President Bob Rutan opened the meeting at 6:04 pm with the flag salute and a moment of silence for our men and women overseas. Rutan requested a report from Treasurer Don Storms who reported our balance and received a motion to accept the report. Rutan then asked the membership for any corrections to the posted minutes. As there were none, Rutan asked for, and received a motion to accept the minutes. Chontow stated that the minutes had a new addition in the form of Editors Notes. These notes were researched answers to comments brought up at the meeting. For those who didn’t see the minutes, one Editor’s note was the requirement for well casing bond which was referenced in the Spring 2004 Construction Code Communicator. This is no longer a requirement. Another Editor’s Note was the Adjustment factor for conductors. The NEC requires an adjustment factor for both Raceways and Cable assemblies. Rutan then questioned whether those attending the meeting would have a need or interest in the Chapter accepting credit cards for the dinner meetings. There was little interest, although there seemed to be more interest for this feature for products or additional services (such as classes or books). Rutan said he would table the idea for now. Rutan then mentioned the ability to pre-order Analysis of Changes to the 2020 NEC at a discount, which we could pass along to the membership. By a raise of hands, there was a significant interest to go ahead with the purchase. Then Rutan moved on to questions from the floor. A question arose as to the method of doing a disconnect/reconnect if the Utility Company prohibits the contractor from performing that reconnection if the inspection scheduling would prohibit the reconnection in a timely manner. A member mentioned a waver supplied by the utility which would give the contractor 14 days to secure a cut-in card. Another question from the floor was to the method used to install an AFCI in a panel where no AFCI is available (i.e Pushmatic, Zinsco, etc). Chontow stated that the NJ UCC has an exemption from the AFCI requirement in the case where no AFCI is available. An additional question was to the Generator Inlet mounting location. Although the inlet states it shall be installed outdoors, similar products (by the same manufacturer) are for indoor use only. Consensus was that it was a liability issue as opposed to a code compliance issue. With no additional questions, Rutan turned over the meeting to James Wong of UL. Jimmy stated that the purpose of field evaluations is to assist the AHJ in the process of determining acceptance of the product
leading to an approval of an inspection. Although the ability of field evaluations has been around for a long time, the 2017 now has a definition for field evaluation body. NFPA has two new standards for competency and methods for field evaluations, NFPA 790 & 791. Jimmy showed an example of a field evaluation report which shows the level of detail that a report produces, with all its discrepancies and corrective actions. He then went on to show photos of his field inspection of the Times Square Ball. He performed part of the inspection in the manufacturing plant, and continued at the installation site. This twelve foot diameter ball has over thirty two thousand LEDs with numerous connections that had to be inspected. Another example was the Coca Cola sign in Times Square which is classified as the world’s largest 3D robotic sign. Each 18” x 18” LED panel moves in and out a maximum of five feet requiring many moving parts, making the evaluation that much more extensive. He then moved on to examples of modifications of switchgear. The most common modifications being the installation or replacement of lugs. Drilling out of buss bars would require a field evaluation, but simply adding or replacing lugs may not, provided the manufacture has guidance for the installation. He also showed an example of the use of fine strand cable with standard lugs, in clear violation with the lug manufacturers installation instructions. Jimmy then moved on to the evaluation of Industrial Control Panels (Standard 508A). He stated that when evaluating this piece of equipment, he could use the “Weakest Link method” for determining the Short Circuit Current Rating, finding the lowest rated component, and listing that entire panel with the lowest component rating. However, a more extensive method could be used which could produce a higher SCCR. Using the “Feeder Calculation method”, every branch of the equipment would be evaluated individually and modifications of individual branches could produce favorable results. As a point of information, Jimmy stated that the construction or modification of equipment is not the only reason for a field evaluation. If listed equipment arrives on the jobsite damaged during transit, a field evaluation may be necessary to insure the integrity of the equipment. Ultimately, it would be the AHJ that would determine the need for the field evaluation.

At the conclusion of his presentation, Jimmy received a great round of applause from the 33 members present.

Respectfully Submitted
Greg Chontow, Secretary