

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE**

Clearinghouse Rule Number: 08-047		Hearing Location: Madison	
Rule Number: Ch. Comm 16		Hearing Date: June 18, 2008	
Relating to: Electrical Construction			
Comments: Oral or Exhibit No.	Presenter, Group Represented, City and State	Comments/Recommendations	Agency Response
Speaker 1	John R. Grau Affordable Electric, Inc. 337 W. Donges Bay Road Mequon, WI 53092	<p>a. Opposes the requirement for arc-fault circuit-interrupters (AFCI) because of the expense of the devices, that the devices are not readily available and that the testers are not readily available.</p> <p>b. Opposes tamper-resistant outlets because these devices are not readily available and believes the fiscal estimate is not accurate. Believes these requirements will add an estimated \$1,500 to the cost of a 2,000-square-foot home because these receptacles are not 80 cents, but \$4 at Menard's when they can be found.</p>	<p>a. Disagree. The National Electrical Code (NEC) first included arc-fault circuit-interrupters (AFCI) in its 1999 edition with an effective date for the AFCI protection of January 1, 2002. When considering that edition, the department did not adopt the NEC requirement for arc-fault circuit-interrupters in dwelling-unit bedrooms.</p> <p>The 2008 NEC requirements expand the use of the device to additional circuits supplying outlets in a dwelling including dining rooms, living rooms, family rooms, hallways, sun rooms, recreation rooms, libraries, parlors, dens and similar rooms or areas. The AFCI device now provides the level of protection that was originally expected.</p> <p>A recent check of availability at a major home repair store indicated that AFCI circuit breakers were available and priced at less than \$40 each.</p> <p>There is no requirement for electricians or others to purchase a tester for AFCI devices. Underwriters Laboratories mandates that each device be provided with its own test button to determine if the device is functioning properly. No testing beyond that of the test button is required for the devices.</p> <p>b. Disagree. Tamper-resistant receptacles as required in NEC section 406.11 are available from manufacturers in various grades including a lower-priced homeowner line that is typically used in dwelling applications; a specification grade that would be common in a commercial application; and a hospital grade. A device in the \$4 price range is more indicative of a specification grade device. The Department is confident that its fiscal estimate is accurate.</p>

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE**

Clearinghouse Rule Number: 08-047		Hearing Location: Madison	
Rule Number: Ch. Comm 16		Hearing Date: June 18, 2008	
Relating to: Electrical Construction			
Comments: Oral or Exhibit No.	Presenter, Group Represented, City and State	Comments/Recommendations	Agency Response
		<p>c. Opposes the removal of GFCI exceptions for sump pumps, refrigerators and freezers because GFCI in these applications have proved to be problematic. Believes this is an area where the Wisconsin code does not have to be consistent with the NEC.</p>	<p>c. Agree in part. The proposal has been modified with an exception that permits a single receptacle without GFCI protection for sump and sewage pumps.</p>
<p>Speaker 2 Exhibit 1</p>	<p>Cindi Gruebling Wisconsin Builders Assoc. 4868 High Crossing Blvd. Madison, WI 53704</p>	<p>a. Requests removal of the requirement relating to tamper-resistant receptacles throughout new dwellings. Believes increased costs will be more substantial than the Department's estimate. Includes a statement from National Association of Home Builders' draft indicating there is no scientific research available which has proven tamper-resistant receptacles are more effective than other safety devices that are currently available on the market. Believes the NEC section 406.11 should not apply in WI until further study can be done on its impact on affordable housing.</p> <p>b. Opposes the requirement that AFCIs be required throughout all new dwelling construction. Believes there is no hard data proving that AFCIs throughout a new dwelling will prevent fires. Indicates the increased costs will be more substantial than the Department's estimate because the requirement may include hidden costs in labor and the use of additional wiring supplies. Indicates higher costs will price prospective home buyers out of the market and recommends that NEC section 210.12 should not apply in Wisconsin.</p> <p>c. Indicates general acceptance of ground-fault circuit interrupter protection location specified in NEC 210.8 (A) (1) through (8), but opposes the inclusion of unfinished basements that may have sump or sewage pumps. Proposes new language excepting ground fault protection for a dedicated branch circuit serving a single receptacle for sewage or sump pumps.</p>	<p>a. Disagree. The effectiveness of these passive devices should exceed that of manual devices such as receptacle plugs or caps.</p> <p>b. Disagree. See response to Speaker 1. Comment a.</p> <p>c. Agree. The proposal has been modified with an exception that permits a single receptacle without GFCI protection for sump and sewage pumps.</p>

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE**

Clearinghouse Rule Number: 08-047		Hearing Location: Madison	
Rule Number: Ch. Comm 16		Hearing Date: June 18, 2008	
Relating to: Electrical Construction			
Comments: Oral or Exhibit No.	Presenter, Group Represented, City and State	Comments/Recommendations	Agency Response
Speaker 3 Exhibit 2	David Boetcher IBEW State Conference 916 Lexington Way Waunakee, WI 53597	<p>a. Expresses concern that the Comm 16.110 requirement that removes meter sockets and meter pedestals from the requirements under NEC section 110.10 will put workers and the public at risk. Indicates the removal of the NEC requirement will result in improperly applied and underrated meter sockets and meter pedestals. Recommends the use of the NEC section 110.10 without modification.</p> <p>b. Recommends eliminating the exception in Comm 16.430 relating to the location of the disconnecting means. Indicates this is a safety requirement for workers and having the disconnecting means located within sight of a motor encourages proper use of “lock-out/tag-out” by offering a nearby location to safety disconnect the motor. Believes this is also consistent with federal regulations.</p> <p>c. Proposes eliminating the addition in Comm 16.517 relating to essential electrical system overcurrent devices be selectively coordinated with all supply side overcurrent protective devices for a fault with duration of 0.1 seconds or longer. Indicates the NEC has had this requirement for nearly 15 years and provides safety for all types of overloads, short-circuits, ground faults and arcing faults, and for all times associated with these overcurrent conditions and recommends the use of the NEC without modification to provide the safest conditions.</p>	<p>a. Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the exception in Comm 16.110 (2).</p> <p>b. Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the exception in Comm 16.430.</p> <p>c. Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the addition in Comm 16.517.</p>
Speaker 4 Exhibit 3	Gordon Pierret Ring & DuChateau, Inc. 10101 Innovation Drive Milwaukee, WI 53097	<p>Supports the requirements under sections Comm 16.517, 16.700, 16.701 and 16.708 relating to selective coordination because he believes the current language as indicated in NFPA 70 has not accomplished its primary goal, which is to provide safer electrical systems. Indicates the following reasons are why the current electrical distribution system has not become safer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadvertent raising the arc flash levels. • Ground fault tripping issues. • Electrical design ramifications. <p>Indicates the Code Making Panels associated with NFPA 99 has also proposed the insertion of the 0.1 second language, which is similar to Wisconsin’s proposed language.</p>	<p>Support noted. However, the proposal has been modified to eliminate the additions in Comm 16.517, 16.700 (4), 16.701 (3) and 16.708 relating to a mandated time limit. This allows the engineer to selectively coordinate the system to the extent feasible given the parameters of devices available from manufacturers.</p>

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE**

Clearinghouse Rule Number: 08-047		Hearing Location: Madison	
Rule Number: Ch. Comm 16		Hearing Date: June 18, 2008	
Relating to: Electrical Construction			
Comments: Oral or Exhibit No.	Presenter, Group Represented, City and State	Comments/Recommendations	Agency Response
Speaker 5 Exhibit 4	Pattie Stone Metropolitan Builders Assn. N16 W23321 Stone Ridge Waukesha, WI 53188	Opposes AFCI and GFCI requirements. Comments similar to Speaker 2. Exhibit 1.	Agree in part. The proposal has been modified with an exception that permits a single receptacle without GFCI protection for sump and sewage pumps. See response to Speaker 1. Comment a. and response to Speaker 2. Comment c.
Speaker 6 Exhibit 5	Brad Gruenewald We Energies/ Wisconsin Utilities Assoc. 189 E. Gauer Circle Milwaukee, WI 53207	Supports the exception for meter pedestal as specified in Comm 16.110 (2) for the following reasons: 1. Electrical code advisory council voted for exclusion. 2. Meter sockets and pedestals are tested under UL 414. 3. We Energies customers are having no problem with meter sockets and pedestals due to this issue. 4. The NEC requirement would increase costs of at least \$1,250 for customers. 5. The weakest link in meter sockets and pedestals is the meter. 6. Other states such as Georgia and Florida are not enforcing NEC 110.10. 7. Wisconsin has ruled before on the issue that "Fault current ratings are not currently being required for meter sockets."	Support noted. However, the proposal has been modified to eliminate the exception in Comm 16.110 (2) because of concerns expressed during the public hearing.
Speaker 7 Exhibit 6	Steve Hansen Senior Field Engineer N38 W32973 Lake Country Drive Nashotah, WI 53058	Comment similar to Speaker 3. Exhibit 2. Comment c. Indicates concern that the Wisconsin proposal will not require selective coordination under short circuit conditions. Cites the Code Making Panel 13 (CMP13) comment 13-204 in the 2008 ROC (report on comments), "The overriding theme of Articles 700 and 701 is to keep the power on throughout an emergency situation, for life safety. Selective coordination increases the reliability of the emergency system. Selective coordination is essential for the continuity of service required in emergency and legally required standby circuits."	Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the addition in Comm 16.517.
Speaker 8 Exhibit 7	Bill Neitzel City of Madison 1405 Droster Road Madison, WI 53716	a. Recommends deleting Comm 16.210 (5) relating to common area branch circuits because it is an addition to the requirements of NEC 210.25 and does not require separation of common area branch circuits for service upgrades for existing 2-family dwellings only.	a. Disagree. There is no documentation provided to indicate a problem with this present allowance.

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE**

Clearinghouse Rule Number: 08-047		Hearing Location: Madison	
Rule Number: Ch. Comm 16		Hearing Date: June 18, 2008	
Relating to: Electrical Construction			
Comments: Oral or Exhibit No.	Presenter, Group Represented, City and State	Comments/Recommendations	Agency Response
		<p>b. Recommends deleting Comm 16.110 (2) relating to circuit impedance, and that the requirements specified in NEC 110.10 do not apply to meter sockets and meter pedestals.</p> <p>c. Recommends changing the proposal code language in Comm 16.230 (3) (b) relating to the allowable length of service entrance busways. Suggests the following: "Service entrance busway shall be permitted to exceed 8 feet with written permission of the department."</p> <p>d. Recommends deleting Comm 16.334 (2) relating to nonmetallic-sheathed cable: Types NM, NMC and NMS.</p> <p>e. Recommends deleting the Department's exception in Comm 16.430 relating to a separate disconnecting means that does not require a motor where the disconnecting means for the controller is individually capable of being locked in the open position.</p> <p>f. Recommends deleting Comm 16.517 relating to essential electrical system overcurrent device to be selectively coordinated with all supply side overcurrent protective devices for faults with a duration of 0.1 seconds or longer.</p> <p>g. Recommends deleting Comm 16.700 (4) relating to emergency system overcurrent devices being selectively coordinated with all supply side overcurrent protective devices for faults with a duration of 0.1 seconds or longer.</p> <p>h. Recommends deleting Comm 16.701(3) relating to legally required standby system overcurrent devices shall be selectively coordinated with all supply side overcurrent protective devices for faults with a duration of 0.1 seconds or longer.</p>	<p>b. Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the exception in Comm 16.110 (2).</p> <p>c. Agree. By removing the proposed language the base rule of 8 feet applies.</p> <p>d. Disagree. There have been no reports of problems with these installations.</p> <p>e. Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the exception in Comm 16.430.</p> <p>f. Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the addition in Comm 16.517.</p> <p>g. Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the addition in Comm 16.700 (4).</p> <p>h. Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the addition in Comm 16.701 (3).</p>

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE**

Clearinghouse Rule Number: 08-047		Hearing Location: Madison	
Rule Number: Ch. Comm 16		Hearing Date: June 18, 2008	
Relating to: Electrical Construction			
Comments: Oral or Exhibit No.	Presenter, Group Represented, City and State	Comments/Recommendations	Agency Response
		<p>i. Recommends deleting Comm 16.708 relating to critical operations power system overcurrent devices shall be selectively coordinated with all supply side overcurrent protective devices for faults with a duration of 0.1 seconds or longer.</p>	<p>i. Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the addition in Comm 16.708.</p>
Speaker 9 Exhibit 8	Bob Fahey Self and City of Janesville 15535 W. Francis Road Evansville, WI 53536	<p>a. Opposes removal of Comm 16.430 relating to disconnecting means, which is against the Electrical Advisory Council's unanimous vote. Requests that documentation be provided to support lessening the requirements of the NEC. Indicates this puts the state at odds with OSHA requirements, and surrounding states that have adopted NEC regulations without issues. Believes enforcing NEC will create a safer environment for electricians and will reduce labor and operating costs.</p> <p>b. Supports Comm 16.210 (4) relating to AFCI in dwellings. Believes the new technology will make things safer, and the benefits outweigh the costs.</p> <p>c. Opposes the less restrictive requirements in Comm 16.110 relating to meter pedestals and meter sockets that will cause dangerous situations for electricians, utility personnel and the public. Believes meter sockets and meter pedestals should be rated for the fault current available from the electrical utility to provide a safe electrical installation.</p> <p>d. Supports the adoption of NEC 406.11 for tamper-resistant receptacles in dwelling units because it will protect young children who may not realize the dangers of electricity.</p>	<p>a. Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the exception in Comm 16.430.</p> <p>b. Support noted.</p> <p>c. Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the exception in Comm 16.110 (2).</p> <p>d. Support noted.</p>
Speaker 10	Thomas Domitrovich Eaton Corporation 4038 St Rt 151 Aliquippa, PA 15001	<p>a. Indicates the requirement under Comm 16.210 relating to AFCI technology will detect arcing and sparking and will prevent fires before they begin. This requirement protects entire branch circuit and connected cords. Indicates the homeowner may replace receptacles and switches without the aid of a licensed electrician, and this will protect the home's circuits. As for affordable housing, these homes are typically smaller and require less arc-fault technology, even with the expansion of the code. Understands the concern of technology availability, but if adopted, manufacturers would stock it.</p>	<p>a. Support noted.</p>

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE**

Clearinghouse Rule Number: 08-047		Hearing Location: Madison	
Rule Number: Ch. Comm 16		Hearing Date: June 18, 2008	
Relating to: Electrical Construction			
Comments: Oral or Exhibit No.	Presenter, Group Represented, City and State	Comments/Recommendations	Agency Response
		<p>b. Supports the ground fault technology in basements and all circuits and appliances because UL has made many changes to address new products so they do not nuisance trip.</p> <p>c. Supports the requirements under Comm 16.700 and 16.708. Comments are similar to Speaker 4, but adds that licensed professional engineers are best qualified to optimize selective coordination as mandated by the NEC.</p> <p>d. Supports the requirements under Comm 16.110. Comments are similar to Speaker 6.</p>	<p>b. Support noted.</p> <p>c. Support noted. However, the proposal has been modified to eliminate the additions in Comm 16.700 (4) and 16.708. This allows the engineer to selectively coordinate the system to the extent feasible given the parameters of devices available from manufacturers.</p> <p>d. Support noted. However, the proposal has been modified to eliminate the exception in Comm 16.110 (2) because of concerns expressed during the public hearing.</p>
Speaker 11	Russell E. Sanders NFPA 3257 Beals Branch Road Louisville, KY 40206	Supports proposed rules on arc-fault circuit interrupter protections. The US fire administration reported 70,000 fires last year caused by electrical faults and resulting in 500 deaths and \$900 million in property loss. The Consumer Products Safety Commission (CPSC) indicates that 50% of those fires would have been preventable with AFCI receptacles. Regarding tamper-resistant receptacles, CPSC reports that 2,400 children were shocked and burned due to sticking objects in unprotected receptacles, and all could have been prevented with tamper-resistant receptacles. Regarding the costs of AFCI, the International Association of Electrical Inspectors (Ohio Chapter) found that it would cost about \$160 to include these in affordable housing. The CPSC determined that in affordable housing with 75 receptacles would cost \$35-\$40 more per home to include tamper-resistant receptacles because they are only about 35-50 cents more per receptacle at local chain stores.	Support noted.
Speaker 12 Exhibit 9	John L. Cyr NECA Milwaukee Chapter 18735 Davidson Road Brookfield, WI 53045	Opposes proposed rules with comments similar to Speaker 9. Comment a., and notes that this violates OSHA and possibly federal regulations.	Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the exception in Comm 16.430.
Speaker 13	Fred W. Brown Self (High Electron) N3977 Meadow Drive Cambridge, WI 53523	<p>a. Opposes Comm 16.110 (2) relating to safety hazard. Believes the code should comply with NEC.</p> <p>b. Opposes Comm 16.310 relating to de-rating of conductors. Indicates Wisconsin should move to the national standard.</p>	<p>a. Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the exception in Comm 16.110 (2).</p> <p>b. Disagree. No substantiation of a problem has been provided.</p>

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE**

Clearinghouse Rule Number: 08-047		Hearing Location: Madison	
Rule Number: Ch. Comm 16		Hearing Date: June 18, 2008	
Relating to: Electrical Construction			
Comments: Oral or Exhibit No.	Presenter, Group Represented, City and State	Comments/Recommendations	Agency Response
		<p>c. Supports 406.11 and 517.18 (c) relating to tamper-resistant receptacles. Suggests that an “or” should be added to include a shock fault circuit interceptor, which is a newer technology.</p> <p>d. Opposes Comm 16.430 relating to disconnecting means. Believes the main issue is the word “impracticable” and suggests Wisconsin should go with the national standard.</p> <p>e. Opposes Comm 16.517, 16.700 (4), 16.701 (3) and 16.708 relating to 0.1 second selective coordination. Explains the NEC deals with selective coordination in health care to insure that over current protection devices work. Believes lowering the limit is dangerous, but indicates it is up for debate.</p>	<p>c. Support noted. New technology should be submitted on a national level.</p> <p>d. Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the exception in Comm 16.430.</p> <p>e. Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the additions in Comm 16.517, 16.700 (4), 16.701 (3) and 16.708. See response to Speaker 3. Comment c. and Speaker 4.</p>
Speaker 14	Tim Crnko Cooper Industries 321 W. Argonne St. Louis, MO 63122	<p>a. Opposes Comm 16.110 relating to electrical installations. Comments are similar to Speaker 9. Comment c. and Speaker 13. Comment a.</p> <p>b. Opposes Comm 16.430. Comments are similar to Speaker 3. Comment b. and Speaker 9. Comment a.</p> <p>c. Indicates selective coordination is in the NEC because of life safety. No other state has this exemption. By lessening the code, it puts everyone at greater risk and liability. Urges the state to adopt NEC code as is.</p>	<p>a. Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the exception in Comm 16.110 (2).</p> <p>b. Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the exception in Comm 16.430.</p> <p>c. Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the additions in Comm 16.517, 16.700 (4), 16.701 (3) and 16.708. See response to Speaker 3. Comment c. and Speaker 4.</p>

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE**

Clearinghouse Rule Number: 08-047		Hearing Location: Madison	
Rule Number: Ch. Comm 16		Hearing Date: June 18, 2008	
Relating to: Electrical Construction			
Comments: Oral or Exhibit No.	Presenter, Group Represented, City and State	Comments/Recommendations	Agency Response
Speaker 15 Exhibit 10	Edwin Wickman GE Consumer & Industrial 2 Towne Square Southfield, MI 48076	Supports proposed rules under Comm 16.517, 16.700, 16.701 and 16.708 relating to selective coordination. Suggests the engineers be allowed to design and do their job. These changes are similar to what the Florida Agency for Healthcare Administration (AHCA) has required for many years. The trade off is between NEC's depth (fully selective on a few circuits) versus the AHCA's breadth (0.1 second for the entire facility). Indicates that any selective solution should be considered "manufacturer proprietary." Believes today's technology would allow mixing different manufacturers or mixing fuses and breakers in a selective system design. Believes market competition will force optimized selective solution that will reduce size and cost of system.	Support noted. However, the proposal has been modified to eliminate the additions in Comm 16.517, 16.700 (4), 16.701 (3) and 16.708 relating to a mandated time limit. This allows the engineer to selectively coordinate the system to the extent feasible given the parameters of devices available from manufacturers.
Speaker 16	John H. Schwab, Jr. EdEc. Insp. Assn. SE WI 12015 W Underwood Wauwatosa, WI 53226	<p>a. Opposes Comm 16.110 relating to electrical installations. Comments are similar to Speaker 3. Comment a. and Speaker 9. Comment a.</p> <p>b. Opposes Comm 16.700 and 16.517 relating to selective coordination. Indicates the 0.1 second is six cycles and that can cause a lot of damage and even kill someone.</p> <p>c. Supports the proposed removal of arc-fault exemption clause to coordinate with NEC.</p> <p>d. Supports the comments of Speaker 12 about Comm 16.430 relating to disconnecting means.</p>	<p>a. Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the exception in Comm 16.110 (2).</p> <p>b. Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the additions in Comm 16.517 and 16.700 (4). See response to Speaker 3. Comment c. and Speaker 4.</p> <p>c. Support noted.</p> <p>d. Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the exception in Comm 16.430.</p>
Exhibit 11	Kevin Benner WI IAEI 1190 Fieldview Dr Menasha, WI 54952	Indicates he has received correspondence from electricians expressing displeasure that Comm 16.38 relating to disconnecting means is <u>not</u> being removed from the 2008 version of Comm 16.	Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the exception in Comm 16.430.

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE**

Clearinghouse Rule Number: 08-047		Hearing Location: Madison	
Rule Number: Ch. Comm 16		Hearing Date: June 18, 2008	
Relating to: Electrical Construction			
Comments: Oral or Exhibit No.	Presenter, Group Represented, City and State	Comments/Recommendations	Agency Response
Exhibit 12	Wade Rudolph, CBET, CHFM WI Healthcare Engineering Association Co-Chair of Codes & Standards Committee	Supports proposed draft changes to Comm 16.517, 16.700, 16.701 and 16.708 relating to selective coordination. Explains these sections apply to hospitals, and without them, "...healthcare will be forced to provide electrical distribution equipment and design concepts that will reduce the system reliability, maintainability and flexibility." Indicates the NFPA requires selective coordination throughout the entire tripping range. Explains that there is evidence that the vast majority of electrical faults experienced in healthcare facilities are at lower levels, which means the 0.1 second or less tripping curves are seldom if ever reached.	Support noted. However, the proposal has been modified to eliminate the additions in Comm 16.517, 16.700 (4), 16.701 (3) and 16.708 relating to a mandated time limit. See response to Speaker 4.
Exhibit 13	Mike Koslowske Heritage Woodworks, Inc. 1874 Commercial Way Green Bay, WI 54311	a. Opposes AFCI requirements in new housing. Indicates there is no data that supports the installation of tamper-resistant receptacles would save lives. Believes it will only add to the cost of new construction by \$800-\$1,100 per home, not \$30 as the Department indicates. b. Opposes GFCIs for sump and sewer pumps in new homes as they would have unintended consequences if they trip during electrical storms and cause basement flooding.	a. Disagree. See responses to Speaker 1. Comment a. and Speaker 2. Comment b. b. Agree. The proposal has been modified with an exception that permits a single receptacle without GFCI protection for sump and sewage pumps.
Exhibit 14	Ronald L. Derrick Derrick Companies 1505 Hwy 65 New Richmond, WI 54017	Comments similar to Exhibit 13.	Agree in part. See responses to Speaker 1. Comment a. and Speaker 2. Comments b. and c.
Exhibit 15	Monarch Homes 10425 W North Ave, #345 Wauwatosa, WI 53226	Comments similar to Exhibit 13.	Agree in part. See responses to Speaker 1. Comment a. and Speaker 2. Comments b. and c.
Exhibit 16	Vincent J. Saporita Cooper Bussman PO Box 14460 St. Louis, MO 63178	Comments similar to Speaker 3. Exhibit 2. Comment c. and includes a CD with test report and videos to support the position.	Agree. The proposal has been modified to eliminate the addition in Comm 16.517.
Exhibit 17	Dave Johnson Manitowoc Co. Home Builders Association 820 South 8 th St. Manitowoc, WI 54220	Comments similar to Exhibit 13.	Agree in part. See responses to Speaker 1. Comment a. and Speaker 2. Comments b. and c.

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE**

Clearinghouse Rule Number: 08-047		Hearing Location: Madison	
Rule Number: Ch. Comm 16		Hearing Date: June 18, 2008	
Relating to: Electrical Construction			
Comments: Oral or Exhibit No.	Presenter, Group Represented, City and State	Comments/Recommendations	Agency Response
Exhibit 18	Joseph R. Bissing Bissing Electric, Inc. 2390 W. Nordale Dr. Appleton, WI 54914	Comments similar to Exhibit 13.	Agree in part. See responses to Speaker 1. Comment a. and Speaker 2. Comments b. and c.
Exhibit 19	Bill Skewes WI Utilities Association 44 E Mifflin St, #202 Madison, WI 53703	Supports changes to Comm 16.110 (2) relating to the Department exception of meter sockets and meter pedestals. Indicates that if the proposal is rejected, the WUA assumes the interpretation given by the Department in 1989 relating to the meter socket exemption would remain in effect.	Support noted. However, the proposal has been modified to eliminate the exception in Comm 16.110 (2) because of concerns expressed during the public hearing.
Exhibit 20	Michael L. Leibham, P.E. Berners-Schober Associates, Inc. 310 Pine St. Green Bay, WI 54301	Supports the proposed changes, especially for Comm 16.517, 16.700, 16.701 and 16.708 relating to selective coordination.	Support noted. However, the proposal has been modified to eliminate the additions in Comm 16.517, 16.700 (4), 16.701 (3) and 16.708. See response to Speaker 4.
Exhibit 21	Roger W. Elliott St. Joseph's Hospital 2661 County Hwy I Chippewa Falls, WI 54729	Supports the proposed changes for Comm 16.517, 16.700, 16.701 and 16.708 relating to selective coordination. Reiterates the importance of these changes to the healthcare industry. Points out that the lives of hospital patients could be in jeopardy if the facility is unable to provide timely, reliable and quickly resettable circuit breaker technology.	Support noted. However, the proposal has been modified to eliminate the additions in Comm 16.517, 16.700 (4), 16.701 (3) and 16.708. See response to Speaker 4.
Exhibit 22	Thomas D. Stank Mercy Health System 1000 Mineral Point Ave. Janesville, WI 53547	Comments similar to Exhibit 21.	Support noted. However, the proposal has been modified to eliminate the additions in Comm 16.517, 16.700 (4), 16.701 (3) and 16.708. See response to Speaker 4.
Exhibit 23	Dale Scherbert Community Memorial Hospital W180 N8085 Town Hall Menomonee Falls, WI 53051	Comments similar to Exhibit 21.	Support noted. However, the proposal has been modified to eliminate the additions in Comm 16.517, 16.700 (4), 16.701 (3) and 16.708. See response to Speaker 4.
Exhibit 24	Roger A. Haines WI Healthcare Engineering Association	Comments similar to Exhibit 21.	Support noted. However, the proposal has been modified to eliminate the additions in Comm 16.517, 16.700 (4), 16.701 (3) and 16.708. See response to Speaker 4.

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE**

Clearinghouse Rule Number: 08-047		Hearing Location: Madison	
Rule Number: Ch. Comm 16		Hearing Date: June 18, 2008	
Relating to: Electrical Construction			
Comments: Oral or Exhibit No.	Presenter, Group Represented, City and State	Comments/Recommendations	Agency Response
Exhibit 25	Greg Graunke Mercy Medical Center 500 S. Oakwood Rd. Oshkosh, WI 54904	Opposes proposed change that would mandate hospitals use fuses instead of circuit breakers as it would take longer to locate and install a fuse than it would to reset a circuit breaker.	Clarification: The proposed rules do not require fuses instead of circuit breakers.
Exhibit 26	John McGinnis, CHFM, NFPA, ASHE 791 Summit Ave. Oconomowoc, WI 53066	Comments similar to Exhibit 21.	Support noted. However, the proposal has been modified to eliminate the additions in Comm 16.517, 16.700 (4), 16.701 (3) and 16.708. See response to Speaker 4.
Exhibit 27	Tim Klein Holy Family Memorial 2300 Western Ave. Manitowoc, WI 54221	Comments similar to Exhibit 21.	Support noted. However, the proposal has been modified to eliminate the additions in Comm 16.517, 16.700 (4), 16.701 (3) and 16.708. See response to Speaker 4.
Exhibit 28	Tamarah Cox Aspirus Wausau Hospital 333 Pine Ridge Blvd Wausau, WI 54401	Comments similar to Exhibit 21.	Support noted. However, the proposal has been modified to eliminate the additions in Comm 16.517, 16.700 (4), 16.701 (3) and 16.708. See response to Speaker 4.
Exhibit 29	Jim Rugg Via e-mail	a. Opposes AFCIs required in new home construction. b. Opposes GFCIs for sump and sewer pumps in new home construction.	a. Disagree. See response to Speaker 1. Comment a. b. Agree. The proposal has been modified with an exception that permits a single receptacle without GFCI protection for sump and sewage pumps.
Exhibit 30	John Stoker, Mike Spahr, and Cindi Gruebling	Comments similar to Exhibit 29.	Agree in part. See responses to Speaker 1. Comment a. and Speaker 2. Comments b. and c.
Exhibit 31	Tom Kruse Via e-mail	Opposes the required installation of tamper-resistant receptacles in new homes. Comments are similar to Exhibit 13. Comment a.	Disagree. See responses to Speaker 1. Comment b. and Speaker 2. Comment a.
Exhibit 32	Ron Janikowski Via e-mail	Opposes modifying NEC 110.10 to exempt meter sockets and meter pedestals from the requirement.	Agree. See response to Speaker 3. Comment a.

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE**

Clearinghouse Rule Number: 08-047		Hearing Location: Madison	
Rule Number: Ch. Comm 16		Hearing Date: June 18, 2008	
Relating to: Electrical Construction			
Comments: Oral or Exhibit No.	Presenter, Group Represented, City and State	Comments/Recommendations	Agency Response
Exhibit 33	Rick S. Leverenz, PE KJWW Engineering Consultants 802 W. Broadway, #312 Madison, WI 53713	Comments similar to Exhibit 21.	Support noted. However, the proposal has been modified to eliminate the additions in Comm 16.517, 16.700 (4), 16.701 (3) and 16.708. See response to Speaker 4.
Exhibit 34	Ron Klassen Wallner Builders 12424 W. Lancaster Ave. Butler, WI 53007	<p>a. Supports tamper-resistant receptacles because cost is low and would improve safety.</p> <p>b. Opposes the required installation of AFCIs because cost would be prohibitive.</p> <p>c. Opposes GFCIs for unfinished basement appliances as it would pose a potential health and safety hazard.</p>	<p>a. Support noted.</p> <p>b. Disagree. See response to Speaker 1. Comment a.</p> <p>c. Agree. The proposal has been modified with an exception that permits a single receptacle without GFCI protection for sump and sewage pumps.</p>
Exhibit 35	Tina Prosser Via e-mail	Supports requiring tamper-resistant receptacles in dwellings.	Support noted.
Exhibit 36	Doug Schnell Schnell Electric	Comments similar to Exhibit 13.	Agree in part. See responses to Speaker 1. Comment a. and Speaker 2. Comments b. and c.
Exhibit 37	Dave Welsh Eaton Corporation 1000 Cherrington Pkwy Moon Township, PA 15108	Supports keeping the exception to NEC 110.10 in Comm 16.110 (2) relating to meter sockets and meter pedestals.	Support noted. However, the proposal has been modified to eliminate the exception in Comm 16.110 (2) because of concerns expressed during the public hearing.
Exhibit 38	Matthew Stanford WI Hospital Assn 5510 Research Park Dr Madison, WI 53725	Supports revisions to ss. Comm 16.517, 16.700, 16.701, and 16.708, but opposes proposals that would force hospitals to use fused systems rather than circuit breakers. Comments similar to Exhibit 21.	Support noted. However, the proposal has been modified to eliminate the additions in Comm 16.517, 16.700 (4), 16.701 (3) and 16.708. See response to Speaker 4.
Exhibit 39	Jim Reif Jim Reif Builders 150 Semi Dr. Francis Creek, WI 54214	Comments similar to Exhibit 13.	Agree in part. See responses to Speaker 1. Comment a. and Speaker 2. Comments b. and c.

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE**

Clearinghouse Rule Number: 08-047		Hearing Location: Madison	
Rule Number: Ch. Comm 16		Hearing Date: June 18, 2008	
Relating to: Electrical Construction			
Comments: Oral or Exhibit No.	Presenter, Group Represented, City and State	Comments/Recommendations	Agency Response
Exhibit 40	Jerry L. Hofman, PE The Durham Company PO Box 908 Lebanon, MO 65536	Supports keeping the exemption of NEC 110.10 for meter socket and meter pedestals in Comm 16.110 (2).	Support noted. However, the proposal has been modified to eliminate the exception in Comm 16.110 (2) because of concerns expressed during the public hearing.
Exhibit 41	Joel Gmack Gmack Development, Inc.	Comments similar to Exhibit 13.	Agree in part. See responses to Speaker 1. Comment a. and Speaker 2. Comments b. and c.
Exhibit 42	Monte Ewing 827 Liliana Terr. Oregon, WI 53575	Proposes a change in s. Comm 16.680 that would be in addition to the requirements of NEC 680.42 (B) and NEC 680.43 (D) regarding bonding. Proposes that "Equipotential Bonding of Perimeter Surfaces required by NEC 680.26 (B) (2) and bonding of Pool Water required by NEC 680.26 (C) shall not apply to a listed self-contained spa or hot tub constructed with nonmetallic walls. Provides background information on the new proposal.	Agree. The proposal has been modified as recommended to include an addition to the requirements of NEC 680.42 (b) and NEC 680.43 (D) relating to equipotential bonding.