

NESC SUBCOMMITTEE 1  
COORDINATION  
25 Sep, 2008-26 Sep, 2008  
IEEE, Piscataway, NJ

Name	Organization	09/25	09/26
<a href="#">Charles C Bleakley</a> (Principal)	SC7	X	X
<a href="#">D. J Christofersen</a> (Alternate)	SC3	X	X
<a href="#">Allen L Clapp</a> (Principal)	SC1	X	X
<a href="#">John B Dagenhart</a> (Principal)	SC2	X	X
<a href="#">Frank A Denbrock</a> (Principal)	SC5	X	X
<a href="#">Eric K Engdahl</a> (Alternate)	SC4	X	X
<a href="#">Gary R Engmann</a> (Alternate)	SC3	A	A
<a href="#">Donald E Hooper</a> (Principal)	Int. SC	X	X
<a href="#">Michael Hyland</a> (Principal)	Main	X	X
<a href="#">David G Komassa</a> (Principal)	SC4	X	X
<a href="#">Ewell T Robeson</a> (Alternate)	SC2	A	A
<a href="#">John C Spence</a> (Alternate)	SC7	A	A
<a href="#">Samuel Stonerock</a> (Alternate)	SC8	X	X
<a href="#">James R Tomaseski</a> (Principal)	SC8	X	X
<b>Guest</b>			
<a href="#">Mickey Gunter</a>		X	X
<a href="#">Greg Obenchain</a>	EEI	X	X

**Chair:** Allen L. Clapp  
**Secretary:** Charles C Bleakley

X - Present

A - Absent

**Revised Text**

Appendix E Ref B34      **CP3353**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Appendix E Ref B54      **CP3354**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept in Principle

**Subcommittee Comment:**

Pending approval and review.

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Index      **CP3147**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**New Text**

Section: 1 Rule: 010      **CP3141**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Reject

**Subcommittee Comment:**

Reference to reliability standards is inappropriate in a safety standard. No need to state what the Code is not for.

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Section: 1 Rule: 010      **CP3407**

*Also Section:1 011 SC1*

*Section:2 Def utility SC1*

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept as Modified

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Engmann, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Section: 1 Rule: 010 Purpose      **CP3415**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept in Principle

**Subcommittee Comment:**

See CP3407

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (8) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Section: 1 Rule: 011 A      **CP3008**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept as Modified

**Subcommittee Comment:**

Electric supply lines and equipment, communication lines and equipment, and work practices associated with each are covered by the NESC. The appropriate place for the word associated is in its present position modifying work practices.

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Section: 1 Rule: 011 B      **CP3203**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept in Principle

**Subcommittee Comment:**

See CP3407

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (6) Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Section: 1 Rule: 011 Scope **CP3416**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept in Principle

**Subcommittee Comment:**

See CP3407

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (8) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Section: 1 Rule: 013 A2c **CP3026**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept as Modified

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (7) Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (2) Bleakley, Komassa

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

Bleakley (Negative) Requiring agreement among the joint users may be used to stifle the use of new equipment or pole hardware designs by the same utility type joint user that compete with each other. Since only agreement and not valid reasoning is required, it may be used by any joint user to stop innovation if it will mean extra work or expense to accommodate the innovation. Since Rule 013A2b requires equivalent safety to be provided, there is no safety gain by requiring agreement instead of notification. This is a safety code, not a code of conduct.

Clapp (Affirmative) The language requiring consent of joint users for experimentation on facilities upon which they were attached was specifically added to the code to address previous problems that occurred when one joint user mistakenly assumed that the experiment would not adversely affect any of the joint users. The intention of the requirement is to assure that potential problems on the facilities of joint users are appropriately considered in the design of any experiment that has to potential to adversely affect any joint-use facility. The intent was that the

only reason for withholding permission would be related to the safety of employees, the public, lines, or equipment.

This proposed change leaves that language requiring permission to conduct the experiment on the joint use facility intact; it merely changes the word parties to utilities. Thus, in the absence of a proposal to delete the requirement to gain permission of joint users, I think the negative votes are not appropriate. However, I recognize the concerns of the negative voters about the possibility of someone withholding permission for an experiment on the basis of some competition-based concern (which is certainly not intended), instead of a safety-based concern. Such action is not intended by the rule. Therefore, I suggest that we should change this rule to the language shown below.

Rule 013A2c. On joint use facilities, all utilities with lines or equipment on or in the joint use facilities agree that no adverse safety issue would be expected to result from the experiment.

Komassa (Negative) Prefer original proposal

---

**Revised Text**

Section: 1 Rule: 013 A2c **CP3204**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept in Principle

**Subcommittee Comment:**

See CP3026

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (7) Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (2) Bleakley, Komassa

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

Bleakley (Negative) See comment on CP3026

Komassa (Negative) See comment on CP3026

---

**Revised Text**

Section: 1 Rule: 013 B2 **CP3027**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept as Modified

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (8) Bleakley, Christofersen, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (1) Clapp

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

Clapp (Negative) I agree with substituting 238C for 202, which was the primary purpose of this CP. However, I cannot support pulling that statement out into an Exception. Usually Exceptions are things that you can do, if you desire, that are less restrictive than the general rule. As a result, people have a tendency to ignore the Exceptions if they are planning to do what is required by the general rule. The original purpose of having this direction be part of the main rule is to assure that users see the requirement to meet 238C when a structure is changed out. Thus, this direction needs to stay in the rule, not be put into an Exception.

---

**Revised Text**

Section: 1 Rule: 013 B2 **CP3205**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept in Principle

**Subcommittee Comment:**

See CP 3027

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**New Text**

Section: 1 Rule: 014 A1 **CP3207**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept

**Subcommittee Comment:****Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)  
**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**New Text**

Section: 1 Rule: 014 A1 **CP3028**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept in Principle

**Subcommittee Comment:**

See CP3027

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Section: 1 Rule: 015 Intent **CP3425**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept as Modified

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**New Text**

Section: 1 Rule: 016 **CP3029**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**New Text**

Section: 2 Area Lighting      **CP3477**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Engmann, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Section: 2 Effective Ground      **CP3453**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (6) Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**New Text**

Section: 2 Effectively Grounded      **CP3450**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (6) Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (1) Bleakley

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

Bleakley (Negative) The proposed definition for Effectively grounded neutral with suggested revision follows:

Effectively Grounded Neutral Conductor: A conductor that is intentionally connected to the source transformer neutral directly or through an impedance to limit phase to ground fault current and has a minimum of four grounds in each mile of line. The conductor shall be of sufficient size to carry the available fault current and allow protective devices to operate promptly under fault conditions.

The phrase " a minimum of" should be replaced with the phrase "not less than"

The use of the word "minimum" was generally changed to "not less than" to alleviate the questions about whether the rule is requiring 4 and only 4 grounds in each mile or not less than 4 grounds in each mile. See the wording in Rule 96C.

---

**New Text**

Section: 2 Engineering Sup      **CP3478**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Engmann, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**New Text**

Section: 2 Premises Wiring      **CP3476**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Engmann, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**New Text**

Section: 2 Rule: Def authorized person **CP3365**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept as Modified

**Subcommittee Comment:**

This proposal is the result of the work of the NESC-NEC Task Force set up by IEEE and NFPA to coordinate the scope and application of each code. This definition is necessary to support other definitions and rules dealing with exclusive control by utilities, including its authorized representatives.

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**New Text**

Section: 2 Rule: Def Clearance **CP3206**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**New Text**

Section: 2 Rule: Def Communication Lines **CP3022**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept in Principle

**Subcommittee Comment:**

See CP3208

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Section: 2 Rule: Def Communication lines **CP3208**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Section: 2 Rule: Def conduit **CP3366**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept as Modified

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (8) Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (1) Bleakley

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

Bleakley (Negative) The proposed definitions are for terms not used in the code. CP 3370 was rejected by SC 7.

---

**Revised Text**

Section: 2 Rule: Def elec supply station **CP3433**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept as Modified

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**New Text**

Section: 2 Rule: Def Excl Cntrl Utility **CP3418**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept as Modified

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Engmann, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**New Text**

Section: 2 Rule: Def Exclusive Control **CP3417**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (8) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Section: 2 Rule: Def lines **CP3435**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept as Modified

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (8) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Section: 2 Rule: Def open conductors **CP3367**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept as Modified

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Section: 2 Rule: Def Random separation **CP3025**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept in Principle

**Subcommittee Comment:**

See SC action on CP3209.

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (8) Bleakley, Christofersen, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (1) Clapp

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

Clapp (Negative) See comment on CP3209.

---

**Revised Text**

Section: 2 Rule: Def Random separation **CP3209**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (8) Bleakley, Christofersen, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (1) Clapp

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

Clapp (Negative) The term “no deliberate separation” was intentionally added in the past to indicate that the cables do not have to be separated from one another and, therefore, should be left in the rule, since the intent is to allow these items to touch, as opposed to still keeping some clearance between the cables that is less than 12 inches. If the desire is to add the 12 inch language, it should be added without deleting the reference to no deliberate separation. I suggest the following would be better if the 12-inch language is absolutely necessary (which I do not object to, but do not see the need for): “Installed with less than 12 inches of separation and without deliberate separation.”

---

**New Text**

Section: 2 Rule: Def Restricted Access **CP3419**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept as Modified

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (8) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**New Text**

Section: 2 Rule: Def Spacing **CP3211**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**New Text**

Section: 2 Rule: Def Supported facility **CP3212**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**New Text**

Section: 2 Rule: Def Supporting structure **CP3210**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**New Text**

Section: 2 Rule: Def supporting structure **CP3364**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Reject

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (8) Bleakley, Christofersen, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (1) Clapp

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

Clapp (Negative) The 2002 Edition deliberately adopted the maximum starting point height for the required 8-ft gap at 6 feet above the permanent support (ground) level to recognize that the data in the OSHA hearings that led to the OSHA 6-ft starting point for requiring fall protection indicates that a fall from heights above the 6-ft level brings with it a significantly increased probability of permanent injury, including paraplegia and quadriplegia. If the structure is readily climbable to a level above 6 ft, it should carry a safety sign warning against climbing the structure, as required by Rule 217. Thus, the 6-ft limitation placed in the code in the 2002 Edition should be returned and kept in the code.

---

**New Text**

Section: 2 Rule: Def Supv Installation **CP3420**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept as Modified

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (7) Bleakley, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)  
**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**New Text**

Section: 2 Rule: Def Surge (lightning) Ar **CP3023**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept as Modified

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Section: 2 Rule: Def Utility **CP3421**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept in Principle

**Subcommittee Comment:**

See CP3407

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (7) Bleakley, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Section: 2 Rule: Def Utilization Equipmen **CP3422**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept as Modified

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Engmann, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Section: 2 Rule: Def V&L conductors **CP3368**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**New Text**

Section: 2 Rule: Def vault **CP3434**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept as Modified

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Section: 3 NFPA 70 **CP3359**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Section: 3 Z535 references      **CP3442**

*Also Part:1 Section:11 110 A1 SC3*

*Part:1 Section:12 124 C1 SC3*

*Part:1 Section:14 146 B SC3*

*Part:2 Section:21 217 A1c SC4*

*Part:2 Section:21 217 A2a SC4*

*Part:3 Section:32 323 C4 SC7*

*Part:3 Section:38 381 G2 SC7*

*Part:4 Section:41 411 D SC8*

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept in Part

**Subcommittee Comment:**

Revised references in Section 3

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (9) Bleakley, Christofersen, Clapp, Dagenhart, Denbrock, Hooper, Hyland, Komassa, Tomaseski

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Part: 2 Section: 23 Rule: 230 B      **CP3454**

*Also Part:2 Section:25 251 B SC5*

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** No action needed.

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (0)

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Part: 2 Section: 23 Rule: 230 B1 **CP3437**

*Also Part:2 Section:23 230 Figure 230-1 SC4*

*Part:2 Section:23 230 Table 230-1 SC4*

*Part:2 Section:23 230 Table 230-2 SC4*

*Part:2 Section:25 250 B SC5*

*Part:2 Section:25 250 D SC5*

*Part:2 Section:25 250 Figure 250-1 SC5*

*Part:2 Section:25 250 Table 250-1 SC5*

*Part:2 Section:25 250 Table 251-1 SC5*

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** No Action Needed

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (0)

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Part: 2 Section: 23 Rule: 231 A **CP3430**

*Also Part:3 Section:38 380 D SC7*

*Part:3 Section:38 384 C SC7*

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** No Action Needed

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (0)

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Part: 2 Section: 25 Rule: 250 C1, Table 250-2 **CP3459**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (0)

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---

**Revised Text**

Part: 2 Section: 26 Rule: 261 A2a **CP3458**

**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept

**Subcommittee Comment:**

**Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**

**Affirmative:** (0)

**Negative:** (0)

**Abstention:** (0)

**Explanation of Vote:**

---