

Membership Introductions & Housekeeping Items

Location: Pearson Room, Holiday Inn and Suites, 2565 Argentia Rd, Mississauga

Attendees: Malcolm Brown, Rob Smith, Eeric Randsalu, Vladimir Gagachev, Martin Lem, Mel Fruitman, Barry Buchanan, Peter Olders, Andrew Pottier, Robert Smith, Dave Sinclair, Ted Olechna, Dianna Thoms, Tony Poirier

Guests: Guy Benjamin, Ray Youseff, Tatjana Dinic, Nansy Hannah

Phone: Chris Magnusson, Phil Lasek, Shawn Paulsen, Carita Edwards, George Chelvanayag

Absent: Tim Pope, Kathryn Farmer

New member – Andrew Pottier

Andrew is a journeyman electrician with close to 30 years' experience in the electrical industry. He has obtained employment throughout his career in various progressive roles, including electrical construction, estimating, and project management.

In 2007 Andrew joined Nova Scotia Power Inc. as an Electrical Wiring Inspector and was responsible for inspections in the City of Halifax and surrounding areas.

In 2010 a vacancy developed within the department for the Chief Electrical Inspector position. As the successful candidate to the position, this provided an opportunity for Andrew to network with a much broader array of industry stakeholders.

Andrew spent over seven and a half years in the Chief Electrical Inspector role which provide him opportunities to participate on the Canadian Electrical Code Part 1 with the Executive Committee, Section Sub-committees, and as Section Chair.

He was also Canadian President of the IAEI between 2015 and 2016.

Andrew's most recent career change in November of 2017 has taken him to Underwriters Laboratories Canada (ULC) where he is responsible for liaison between ULC and Provincial Regulators and other industry stakeholders. In addition to these responsibilities Andrew is the direct contact between ULC and the Canadian Advisory Council on Electrical Safety (CACES), and the Interprovincial Gas Advisory Council (IGAC).

Ontario Amendments Under Consideration

Presented by Tatjana Dinic and Ray Youseff

If OPCC members have comments, they can either submit via the website or email Dianna directly.

OPCC is an advisory committee to look at the code and propose changes. Changes to the amendments are done by ESA after the public consultation which ends on **April 20th**. The amendments are then brought back to the OPCC for balloting at the next meeting, **May 16th**. ESA will then submit to the board who then recommends it to the government in June. If all goes well, the government will accept it and it would then become enforceable.

May 16th, we do require quorum to ballot. If a member is not able to attend the meeting to ballot, then they can send someone as a proxy. If doing so, please let Dianna know.

Rule	Description	Minutes
2018-OA-001 2-005(h) New	Application for inspection not required for elevating devices	- EDIT: “the owner requires in wiring” to “writing.”
2018-OA-002 Section 2	Replace “inspection department” with “Authority”	- “Authorities having jurisdiction” is used in CSA.
2018-OA-003 Section 2	Change “Application for Inspection” to “Notification” and others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is the definition of notification? There were questions if contractors would still be receiving the same tracking number. Does changing “Application for Inspection” imply that there will be an inspection? - The term “Application for Inspection” implies a two part process, application followed by inspection where as notification is not clear as to where you are in the process. - Could have not a single word but a phrase with multiple words. -Notification is confusing, could be misconstrued. The industry calls it a permit. -Use the term permit and define the 48-hours, could define permit to include the 48-hours. - The term “Notice of Project” was also suggested.
2018-OA-004 2-005(c)	Clarification to exemptions from an application for inspection a notification	
2018-OA-005 2-010(1)	Add requirements for Plan Review of energy storage installations and of standby generation that supports life safety loads	- There are smaller unit being installed in parallel with supply authority or branch circuits feeding an operating room and are only 5kW engineered systems. These act like a UPS but are not. These would not be captured by this amendment.



2018-OA-006 2-010	Editorial change to clarify when plan review is not required	
2018-OA-007 2-022(3) and Appendix B Note	Amend requirements for lighting equipment approval	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OLED lighting panels and organic panels are covered under a different standard and can be connected as a product. - Why the higher voltage for DC? This is based on C.22.2 No. 223 which changed the voltage from 42.5V DC to 60 V DC in 2015. These are the voltage levels that humans can tolerate at wet, damp and dry conditions.
2018-OA-008 10-116(6)	Relocate Ontario amendment about the use of a metal frame of a building as a grounding conductor.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effectively grounded continues be a defined term in Section 10.
2018-OA-009 12-022 New	Requirements for cables and raceways installed in metal corrugated roof decking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is the difference between a roof and a wall, why are we treating a roof different than concealed conductors in roofs? Tin pan makes it difficult to find the wires using devices on the market. The wires in the roof decking are usually higher voltage; roofs have life spans so work is completed more frequently than in a house. - EDIT: Does not require a Subrule number as there are no other rules. -With more complicated roofing structures, you will have tighter circles of screws, which increases the likelihood of hitting a conductor.
2018-OA-010 16-222 and Appendix B Note	Amend requirements for equipment connected to Class 2 circuits	
2018-OA-011 24-104(2)	Delete current Ontario Amendment to Rule 24-104(2)	
2018-OA-012 26-724	Delete current Ontario Amendment to Rule 26-724(f)(i) (2015)	
2018-OA-013 28-500(4) and Appendix B Note New	Add new requirement for use of manual motor controllers not suitable as disconnecting means	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Product was not used as intended; will there be more marking for other misused products? Another agreement that this is unnecessary marking.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The switch when beside the motor, looks like it could be a disconnect switch to people who are not electricians. - This is labelled, so there is no ambiguity; perhaps a product change is required to change the colour of the button to yellow. - The person who is installing it would be responsible for the field marking. - EDIT: Change wording to “Isolate motor at disconnect panel..” - EDIT: 4 – needs to be relocated. - How often does this happen? Unsure though there was fatality in 1998 and now this one.
2018-OA-014 30-200(1)	Delete existing Ontario Amendment to CE Code Rule 30-200(1)	
2018-OA-015 Rule 64-000 and 64-900s New	Include energy storage systems in Section 64	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EDIT: 64-904(c) says photovoltaic and not ESS. - How does this relate to storage batteries in 26-540. 64 already has a section for batteries, this should link to Section 26 with an appendix B - If they are containers, would a field evaluation be required to make it a product? For containers they could have it field evaluated as an ESS and inspected for the installation. Or if the devices are approved then code rules for interconnection would apply. - Now there would be three sections for batteries, need to clarify where to look for batteries. - CEC has a ballot to change the title and one rule. This proposal is a starting point, a minimum requirement. - NEC Article 706 has a lot of changes being completed, limitations put on size in which they apply. Shawn is on NEC panel for ESS, he is going to look for the link for the proposal. - What about batteries that are portable?

<p>2018-OA-016 68-072 New</p>	<p>Add new requirement for disconnecting means for pools and hot tubs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why just distance from the pump, not the heater? The disconnect switch would apply to the entire hot tub, not just the pump. Could change the wording to the hot tub. - Many other jurisdictions including ESA were enforcing this as a motor rule. Was sent to Part 1 but was delayed. Pool and hot tub association was involved with the Part 1. NEC has this and is called a maintenance disconnect and it applies for all pool equipment. - For “within sight” there would be no maximum. - EDIT: Appendix B note starting “For cord-connected...” language sounds very descriptive, should it be moved into the rule. - EDIT: Second note references another rule. - Could we allow the disconnect to be part of the cabana which could be in an unlocked building.
<p>2018-OA-017 75-904</p>	<p>Amend Specification 41 to include height requirements for a pole mounted transfer device</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If a consumer wants to service their transformer, they would need to contact their utility - Concern about servicing if a blade breaks
<p>2018-OA-018 Appendix A</p>	<p>Amend Appendix A as non-mandatory</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This should go to Part 1 for vote, as this is part of the Canadian Standard. What happens if a product is approved according to the Part 2 standard which relies on Part 1 standard? All Canadian Standards say that they must meet CEC Part 1 Standard. - EDIT: 3 – “select” changed “meet standard” - EDIT: 3 – “required” even though it’s not mandatory. If it is something that is mandatory, why are we stating this? - Appendix A is not a complete list of all certification bodies; this states that they must use the appropriate standard. - Canadian Rules point to the appropriate standard, we are not removing it completely because it is good guidance.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shawn – also have issue with 3 as not all standards become Canadian standards. - EDIT: Rationale: change “certification agency” to SDO
2018-OA-019 Appendix B Note to Rule 2-024	Amend to recognize other certification bodies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Other recognized bodies would still have to be recognized by a Canadian certification body, suggested that we add as much. - Can add information in the appendix A note to inform that they meet Canadian standards.
2018-OA-020 78-000, 78-200 to 78-210 and 78-052	Delete current Ontario Amendment to Rules 78-000 and 78-200 to 78-210, and amend Rule 78-052 (CE Code 2018) to clarify GFCI requirements for branch circuits	
2018-OA-021 30-1400 and Appendix B Note	Clarification that Rules 30-1402 to 1410 apply to LED luminaires supplied by Power over Ethernet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could this apply to other technology other than PoE?
2018-OA-022 26-656 New	Increased AFCI requirements in dwelling units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This was submitted and defected to the CEC by ESA. - A proposal to the CEC by Levinaton to introduce more exemptions for AFCIs. The survey shows a high rejection of that proposal in the section committee. - Manufactures have an interest in correcting the nuisance tripping, less than 15 have been submitted to the EFC, only 4 or 5 are valid nuisance tripping. - Branch circuit wiring for lighting could be next.
2018-OA-023 30-1009 New	Clearances of poles supporting luminaires	
2018-OA-024 30-1300	Amend requirement for Roadway lighting systems near distribution lines	
2018-OA-025 16-310 and 16-330 (8) New	Amend ampacity rating of Power over Ethernet (PoE) source equipment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the equipment itself rated at a nominal amount, or is the equipment being controlled in such a manner that it only is able to produce 0.3A? - Suggested to just use nominal without the

		<p>rest of the definitions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The revised proposal that has been submitted to the CE Code for 2021 and removes the different amperages. It has not received any negative ballots yet. Need to find out if this has been balloted and past. - Peter Olders submit to ESA that we use the version from CSA as a public comment.
<p>Next meeting: May 16, 2018</p>		