood Lighting, Inc.	O	DR
Pat Miller	Hubbell Wiring Devices	Hubbell Inc.	O	MP
Edwin S. Kramer	I.A.T.S.E. Local 1	I.A.T.S.E. Local 1	P	U
Roger Lattin	I.A.T.S.E. Local 728	I.A.T.S.E. Local 728	P	U
R. Bruce Prochal	IATSE Local 728	I.A.T.S.E. Local 728	A	U
Patric J. Abaravich	I.A.T.S.E. Local 728	I.A.T.S.E. Local 728	A	U
Alan M. Rowe	IATSE Local 728	I.A.T.S.E. Local 728	A	U
Keith S. Woods	Lakhri Impressions Ltd.	IATSE Local 891	O	U
Simon Hunt	IATSE Local 891	IATSE Local 891	O	U
John (Javid) D. Butler	Integrated Theatre, Inc.	Integrated Theatre, Inc.	O	CP
David Murray	IPC Resistors Inc.	IPC Resistors Inc.	O	CP
Jose J. Flores	Kino Flo, Inc.	Kino Flo, Inc.	O	MP
Ken Vannice	Leviton Manufacturing Co., Inc.	Leviton Manufacturing Co., Inc.	P	MP
Bill Grande	Leviton Manufacturing Co., Inc.	Leviton Manufacturing Co., Inc.	A	MP
Bob Luther	Lex Products Corp.	Lex Products Corp.	P	CP
Tyrone Mellon_Jr.	Lex Products Corp.	Lex Products Corp.	A	CP

Name	Company	Representing	Voting status	Int. cat.
Sean Sloat	Lex Products Corp.	Lex Products Corp.	A	CP
Louis Bradfield	Louis Bradfield	Louis Bradfield	I	U
Jim Holladay	Luxence	Luxence	O	G
Hiroshi Kita	Marumo Electric Co., Ltd.	Marumo Electric Co., Ltd.	O	MP
Michael J. Carnaby	Mikan Theatricals	Mikan Theatricals	O	DR
W. G. Krokaugger, P. E.	Mole-Richardson Co.	Mole-Richardson Co.	P	CP
Alex Yoon	Mole-Richardson Co.	Mole-Richardson Co.	A	CP
Vincent J. Cannavale	Motion Laboratories	Motion Laboratories	P	CP
Peter Herrmann	Motion Laboratories	Motion Laboratories	A	CP
David Herrmann	Motion Laboratories	Motion Laboratories	A	CP
Natti Pierce-Thomson	North American Theatre Technology	North American Theatre Technology	O	U
Marsha DuBois	Pintech Stage Connectors, Inc.	Pintech Stage Connectors, Inc.	O	CP
Steve DuBois	Pintech Stage Connectors, Inc.	Pintech Stage Connectors, Inc.	O	CP
Ron Bonner	PLASA	PLASA	P	U
James Eade	PLASA	PLASA	O	G
Paul F. Mardon	Pulsar Ltd.	Pulsar Ltd.	O	MP
Douglas Franz	QVC Network	QVC Network	O	U
Eric Tishman	Rosco Laboratories	Rosco Laboratories	O	MP
Richard B. Glickman	Gliconen Corporation	Rosco Laboratories	O	MP
Michael Lay	Philips Strand Lighting	Royal Philips Electronics	P	MP
Robert Barbagallo	Solotech Inc.	Solotech Inc.	O	DR
Michael Scudday	SSRC, Inc.	SSRC, Inc.	P	CP
Stephen Vanciel	Stephen Vanciel	Stephen Vanciel	O	U
Reuben Goldberg	Technic Services	Technic Services	O	U
Dominic Vincenty	TPS	Television Production Service	O	DR

Name	Company	Representing	Voting status	Int. cat.
Jerry Gorrell	Theatre Safety Programs	Theatre Safety Programs	P	U
Colin Waters	TMB	TMB	O	DR
Phillip M. Gallo	TMB	TMB	O	DR
Charles (Chuck) Kurten	Underwriters Laboratories, Inc.	Underwriters Laboratories, Inc.	O	G
Richard Wolpert	Union Connector Company (MO)	Union Connector Company	O	CP
Mitch Heffer	Entertainment Technology (Royal Philips Electronics)	USITT	P	U
William L. Maiman	William L. Maiman	William L. Maiman	O	U

Key to codes:

- | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----|--|
| P | principal voting member | MP | mass-market producer interest category |
| A | alternate voting member | CP | custom-market producer interest category |
| I | individual voting member | DR | dealer or rental company interest category |
| O | observer, non-voting | U | user interest category |
| | | G | general-interest interest category |
| | | DE | designer interest category |

Tables of Non-Yes Votes, Ballot Items 42 through 72, Letter Ballot EP/2010-7002
 (tabular summary document EP/2010-7014)
Reconsidered and Revoted by the EPWG on 22 September 2010

42 ADD: CEC & definition

The Canadian Electrical Code, or CE code or CSA C22.1 is a voluntary code for adoption and enforcement by regulatory authorities; it meets the fundamental safety principles for electrical installations of buildings and for addressing the installation and maintenance of electrical equipment in Canada.

EESCO Committee Public review comments
 Submitted by R. Dean – Secretary

Comment Resolution: Accept

<i>Voter</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Art Wanuch and Ian Foulds	Yes	
Edwin S. Kramer	No with reasons	# 42 Reject. See # 29 This document is based on NFPA 70 The National Electrical Code®. A separate document based on Canadian code is anticipated.
George Long	Yes	
Jerry Gorrell	No with reasons	Not relevant to this document.
Keith S. Woods	No with reasons	Why is this here if we are writing a separate Canadian document? See comments on comment #1 and #29
Ken Vannice	Yes	
Lizz Pittsley	No with	In light of the resolution to comment #29, does the definition of the CEC belong in this document or only in

	reasons	the Canadian document to come?
Michael M. Lay	Yes	
Mitch Hefter	Yes	
Roger Lattin	Yes with comments	Will we need this definition if there is a separate document?
Steve Terry	No with reasons	Question--is the CEC at all germane to the revised NEC-based version of E1.18-1? If not, this definition is not needed.
Tyrone Mellon	Yes	
Vincent J. Cannavale	No with reasons	There's going to be a separate Canadian document.
William Krokaugger	Yes	

Jerry Gorrell moved that the resolution be changed to Reject. Reason: The Canadian material will be in a separate document. There is no need to add a reference or definition of the CEC, since this document will not reference the CEC and therefore no definition is needed. Seconded by discussion. Approved unanimously.

43 Reduction Switch: Does this mean "Overcurrent Device" ?

EESCO Committee Public review comments
Submitted by R. Dean – Secretary

Comment Resolution: Term is not used in document and has been deleted.

<i>Voter</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Art Wanuch and Ian Foulds	Yes	

Edwin S. Kramer	Yes	
George Long	Yes	
Jerry Gorrell	Yes	
Keith S. Woods	No with reasons	Are we putting in a definition for overcurrent devices?
Ken Vannice	Yes	
Lizz Pittsley	Yes	
Michael M. Lay	Yes	
Mitch Hefter	Yes	
Roger Lattin	No with reasons	See comment for # 25.
Steve Terry	Yes	
Tyrone Mellon	Yes	
Vincent J. Cannavale	Yes	
William Krokaugger	Yes	

Roger Lattin moved that, since we will add a section on reduction switches, the comment resolution should be "Accept in principle. Coordinate with comment 25 resolution." The motion was seconded and then approved unanimously.

44 Sectioning switch: Should this be "isolation switch"?

EESCO Committee Public review comments
Submitted by R. Dean – Secretary

Comment Resolution: Term is not used in the document and has been deleted.

<i>Voter</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Art Wanuch and Ian Foulds	Yes	
Edwin S. Kramer	Yes	
George Long	Yes	
Jerry Gorrell	Yes	
Keith S. Woods	Yes	
Ken Vannice	Yes	
Lizz Pittsley	Yes	
Michael M. Lay	Yes	
Mitch Hefter	Yes	
Roger Lattin	No with reasons	See comment to # 25.
Steve Terry	Yes	
Tyrone Mellon	Yes	
Vincent J. Cannavale	Yes	
William Krokaugger	Yes	

Jerry Gorrell moved that we accept the resolution. (No change.) The motion was seconded and then approved unanimously.

45

Accepted

46 Separately derived system: Referred to in the CEC as a “New System”

EESCO Committee Public review comments

Submitted by R. Dean – Secretary

Comment Resolution: Reject. This document is based on NFPA 70 The National Electrical Code®. A separate document based on Canadian code to be developed. Terms not in document are normally not included in definitions.

<i>Voter</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Art Wanuch and Ian Foulds	Yes	
Edwin S. Kramer	No with reasons	The comment resolution of “reject” is correct, as is the statement “This document is based on NFPA 70 The National Electrical Code®.” However announcing, “A separate document based on Canadian code to be developed” commits the EPWG to coming up with one. I believe it is indeed a good idea and should be done, but committing to it is inappropriate for many reasons. Make the last sentence less definitive by changing it to “A separate document based on Canadian code is anticipated.”
George Long	Yes	
Jerry Gorrell	Yes	
Keith S. Woods	Yes with comments	Again, we are all over the map on what is and is not happening with the CEC and Canada. See my comment regarding the scope statement, comment #29
Ken Vannice	Yes	
Lizz Pittsley	Yes	
Michael M. Lay	Yes	
Mitch Hefter	Yes	

Roger Lattin	Yes	
Steve Terry	Yes	
Tyrone Mellon	Yes	
Vincent J. Cannavale	No with reasons	There's going to be a separate Canadian document.
William Krokaugger	Yes	

There was discussion in which the consensus was that the disagreeing votes actually agreed with the resolution. No change was made. The resolution was accepted.

47 Single-pole separable connectors: Change definition to be a better descriptor

EESCO Committee Public review comments
 Submitted by R. Dean – Secretary

Comment Resolution: Definition now reads:

“Single Pole Separable Connector: A device, either inlet, outlet, or cable-connected, for the connection of single conductor cables in a pin and sleeve configuration. Frequently referred to as a “Single Pole” or “Single Pole Connector”.

<i>Voter</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Art Wanuch and Ian Foulds	Yes	
Edwin S. Kramer	No with reasons	# 47 Reject. In UL 1682, Plugs, Receptacles, and Cable Connectors of the Pin and Sleeve Type, clause 1.2 states “In the U.S. this standard does not apply to single conductor pin and sleeve devices.” While a Single-pole separable connector may indeed have a Pin and Sleeve configuration, the UL (and Canadian Standards Association CSA 22.2 No. 182.1) tells us that the standard for this connector does not apply.

		The proposed new definition does not improve clarity and will sow misinformation.
George Long	Yes	
Jerry Gorrell	Yes	
Keith S. Woods	Yes	
Ken Vannice	Yes	
Lizz Pittsley	Yes	
Michael M. Lay	Yes	
Mitch Hefter	Yes	
Roger Lattin	Yes	
Steve Terry	Yes	
Tyrone Mellon	Yes	
Vincent J. Cannavale	Yes	
William Krokaugger	Yes	

Tyrone Mellon noted that Kramer's objection was technically incorrect. Mellon said he was content with the existing resolution and definition. There was further discussion. No motion was made to change the resolution, so the existing resolution was accepted.

48 ADD: definition of "Single Pole" - means a single pole separable connector, as per the definition here. This can then be used throughout the document in place of the more cumbersome full-up "single pole separable connector", given its prevalence throughout.

EESCO Committee Public review comments
 Submitted by R. Dean – Secretary

Comment Resolution: Accept in principle. Definition now reads:

Single Pole Separable Connector: A device, either inlet, outlet, or cable-connected, for the connection of single conductor cables in a pin and sleeve configuration. Frequently referred to as “Single Pole or “Single Pole Connector”.

<i>Voter</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Art Wanuch and Ian Foulds	Yes	
Edwin S. Kramer	Yes	
George Long	Yes	
Jerry Gorrell	Yes	
Keith S. Woods	Yes	
Ken Vannice	Yes with comments	“single pole” alone is not clear enough
Lizz Pittsley	Yes	
Michael M. Lay	Yes	
Mitch Heffer	Yes	
Roger Lattin	Yes	
Steve Terry	Yes	
Tyrone Mellon	Yes	
Vincent J. Cannavale	Yes	
William Krokaugger	Yes	

There was discussion. The resolution vote stands.

49 single-pole separable connectors: Should this definition not include panel mount plugs and connectors as part of the definition? ***, having only one pole.

The current phraseology does not include nor seem to imply the inclusion of panel mounts.

EESCO Committee Public review comments
Submitted by R. Dean – Secretary

Comment Resolution: The term “device” includes everything.

<i>Voter</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Art Wanuch and Ian Foulds	Yes	
Edwin S. Kramer	Yes	
George Long	Yes	
Jerry Gorrell	Yes	
Keith S. Woods	Yes	
Ken Vannice	Yes	
Lizz Pittsley	Yes with comments	Comment Resolution: Accept in principle. The new definition of Single Pole Separable Connectors resolves the issues in this comment. See resolution to comments #47 and #48.
Michael M. Lay	Yes	
Mitch Hefter	Yes	
Roger Lattin	Yes	
Steve Terry	Yes	
Tyrone Mellon	Yes	
Vincent J. Cannavale	Yes	
William Krokaugger	Yes	

Lizz Pittsley explained that she was not disagreeing. The resolution vote stands.

50 FPN1- Suggest substituting "Bonding" for consistent clarity. Significant confusion exists with respect to "ground" and "grounded (circuit) conductor. It would be highly preferable to delineate ground and bond separately, and maintain that distinction throughout the document.

EESCO Committee Public review comments
Submitted by R. Dean – Secretary

Comment Resolution: Accept in principle. Text now reads:

“(FPN 1) A female tails set may have male or female grounded circuit conductor (Neutral) connector(s). It may also have male or female bonding (grounding) circuit conductor connector(s).”

<i>Voter</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Art Wanuch and Ian Foulds	Yes	
Edwin S. Kramer	No with reasons	Keep calling the green wire “ground”. It is the common term used in the Entertainment Industry and fits with the NEC definition. Adding “Bonding” in parentheses is OK and will meet the intent of the proposal.

George Long	Yes with comments	The new language is still very confusing and not clear. Too many variables of "May or May Not"
Jerry Gorrell	Yes	
Keith S. Woods	No with reasons	All electrical power distribution systems have only one ground conductor, the one that is connected to the system ground at the service enclosure (genset, hydro etc). Therefore all green coded cables that run out from the service enclosure are bonds, not grounds as we all tend to call them. This is a big semantic issue that needs addressing now. As such the wording of this statement should use the word "shall" and remove the words "may also" when discussing the bonding (grounding) cable.
Ken Vannice	Yes	
Lizz Pittsley	No with reasons	While I support clarity, I do not think that this language change will provide it. In the field, feeder cable is considered to be a ground, a neutral, and three hots. In this document, it has become a bonding (grounding) (ground) conductor, a neutral (grounded) conductor, and three current carrying conductors. I believe that the more elaborate the language becomes, the less useful this document becomes to the intended audience of end users.
Michael M. Lay	Yes	
Mitch Heffer	Yes	
Roger Lattin	Yes	
Steve Terry	No with reasons	A bonding conductor and a grounding conductor are not the same. Grounding conductor is a widely-used and well-understood term.
Tyrone Mellon	Yes	
Vincent J. Cannavale	Yes	
William Krokaugger	Yes with comments	Should the wording be: A female tail-set may-----not "A female tails set may"---

Jerry Gorrell moved that the resolution shall be changed to read: Accept in principle. Text shall read:

"(FPN 1) A female tails set may have male or female neutral (grounded) circuit conductor connector(s). It may also have male or female grounding circuit conductor connector(s), and sometimes male or female bonding circuit conductor connector(s)."

The motion was seconded and then approved with a unanimous vote.

51 FPN2-Suggest substituting "Bonding" for consistent clarity. Significant confusion exists with respect to "ground" and "grounded (circuit) conductor. It would be highly preferable to delineate ground and bond separately, and maintain that distinction throughout the document.

EESCO Committee Public review comments
Submitted by R. Dean – Secretary

Comment Resolution: Accept in principle. Text now reads:

“(FPN 2) A male tails set may have male or female grounded circuit conductor (Neutral) connector(s). It may also have male or female bonding (grounding) circuit conductor connector(s).”

Voter	Vote	Comments
Art Wanuch and Ian Foulds	Yes	
Edwin S. Kramer	No with reasons	Keep calling the green wire “ground”. It is the common term used in the Entertainment Industry and fits with the NEC definition. Adding “Bonding” in parentheses is OK and will meet the intent of the proposal.
George Long	Yes	
Jerry Gorrell	Yes	
Keith S. Woods	No with reasons	See above.
Ken Vannice	Yes	
Lizz Pittsley	No with reasons	See comments on resolution of comment #50.
Michael M. Lay	Yes	
Mitch Hefter	Yes	
Roger Lattin	Yes	
Steve Terry	No with reasons	A bonding conductor and a grounding conductor are not the same. Grounding conductor is a widely-used and well-understood term.
Tyrone Mellon	Yes	
Vincent J. Cannavale	No with reasons	GROUND is used more often.
William Krokaugger	Yes with comments	See comment #50.

Jerry Gorrell moved that the resolution shall be changed to read: Accept in principle. Text shall read:

“(FPN 1) A male tails set may have male or female neutral (grounded) circuit conductor connector(s). It may also have male or female grounding circuit conductor connector(s), and sometimes male or female bonding circuit conductor connector(s).”

The motion was seconded and then approved with a unanimous vote.

52

Accepted

53

Accepted

54

Accepted

55 2.1.1.1 An FPN needs to be added to this stating that this is part of the CEC part 2, not part 1. Part 1 does not deal with the design and manufacture that this section deals with. Also, the second paragraph of the FPN is redundant as it just restates some of what is written in the first paragraph.

Keith S. Woods
Lahkri Impressions Ltd/IATSE Local 891
37 Darney bay
Port Moody, BC V3H 3T9

Comment Resolution: Accept

<i>Voter</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Art Wanuch and Ian Foulds	Yes	
Edwin S. Kramer	No with reasons	Reject. This document is based on NFPA 70 The National Electrical Code®.
George Long	Yes	
Jerry Gorrell	No with reasons	Not relevant to this document.
Keith S. Woods	No with reasons	So, is this document now addressing Canada? Suggest removal of all questions that are pertaining to Canada, and a line be added to the scope stating that this document is not a valid document for power distribution in Canada. How does this work for Mexico?
Ken Vannice	Yes	
Lizz Pittsley	No with reasons	This needs to be consistent with the resolutions of the other comments dealing with the CEC: Comment Resolution: Reject. This document is based on NFPA 70 The National Electrical Code®. A separate document based on Canadian code to be developed.
Michael M. Lay	Yes	
Mitch Hefter	No with reasons	1) Canadian specific issues are being separated out to another document. 2) No reference to CEC appears in this clause.
Roger Lattin	No vote	
Steve Terry	No with	Canadian references are no longer needed in the revised document.

	reasons	
Tyrone Mellon	Yes	
Vincent J. Cannavale	No with reasons	This document is based on NFPA 70.
William Krokaugger	Yes	

Gorrell moved that the resolution shall be "Reject. This document will not cover the CEC. Canadian work practices will be covered in a separate document." The motion was seconded and then approved with a unanimous vote.

56 2.1.2 An FPN needs to be added stating that in the CEC #6 wire is only allowable as a bond wire, not a ground wire in entertainment power distribution systems. Ground wire is only allowed to be one size smaller than the main feed wire. If the system is a 400A main with 4/0 then the ground wire must be no smaller than 2/0.

Keith S. Woods
Lahkri Impressions Ltd/IATSE Local 891
37 Darney bay
Port Moody, BC V3H 3T9

Comment Resolution: Reject. This document is based on NFPA 70 The National Electrical Code®. A separate document based on Canadian code to be developed.

<i>Voter</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Art Wanuch and Ian Foulds	Yes	
Edwin S. Kramer	No with reasons	The comment resolution of "reject" is correct, as is the statement "This document is based on NFPA 70 The National Electrical Code®." However announcing "A separate document based on Canadian code to be developed" commits the EPWG to coming up with one. I believe it is indeed a good idea and should be done, but committing to it is inappropriate for many reasons. Make the last sentence less definitive by changing it to "A separate document based on Canadian code is anticipated."
George Long	Yes	
Jerry Gorrell	Yes	
Keith S. Woods	Yes with comments	See above comment.
Ken Vannice	Yes	
Lizz Pittsley	Yes	
Michael M. Lay	Yes	

Mitch Hefter	Yes	
Roger Lattin	Yes	
Steve Terry	Yes	
Tyrone Mellon	Yes	
Vincent J. Cannavale	No with reasons	This document is based on the NEC and NFPA 70.
William Krokaugger	Yes	

There was discussion in which it was noted that the word "is" shall be added before "to be developed." This is an editorial correction. The resolution stays as fundamentally "reject."

57 2.1.2 - Cable size Why are #1, 1/0 and 3/0 cable sizes unacceptable if they are larger than the #2 cable that is acceptable?

John Ringelman
Stage Rigging, Inc.

Comment Resolution: No change. The use of 2, 2/0 and 4/0 are currently industry standards in the United States. While there is nothing wrong with 1, 1/0 and 3/0, with proper derating, but they are the standard of the US industry and we want to discourage their use. Since this document is not mandatory (see resolution to comment # 9) they could still be used if one so chose.

<i>Voter</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Art Wanuch and Ian Foulds	Yes	
Edwin S. Kramer	Yes	
George Long	Yes	
Jerry Gorrell	Yes	
Keith S. Woods	Yes	
Ken Vannice	Yes	
Lizz Pittsley	Yes with comments	I believe this should read: Comment Resolution: No change. The use of 2, 2/0 and 4/0 are currently industry standards in the United States. While there is nothing wrong with 1, 1/0 and 3/0, with proper derating, they are <i>not</i> the standard of the US industry and we want to discourage their use. Since this document is not mandatory (see resolution to comment # 9) they could still be used if one so chose.
Michael M. Lay	Yes	
Mitch Hefter	Yes with comments	2nd line - "... derating, but they are <u>not</u> the standard..."

Roger Lattin	Yes with comments	There were many discussions in the beginning of this project about cable sizes, it was agreed that we would only include the "common" cable sizes used in the entertainment industries which are #2, 2/0, and 4/0.
Steve Terry	Yes	
Tyrone Mellon	Yes	
Vincent J. Cannavale	Yes	
William Krokaugger	Yes	

Correll moved that the comment resolution read: "No change. The use of 2, 2/0 and 4/0 are industry common practice in the United States. While there is nothing wrong with 1, 1/0 and 3/0 with proper derating. Their use is not common practice in the US industry and we want to discourage their use. Since this document is not mandatory (see resolution to comment # 9) they could still be used if one so chose."
 The motion was seconded and then approved with a unanimous vote.

58 2.1.2 Preface with "Copper cable ----"

EESCO Committee Public review comments
 Submitted by R. Dean – Secretary

Comment Resolution: Accept.

<i>Voter</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Art Wanuch and Ian Foulds	Yes	
Edwin S. Kramer	No with reasons	Reject. In 2.1.1.1 the first sentence states "Conductors shall be made of annealed copper wires..." and the second one is "Portable feeder cables shall utilize flexible copper conductors with a fine strand Class K or M, maximum strand size 30 AWG", while 2.1.1.2 is "Aluminum and conductors other than those specified in 2.1.1.1 are not permitted." In two places E1.18 states Copper shall be used, and there is one instance of "...conductors other than those specified in 2.1.1.1 are not permitted. [the only conductors specified are copper]. The proposed words are repetitive and redundant as well as not enhancing the readability of the document.
George Long	Yes	
Jerry Correll	Yes	

Keith S. Woods	Yes	
Ken Vannice	Yes	
Lizz Pittsley	Yes	
Michael M. Lay	Yes	
Mitch Hefter	Yes	
Roger Lattin	Yes	
Steve Terry	Yes	
Tyrone Mellon	Yes	
Vincent J. Cannavale	Abstain with reasons	It's unclear to me.
William Krokaugger	Yes	

There was discussion. No changes were made. The resolution vote stands.

59 2.1.2

See previous suggestion re: "bonding". This is consistent with the NEC requirement for grounding "Raceways and Equipment"- i.e. a bonding conductor.

EESCO Committee Public review comments
Submitted by R. Dean – Secretary

<i>Voter</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Art Wanuch and Ian Foulds	No vote	
Edwin S. Kramer	Yes	
George Long	Yes	
Jerry Gorrell	Yes	
Keith S. Woods	No with reasons	Per comments on #55 and # 56
Ken Vannice	Yes	
Lizz Pittsley	No with reasons	I am unclear as to how this is consistent with comment #56. Also, I am not sure I support the whole bonding/grounding revision.
Michael M. Lay	Yes	
Mitch Hefter	Yes	
Roger Lattin	No vote	

Steve Terry	Yes	
Tyrone Mellon	Yes	
Vincent J. Cannavale	Yes	
William Krokaugger	Yes	

Roger Lattin moved that the resolution should be changed to "Accept in principle. Clause 2.1.2 shall have a sentence that in effect reads: 'Number 6 AWG shall be permitted to be used as a grounding or bonding conductor when the overcurrent device associated with the ungrounded (hot) conductors is rated at 200 A or less.'" The motion was seconded and then approved with a unanimous vote.

60

Accepted

61 2.1.2 Cable size

needs additional reference to Bond wire (re: definitions)

EESCO Committee Public review comments
Submitted by R. Dean – Secretary

Comment Resolution: Accept

<i>Voter</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Art Wanuch and Ian Foulds	Yes	
Edwin S. Kramer	Yes with comments	Can we make it "Ground (bond)" to match US usage? (Or Bond...James Bond, to match British usage :-)
George Long	Yes	
Jerry Gorrell	Yes	
Keith S. Woods	Yes	
Ken Vannice	Yes	
Lizz Pittsley	Yes	
Michael M. Lay	Yes	
Mitch Hefter	Yes	
Roger Lattin	Yes	

Steve Terry	No with reasons	A bonding conductor and a grounding conductor are not the same. Grounding conductor is a widely-used and well-understood term.
Tyrone Mellon	Yes	
Vincent J. Cannavale	Yes	
William Krokaugger	Yes	

There was discussion, but no change. The resolution vote stands.

62 CEC section 66 – 450 allows use of #4awg or larger for single-conductor specific reference to CEC?

EESCO Committee Public review comments
Submitted by R. Dean – Secretary

Comment Resolution: Reject. 2008 NEC 520.53(H)(2) states: “Single-conductor portable supply cable sets shall be not smaller than 2 AWG conductors. The equipment grounding conductor shall not be smaller than 6 AWG conductor.”

2006 CEC 66-450 states: 66-450 Single-conductor cables

Single-conductor cables shall be permitted in sizes No. 4 AWG and larger, provided that they are (a) rated for the circuit voltage and suitable for the intended application;

(b) of a matched set with the same length for all conductors of the circuit including the bonding conductor;
and

(c) covered or guarded so as not to present a tripping hazard in pedestrian walkways or roadways.

BSR E1.18 applies the more restrictive approach. Adoption of this standard is voluntary, and local regulations may relax or restrict the requirements within BSR E1.18.

<i>Voter</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Art Wanuch and Ian Foulds	Yes	
Edwin S. Kramer	No with reasons	Reject. This document is based on NFPA 70 The National Electrical Code®.
George Long	Yes	
Jerry Gorrell	Yes	
Keith S. Woods	Yes with comments	See previous comments regarding Canadiana in this document.

Ken Vannice	Yes	
Lizz Pittsley	Yes	
Michael M. Lay	Yes	
Mitch Heffer	Yes	
Roger Lattin	Yes	
Steve Terry	Yes	
Tyrone Mellon	Yes	
Vincent J. Cannavale	No with reasons	Based on The NEC
William Krokaugger	Yes	

There was discussion. No change was made.

63

Accepted

64 2.1.3 Cable types

Existing text:

Feeder cable systems shall utilize single-conductor cables Listed for Extra-Hard Usage as specified elsewhere by a code, standard or the National Electrical Code.(FPN) Types SC, SCE, SCT, W, & PPE are examples of single-conductor cables Listed for Extra- Hard Usage. The Canadian Electrical Code identifies Type PPC as for hard usage but is similar to Type SC and is employed in a similar manner.

New text:

2.1.3 Cable types

Feeder cable systems shall utilize single-conductor cables Listed for Extra-Hard Usage as specified elsewhere by a code, standard or the National Electrical Code.(FPN) Types SC, SCE, SCT, W, & PPE are examples of single-conductor cables Listed for Extra- Hard Usage. ~~The Canadian Electrical Code identifies Type PPC as for hard usage but is similar to Type SC and is employed in a similar manner.~~

Comment:

E1.18-1 requires the use of Extra-Hard Usage cable it this very paragraph. Table 11 in the CEC lists many kinds of Extra-Hard Usage cables.

Remove the last sentence of the FPN.

Eddie Kramer

1501

Comment Resolution: Accept in part and in principle. Text now reads:

"(FPN) Types SC, SCE, SCT, W, & PPE are examples of single-conductor cables Listed for Extra- Hard Usage. Table 11 in the CEC lists many kinds of Extra-Hard Usage cables."

<i>Voter</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Art Wanuch and Ian Foulds	Yes	
Edwin S. Kramer	No with reasons	Accept. This is a US centric document, based on the NEC and the information about the Canadian Code does not increase its usefulness.
George Long	Yes	
Jerry Gorrell	Yes with comments	Delete reference to CEC.
Keith S. Woods	Yes with comments	Need to remove the Canadiana references.
Ken Vannice	Yes with comments	The change to the Canadian comment isn't helpful because the single conductor cable isn't indicated for extra hard usage. It would be more helpful to say that the Canadian PPC meets the intent of this clause.
Lizz Pittsley	No with reasons	The reference to the CEC has already been removed from the BSR1-18-1r15 version of the document. It should be removed from this resolution as well.
Michael M. Lay	Yes	
Mitch Hefter	Yes	
Roger Lattin	Yes with comments	Do we need the CEC reference if we are doing a Canadian specific document?
Steve Terry	No with reasons	References to the CEC are no longer germane to the revised NEC-based document.
Tyrone Mellon	Yes	
Vincent J. Cannavale	Yes	
William Krokaugger	Yes	

Jerry Gorrell moved that we eliminate the Canadian reference in the resolution so the resolution says: "Accept in part and in principle. Text now reads: '*(FPN) Types SC, SCE, SCT, W, & PPE are examples of single-conductor cables Listed for Extra- Hard Usage.*'"

The motion was seconded and then approved with a unanimous vote.

65 2.1.3 cable temperature rating

Should there be a reference to minimum temp use rating at this point?

EESCO Committee Public review comments
Submitted by R. Dean – Secretary

Comment Resolution: No change. Temperature rating for use of a cable (including lower limit) depends on the specification of the cables being used.

<i>Voter</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Art Wanuch and Ian Foulds	No with reasons	Believe this should be included to provide guidance.
Edwin S. Kramer	Yes	
George Long	Yes	
Jerry Gorrell	Yes	
Keith S. Woods	Yes	
Ken Vannice	Yes	
Lizz Pittsley	Yes	
Michael M. Lay	Yes	
Mitch Hefter	Yes	
Roger Lattin	Yes	
Steve Terry	Yes	
Tyrone Mellon	Yes	
Vincent J. Cannavale	No with reasons	The temperatures will be changed in the Canadian document.
William Krokaugger	Yes	

There was discussion. The concensus was that extreme cold is unlikely to be a practical issue. The resolution was not changed.

66 2.1.4 Voltage

Existing text:

2.1.4 Voltage Text Cable shall have a minimum rating of 600 V.

Comment:

From E1.18-1 “2.1.3 Cable types Feeder cable systems shall utilize single-conductor cables Listed for Extra-Hard Usage...”. Extra-hard usage cable is a 600V cable (see table 400.4 “Flexible Cords and Cables” of the NEC or table 11 “Conditions of Use, Voltage, and Temperature Ratings of Flexible Cords...” of the CEC).

Remove this paragraph.

New text:

2.1.4 Voltage

Cable shall have a minimum rating of 600 V.

Eddie Kramer

1501

Comment Resolution: Accept.

<i>Voter</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Art Wanuch and Ian Foulds	No with reasons	Not sure what is being accepted, unclear of what the new text is.
Edwin S. Kramer	Yes	
George Long	Yes	
Jerry Gorrell	Yes	
Keith S. Woods	Yes	
Ken Vannice	Yes	
Lizz Pittsley	Yes	
Michael M. Lay	Yes	
Mitch Hefter	Yes	
Roger Lattin	Yes	
Steve Terry	No with reasons	Reiterating 600V is useful for users--leave it in but correct the grammar.
Tyrone Mellon	Yes	
Vincent J. Cannavale	Yes	
William Krokaugger	Yes	

There was discussion. Gorrell moved that the resolution shall be "Accept in principle. A requirement for a minimum voltage rating of 600 V shall be included." The motion was seconded and then approved with a unanimous vote.

67 2.1.4

Remove the word voltage from title

Insert phrasing “Cable insulation shall have a minimum rating of 600 V.”

insulation: A material that isolates conductive materials and helps to correctly channel electricity.

Better grammar???

EESCO Committee Public review comments
Submitted by R. Dean – Secretary

Comment Resolution: See resolution to comment #66

<i>Voter</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Art Wanuch and Ian Foulds	No with reasons	See above comment.
Edwin S. Kramer	Yes	
George Long	Yes	
Jerry Gorrell	Yes	
Keith S. Woods	Yes	
Ken Vannice	Yes	
Lizz Pittsley	Yes	
Michael M. Lay	Yes	
Mitch Hefter	Yes	
Roger Lattin	Yes	
Steve Terry	No with reasons	See my negative vote on comment 66.
Tyrone Mellon	Yes	
Vincent J. Cannavale	Yes	
William Krokaugger	Yes	

The consensus was that the reference to resolution 66 is still accurate.

68

Accepted

69 2.1.7, 2.2.3, 2.2.5

2.1.7; 2.2.3; 2.2.5 An FPN stating that this is part of the CEC Part 2

Keith S. Woods
 Lahkri Impressions Ltd/IATSE Local 891
 37 Darney bay
 Port Moody, BC V3H 3T9

Comment Resolution: Accept.

<i>Voter</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Art Wanuch and Ian Foulds	Yes	
Edwin S. Kramer	No with reasons	Reject. This document is based on NFPA 70 The National Electrical Code®.
George Long	Yes	
Jerry Gorrell	No with reasons	Not relevant to document.
Keith S. Woods	No with reasons	This should be struck due to it's Canadiana references.
Ken Vannice	Yes	
Lizz Pittsley	No with reasons	This needs to be consistent with the resolutions of the other comments dealing with the CEC: Comment Resolution: Reject. This document is based on NFPA 70 The National Electrical Code®. A separate document based on Canadian code to be developed.
Michael M. Lay	Yes	
Mitch Hefter	No with reasons	Canadian specific issues are being separated out to another document
Roger Lattin	Yes with comments	Is this necessary because of the new Canadian Document?
Steve Terry	No with reasons	References to the CEC are no longer germane to the revised document.
Tyrone Mellon	Yes	

Vincent J. Cannavale	No with reasons	This document is based on NFPA 70 The National Electrical Code.
William Krokaugger	Yes	

There was discussion. Lattin moved that the resolution shall be: "Reject. This document will not reference Canadian Code. Canadian Code requirements and work practices will be covered in a separate document." The motion was seconded and then approved with a unanimous vote.

70

Accepted

71 2.2.2 Locking

Existing text:

2.2.2 Locking Single-pole separable connectors shall be of the locking type. Sister lugs (bus bar clamps) shall be considered locking-type connectors for the purposes of satisfying this requirement

Comment:

Sister lugs screw to the bus bar, so they are "locking-type". Rewrite this sentence and make it a FPN.

New text:

2.2.2 Locking

Single-pole separable connectors shall be of the locking type. ~~Sister lugs (bus bar clamps) shall be considered locking-type connectors for the purposes of satisfying this requirement (FPN)~~Sister lugs (bus bar clamps) screw to the bus bar so they are locking-type connectors.

Eddie Kramer
1501

Comment Resolution: Accept.

<i>Voter</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Art Wanuch and Ian Foulds	No with reasons	Does not fall within the definition given in comment 47/48 as having a pin and sleeve.
Edwin S. Kramer	Yes	
George Long	Yes	
Jerry Gorrell	Yes	
Keith S. Woods	Yes	

Ken Vannice	Yes	
Lizz Pittsley	Yes	
Michael M. Lay	Yes	
Mitch Hefter	No with reasons	UL 498 states: 2.6 CONFIGURATION, LOCKING—A device having a configuration that requires a motion other than a straight push or pull to connect or separate it when used with its mating part. Definition should be revised to reflect this definition.
Roger Lattin	Yes	
Steve Terry	Yes	
Tyrone Mellon	Yes	
Vincent J. Cannavale	Yes	
William Krokaugger	Yes	

There was discussion. Hefter withdrew his objection. There was no change to the resolution.

72 2.2.2

Please verify that “sister lugs” are listed, and to what standard?

EESCO Committee Public review comments
Submitted by R. Dean – Secretary

Comment Resolution: You can purchase UL listed sister lugs from Bates.

<i>Voter</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Art Wanuch and Ian Foulds	No with reasons	Please specify the standard.
Edwin S. Kramer	Yes	
George Long	Yes	
Jerry Gorrell	Yes	
Keith S. Woods	Yes	
Ken Vannice	Yes	
Lizz Pittsley	Yes	
Michael M. Lay	Yes	
Mitch Hefter	Yes	
Roger Lattin	Yes with	You may also purchase them from Mole-Richardson & Co.

	comments	
Steve Terry	Yes	
Tyrone Mellon	Yes	
Vincent J. Cannavale	Yes	
William Krokaugger	Yes	

The resolution was discussed.

Jerry Gorrell moved that the resolution shall be changed to: "Accept in principle. Listed sister lugs are available. We will not list the standard to which the devices are Listed because that is a matter for the listing NRTL and its engineers to decide." The motion was seconded and then approved with a unanimous vote.