

NH Building Code Review Board
NH Department of Safety
33 Hazen Drive
Concord, NH 03305

Request to amend the New Hampshire adopted version of NFPA 70, NEC 2011

This is a copy of a similar proposal intended to be submitted by William Benard to NFPA for consideration in the NFPA 70 2014 version of the NEC.

Date	10/13/2011	Name	William Benard		Tel. No.	603-644-7170	
Company	Gemini Electric Inc.				Email	Billb@geminielectricinc.com	
Street Address	8 Priscilla Lane	City	Auburn	State	NH	Zip	03032

Please indicate organization represented (if any) | New Hampshire Electrical Contractors Business Association

1. Section/Paragraph | 100

2. Proposal Recommends (check one): new text revised text deleted text

3. Proposal (include proposed new or revised wording, or identification of wording to be deleted): [Note: Proposed text should be in legislative format; i.e., use underscore to denote wording to be inserted (inserted wording) and strike-through to denote wording to be deleted (~~deleted wording~~).]

Add to the existing definition of Structure: "That which is built or constructed *for other than listed or identified freestanding electrical equipment.*"

Substantiation:

This proposal attempts to address different interpretations of the term structure especially when a disconnecting means is required at a structure in section 225.32 and in at least one case by clarifying that a disconnecting means is not required at a standalone transfer switch or other approved standalone transfer equipment where the conductors are already protected by equipment ahead at the source as in the case of a generator with a built in feeder disconnect.

Although not all in the industry would consider standalone transfer equipment as a "structure," it is hard to convince those that do that such equipment does not fit the existing literal wording in the definition of the term in Article 100. The addition of the wording in the new definition would clarify for more consistent interpretation and determination as to the intention of the protection requirements determined for a "structure."

The fiscal impact to the customer is substantial as the request to amend recommends adding an exemption to requiring additional electrical disconnects where the safety of the installation is not enhanced in any way. The installation of additional switches in areas not needing such equipment only adds to the complexity and potential installation failure points in the overall system. The only impact to the exemption of the disconnect location would be the elimination of an additional unnecessary financial burden to the installation.

I am the author of the text in this proposal along with the photos and graphic descriptions as presented. The information provided will be substantiated with testimony during the presentation of this proposal.

William Benard



