

NESC© 2007 Edition Revision Process
On-Line Database
 Meeting Minutes

[Back to
Home Page](#)

[Query/Modify
Records](#)

[Reports](#)

[Prepare for
Meetings](#)

[Meetings
Area](#)

[NESC
Zone](#)

[NESC Revision Process
Home Page](#)

NESC SUBCOMMITTEE 2
 GROUNDING METHODS
 30 Sep, 2003 - 01 Oct, 2003
 IEEE, Piscataway, NJ

Name	Voting	Organization	09/30	10/1
Jeffrey Boksiner (Principal)	Y	ATIS	X	X
Harvey L Bowles (Principal)	Y	RUS	X	X
A.C Channaiah (Principal)	Y	SEEX	X	X
John B Dagenhart (Principal)	Y	IEEE/PES/T&D	X	X
Michael M Dixon (Principal)	Y	EEI	X	X
Lauren E Gaunt (Alternate)	N	EEI	A	A
Ned Maxwell (Principal)	N	NARUC	A	A
Robert Molde (Principal)	Y	EEI	X	X
Joseph Muccilo (Alternate)	N	EIA	A	A
Terry W Page (Alternate)	N	SEEX	A	A
Percy E Pool (Principal)	Y	EIA	X	X
Ewell T Robeson (Principal)	Y	EEI	X	X
Robert D Saint (Principal)	Y	NRECA	X	X
James R Tomaseski (Principal)	Y	IBEW	A	A
William J Turner (Alternate)	N	EEI	A	A
Donald W Zipse (Principal)	Y	IEEE/IAS	X	X

Guest

Gregg Allen		South Atlantic, LLC	X	
Larry Romero		WAPA	X	X
Nelson Uher		Progress Energy	X	X
Sue Vogel		IEEE	X	X

X - Present A - Absent

Chair: John Dagenhart **Secretary:** Ewell Robeson

Notes: SC2 approved a motion to take a recommendation to Subcommittee 1 on removing the words "ground rods" from Rule 017B. Ground rod dimensions are specific and not nominal in Rule 094B2.

CP 2831 was made to address IR 532

Revised Text

Section: 09

Rule: 092 B3

CP2706

Subcommittee Recommendation: Accept as modified

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

Affirmative: (11) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski, Zipse

Negative: (0)

Abstention: (0)

Explanation of Vote:

New Text

Section: 09

Rule: 094 B7

CP2715

Subcommittee Recommendation: Accept as modified

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

Affirmative: (10) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski

Negative: (0)

Abstention: (1) Zipse

Explanation of Vote:

New Text

Section: 9

Rule: 090

CP2738

Subcommittee Recommendation: Reject

Subcommittee Comment:

The submitters intent is covered by the scope of Section 9 in Rule 091.

Affirmative: (10) Boksiner, Bowles, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski, Zipse

Negative: (1) Channaiah

Abstention: (0)

Explanation of Vote:

CHANNIAH: This proposal was submitted to include language and clarity in consistent with exiting similar language in other parts of the code such as: in Part 2, Rule 200 - Purpose and in Part 3, Rule 300 - Purpose. The committee did not recognize this fact and voted against this proposal with the understanding the "Scope" and not the "Purpose" should include such details. Although, I agree with their interpretation, including the suggested change in the CP would have provided consistency and clarity for the users. This need was based on the fact that in the Section 090 "Grounding Methods", the rules for grounding are covered in other parts of the code, but the methods of grounding are covered in Section 090. In addition this Section applies to the entire code, even though it is identified as a separate Section, outside other parts of the code. This fact is not clearly understood by some users, which was discovered in NESC training schools. Consequently, this CP was introduced to help clarify applicability of Section 090-Grounding Methods.

New Text

Section: 9

Rule: 092 B1

CP2769

Subcommittee Recommendation: Reject

Subcommittee Comment:

This is already covered by Rule 097D2.

A similar proposal was submitted for the NESC 2002 revision cycle, which was also rejected by Subcommittee 2.

No new information has been presented.

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:

Affirmative: (10) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski

Negative: (1) Zipse

Abstention: (0)

Explanation of Vote:

ZIPSE: Persons taking showers have been shocked from free flowing, uncontrolled current over the earth, grounding and bonding systems, metallic water piping, etc.

Revised Text

Section: 9

Rule: 092 B2b(3)

CP2606

Subcommittee Recommendation: Accept

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

Affirmative: (10) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski, Zipse

Negative: (0)

Abstention: (1) Pool

Explanation of Vote:

Revised Text

Section: 9

Rule: 092 C3b

CP2644

Subcommittee Recommendation: Reject

Subcommittee Comment:

The proposal states that the overhead conductor is not always grounded, therefore it cannot be an overhead ground wire. Subcommittee 2 concludes that the current definition is adequate.

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:

Affirmative: (11) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski, Zipse

Negative: (0)

Abstention: (0)

Explanation of Vote:

Revised Text

Section: 9

Rule: 092 D

CP2538

Subcommittee Recommendation: Accept as modified

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

Affirmative: (9) Boksiner, Bowles, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski

Negative: (2) Zipse, Channaiah

Abstention: (0)

Explanation of Vote:

CHANNIAH: This proposal deals with investigation and remedial of objectionable ground currents, where warranted. It has some positive as well as some not so positive changes recommended. I do support the proposed numbered parts/items 1 though 4 in the proposal, which are very beneficial, except the language in new item#5. That

is item #5 states, other effective methods should be employed subject to approval of administrative authority. I am not sure why other appropriate methods employed should be subject to approval of the administrative authority, in order to mitigate the objectionable currents. Other appropriate methods should be pursued any way to find a solution to the problem and without the need to go to the administrative authority to seek to solve a safety concern. I do not support replacing the existing word “should” in the opening paragraph with “may” for the following reason: § Investigation of objectionable current and mitigating such current is a solution to a safety concern for humans and animals and requires a proactive action. This should be a requirement (“should” rule) as in the existing rule, and not an option (“may” rule) as proposed by this CP. Hence, it is recommended that the existing wording of “should” be retained. The author of this comment is not aware of customers cutting grounds as a result of perceived objectionable ground currents on multigrounded systems and misapplication of rule 92D.as stated. It should be recognized that objectionable ground currents and the attendant stray voltage concerns at customer’s facilities are commonly a problem as a result of poor electrical wiring, grounding and bonding, and poor maintenance practices at such facilities. So, it takes a well coordinated effort and adequate education and communication between a utility and concerned customer to amicably resolve first, before going to the administrative authority level as suggested by item #3 in the supporting comments.

ZIPSE: I agree with some parts of Mr. A.C Channaiah’s comments. “This proposal deals with investigation and remedial of objectionable ground currents, where warranted. It has some positive as well as some not so positive changes recommended. I do support the proposed numbered parts/items 1 through 4 in the proposal, which are very beneficial, except the language in new item #5. That is item #5 states, other effective methods should be employed subject to approval of administrative authority. I am not sure why other appropriate methods employed should be subject to approval of the administrative authority, in order to mitigate the objectionable currents.

“Other appropriate methods should be pursued any way to find a solution to the problem and without the need to go to the administrative authority to seek to solve a safety concern.

“I do not support replacing the existing word “should” in the opening paragraph with “may” for the following reason:

“Investigation of objectionable current and mitigating such current is a solution to a safety concern for humans and animals and requires a proactive action. This should be a requirement (“should” rule) as in the existing rule, and not an option (“may” rule) as proposed by this CP. Hence, it is recommended that the existing wording of “should” be retained.”

The paragraph beginning with “Under normal system conditions a grounding conductor current . . .” is totally unacceptable and must be deleted. It is not the “system’s owner/operator” who is being denied the use of his or her’s swimming pool, hot tub, metallic swing set as is occurring in Brick Township, NJ and in other places within the United States. It is not the “system’s owner/operator” who is concern over the loss of someone else’s cows and pigs because of the system’s owner/operator’s stray current flowing uncontrolled over the earth.

The “Note” as it is written is incorrect, vague and inexplicit and must be removed or modified to make it correct.

Revised Text

Section: 9

Rule: 092 E

CP2714**Subcommittee Recommendation: Reject**

Subcommittee Comment:

The term "other parts of this code" are used in other parts of this code.

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:

Affirmative: (11) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski, Zipse

Negative: (0)

Abstention: (0)

Explanation of Vote:

Revised Text

Section: 9

Rule: 093 B

CP2793

Subcommittee Recommendation: Reject

Subcommittee Comment:

The existing rule is adequate. The proposed rule is more of a design specification.

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:

Affirmative: (11) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski, Zipse

Negative: (0)

Abstention: (0)

Explanation of Vote:

New Text

Section: 9

Rule: 094 A and B

CP2708

Subcommittee Recommendation: Accept in principle.

Subcommittee Comment:

See CP 2715.

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:

Affirmative: (10) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski

Negative: (0)

Abstention: (1) Zipse

Explanation of Vote:

Revised Text

Section: 9

Rule: 094 A(1)

CP2671**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept as modified**Subcommittee Comment:****Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:****Affirmative:** (9) Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski, Zipse**Negative:** (2) Pool, Boksiner**Abstention:** (0)**Explanation of Vote:**

BOSKSINER: The proposed rule change provides for safety in case of changes to the water piping system that is not under the control of the utility.

POOL: The supplemental electrode is necessary to ensure safety in cases where changes to the water piping system are not under the control of the utility.

New Text

Section: 9

Rule: 094 B.2

CP2790**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Reject.**Subcommittee Comment:**

There is insufficient justification given, from a performance standpoint, for changing the rule.

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**Affirmative:** (11) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski, Zipse**Negative:** (0)**Abstention:** (0)**Explanation of Vote:**

Revised Text

Section: 9

Rule: 094 B2a

CP2732**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Reject.

Subcommittee Comment:

There is insufficient justification given, from a performance standpoint, for changing the rule.

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:

Affirmative: (11) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski, Zipse

Negative: (0)

Abstention: (0)

Explanation of Vote:

Revised Text

Section: 9

Rule: 094 B2a

CP2731

Subcommittee Recommendation: Reject

Subcommittee Comment:

There is insufficient justification given, from a performance standpoint, for changing the rule.

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:

Affirmative: (11) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski, Zipse

Negative: (0)

Abstention: (0)

Explanation of Vote:

New Text

Section: 9

Rule: 094 C

CP2794

Subcommittee Recommendation: Reject

Subcommittee Comment:

The Subcommittee does not think the proposed changes are necessary.

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:

Affirmative: (8) Boksiner, Bowles, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Zipse

Negative: (3) Tomaseski, Dagenhart, Channaiah

Abstention: (0)

Explanation of Vote:

CHANNIAH: Presently, there are no guidelines in the code for locating ground electrodes, specifically ground rods at structure locations. As a result, many utilities have installed ground rods in pole holes, undermining the effectiveness of grounding. By placing the ground rod in pole holes leads to: (1) Lack of tight fit into the surrounding soil to discharge the abnormal currents, during lightning, fault and unbalanced loading conditions. (2) Limits the surface area of contact due to proximity to pole surface which is not conductive. (3) Increases the current density at the interface of ground rod and earth due to decreased surface area, contributes to drying effect and increased soil contact resistance. (4) Pole movement contributes to movement of the rod, increased contact resistance and soil dryness, and again inefficient current discharge to surrounding soil. (5) Wood pole being hygroscopic, absorbs moisture from the immediate surrounding soil and thus leaves the soil dry, which increases the soil resistance and associated inferior performance of the ground rod. During pole inspection and treatment, ground rod in the pole hole interferes with such pole treatment and possible chemicals covering the conductive surface of the soil, in addition to loosening the ground rod again, which will take quite some time to attain firm contact with the surrounding soil. (6) Situations of ground connection problems are experienced during the pole treatment process. This proposal was attempting to alleviate some of the above problems by proposing some guidelines for ground rod placement. I do hope this Committee would consider modifying this proposal and adopt some practical ideas offered by this CP.

DAGENHART: I think the change proposal has merit.

TOMASESKI: I agree with the comments provided by Mr. Channaiah and Mr. Dagenhart.

New Text

Section: 9

Rule: 094 C

CP2793

Subcommittee Recommendation: Reject

Subcommittee Comment:

The existing rule is adequate. The proposed rule is more of a design specification.

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:

Affirmative: (11) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski, Zipse

Negative: (0)

Abstention: (0)

Explanation of Vote:

Revised Text

Section: 9

Rule: 096 B

CP2605

Subcommittee Recommendation: Accept

Subcommittee Comment:

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:

Affirmative: (11) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski, Zipse
Negative: (0)
Abstention: (0)

Explanation of Vote:

Deleted Text

Section: 9
Rule: 096 C
CP2775

Subcommittee Recommendation: Duplicate See CP 2774

Subcommittee Comment:

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:

Affirmative: (0)
Negative: (0)
Abstention: (0)

Explanation of Vote:

Deleted Text

Section: 9
Rule: 096 C
CP2774

Subcommittee Recommendation: Reject

Subcommittee Comment:

This CP in effect is trying to eliminate an effectively grounded system which has been shown to perform safely.

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:

Affirmative: (10) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski
Negative: (1) Zipse
Abstention: (0)

Explanation of Vote:

ZIPSE: Multigrounded neutral distribution system may perform in a safe mode for humans, dairy cows and others if the multigrounded neutral distribution system is installed, operated and maintained in accordance with the NESC Rules, providing the NESC Rules are stringently followed including Rule 214, however in my experience it is the exception rather than the rule that utilities comply with Rule 214 and perform the necessary maintenance. Measurements have been made that show there exist a multigrounded neutral distribution system with the level of stray currents was insufficient to harm dairy cows. In addition, I have been informed of another multigrounded neutral distribution system that also has insufficient stray current to harm dairy cows and humans. The problem still exists and unfortunately the subcommittee has elected to maintain the status quo.

New Text

Section: 9

Rule: 096 C

CP2831**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept**Subcommittee Comment:****Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:****Affirmative:** (11) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski, Zipse**Negative:** (0)**Abstention:** (0)**Explanation of Vote:**

Revised Text

Section: 9

Rule: 097 A

CP2644**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Reject**Subcommittee Comment:**

The proposal states that the overhead conductor is not always grounded, therefore it cannot be an overhead ground wire. Subcommittee 2 concludes that the current definition is adequate.

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**Affirmative:** (11) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski, Zipse**Negative:** (0)**Abstention:** (0)**Explanation of Vote:**

Deleted Text

Section: 9

Rule: 097 B 2

CP2772**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Reject**Subcommittee Comment:**

See CP2769

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:

Affirmative: (10) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski

Negative: (1) Zipse

Abstention: (0)

Explanation of Vote:

ZIPSE: See CP supporting comments.

Revised Text

Section: 9

Rule: 097 C

CP2773

Subcommittee Recommendation: Reject

Subcommittee Comment:

See CP2769

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:

Affirmative: (10) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski

Negative: (1) Zipse

Abstention: (0)

Explanation of Vote:

Don Zipse: See CP supporting comments.

Revised Text

Section: 9

Rule: 097 D 2

CP2771

Subcommittee Recommendation: Reject

Subcommittee Comment:

No data has been submitted to show 6ft minimum has cause any problems.

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:

Affirmative: (10) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski

Negative: (1) Zipse

Abstention: (0)

Explanation of Vote:

ZIPSE: A ground electrode has a sphere of influence around the electrode equal to the depth of the electrode. See attached diagram.

Revised Text

Section: 9

Rule: 097 D 2

CP2770**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Reject**Subcommittee Comment:**

See CP2769

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**Affirmative:** (10) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski**Negative:** (1) Zipse**Abstention:** (0)**Explanation of Vote:**

ZIPSE: See CP supporting comments.

Revised Text

Section: 9

Rule: 097 D 2

CP2769**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Reject**Subcommittee Comment:**

This is already covered by Rule 097D2.

A similar proposal was submitted for the NESC 2002 revision cycle, which was also rejected by Subcommittee 2.

No new information has been presented.

A similar proposal was submitted for the NESC 2002 revision cycle, which was also rejected by Subcommittee 2.

No new information has been presented.

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**Affirmative:** (10) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski**Negative:** (1) Zipse**Abstention:** (0)**Explanation of Vote:**

ZIPSE: Persons taking showers have been shocked from free flowing, uncontrolled current over the earth, grounding and bonding systems, metallic water piping, etc.

New Text

Section: 9

Rule: 097 D2

CP2629**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept**Subcommittee Comment:****Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:****Affirmative:** (10) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski**Negative:** (1) Zipse**Abstention:** (0)**Explanation of Vote:**

ZIPSE: It is unnecessary to add the added sentence.

New Text

Section: 9

Rule: 097 D2

CP2607**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept as modified**Subcommittee Comment:**

Note 3 as proposed does not apply to 97D1 & 97D2. It applies to 97D1 only.

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:**Affirmative:** (11) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski, Zipse**Negative:** (0)**Abstention:** (0)**Explanation of Vote:**

Deleted Text

Section: 9

Rule: 097 G

CP2672**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Reject

Subcommittee Comment:

The change proposal tried to accomplish too much in one CP.

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:

Affirmative: (9) Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski, Zipse

Negative: (2) Pool, Boksiner

Abstention: (0)

Explanation of Vote:

BOKSINER & POOL: This proposal consolidates rules relating to communication systems. It significantly increases the usability of the NESC.

Revised Text

Section: 9

Rule: 097 G

CP2539

Subcommittee Recommendation: Accept

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

Affirmative: (11) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski, Zipse

Negative: (0)

Abstention: (0)

Explanation of Vote:

Revised Text

Section: 9

Rule: 099

CP2672

Subcommittee Recommendation: Reject

Subcommittee Comment:

The change proposal tried to accomplish too much in one CP.

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:

Affirmative: (9) Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski, Zipse

Negative: (2) Pool, Boksiner

Abstention: (0)

Explanation of Vote:

BOKSINER & POOL: This proposal consolidates rules relating to communication systems. It significantly increases the usability of the NESC.

Revised Text

Section: 9

Rule: 099 B

CP2632**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept as Modified**Subcommittee Comment:****Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:****Affirmative:** (11) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski, Zipse**Negative:** (0)**Abstention:** (0)**Explanation of Vote:**

Revised Text

Section: 9

Rule: 099 C

CP2633**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Accept as Modified**Subcommittee Comment:****Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:****Affirmative:** (11) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski, Zipse**Negative:** (0)**Abstention:** (0)**Explanation of Vote:**

Revised Text

Section: 9

Rule: 099 C

CP2535**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Reject**Subcommittee Comment:**

No need to change existing wording. The change would allow bonding to gas piping.

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:

Affirmative: (11) Boksiner, Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Pool, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski, Zipse

Negative: (0)

Abstention: (0)

Explanation of Vote:

New Text

Section: 9

Rule: 099 D

CP2634**Subcommittee Recommendation:** Reject**Subcommittee Comment:**

The requirement for grounding and bonding are covered in other parts of this code and the methods employed for grounding is covered in Section 09 – Grounding Methods. The requirement for bonding of above ground metallic apparatus separated by 6 feet or less is covered in Part 3, Rule 350F. Hence the proposed rule change is not appropriate in the context of grounding and bonding requirements.

If the author of this CP feels, that the existing Rule 350F does not adequately address his concerns, it is recommended that he may introduce similar CP in part 2.

If the author of this CP feels, that the existing Rule 350F does not adequately address his concerns, it is recommended that he may introduce similar CP in part 2.

Vote on Subcommittee Recommendation:

Affirmative: (9) Bowles, Channaiah, Dagenhart, Dixon, Molde, Robeson, Saint, Tomaseski, Zipse

Negative: (2) Pool, Boksiner

Abstention: (0)

Explanation of Vote:

BOKSINER: This Proposal should be Accepted or Accepted in Principle. It contains important safety measures. Section 9 contains several requirements for bonding on systems that are required to be grounded, for example, in Rule 92C3a, 92C3b, 92E2, 92E3, 92E4, 92E6, 97G, and 99C. Thus, there is suitable precedent to formulate in Section 9 a requirement for bonding between above-ground metallic power and communications apparatus. A suitable wording for such requirement would be:

"Common bonding shall be provided between all above ground metallic power and communications apparatus (pedestals, terminals, apparatus cases, transformer cases, etc.) that are separated by a distance of 1.8 m (6 ft) or less where any of the apparatus is required to be grounded by other parts of this code. Common bonding shall also be required between all such above ground metallic power and communications apparatus and any grounding conductor (such as a vertical pole ground) that are separated by a distance of 1.8 m (6 ft) or less."

POOL: This Proposal should be either Accepted or Accepted in Principle. It contains important safety measures. Section 9 contains several requirements for bonding on systems that are required to be grounded, for example, in

Rule 92C3a, 92C3b, 92E2, 92E3, 92E4, 92E6, 97G, and 99C. Thus, there is precedent to formulate in Section 9 a requirement for bonding between above-ground metallic power and communications apparatus. A revised proposal is offered for consideration:

099D Common Bonding. Where above ground metallic power and communications apparatus (pedestals, terminals, apparatus cases, transformer cases, etc.) are separated by a distance of 1.8 m (6 ft) or less, common bonding shall be provided between them.

Where above ground metallic power and communications apparatus and any grounding conductor (such as a vertical pole ground) are separated by a distance of 1.8 m (6 ft) or less, common bonding shall also be required.
