

SOUTH CAROLINA BUILDING CODES COUNCIL
2020 NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CODE
MEETING MATERIALS
OCTOBER 6, 2021





2020 National Electrical Code
South Carolina Building Codes Council
Proposed Modification Continuations from 2017

2020 Code Section: 90.2(B)(5)b Not Covered

Modification: Language was added to the sentence

b. Are located in legally established easements, ~~or~~ rights- of-way, or by other agreements either designated by or recognized by public service commissions, utility commissions, or other regulatory agencies having jurisdiction for such installations, or

Reason: To provide a more concise understanding of the additional agreements and rules that govern an electric utility's operations.

Proponent: Duke Energy

Previous Code Cycles	Previous Modification Number	Previous Code Section
NEC 2017	NEC 2017 01	90.2(B)(5)b
NEC 2014	NEC 2014 01	90.2(B)(5)b
NEC 2011	NEC 2011 01	90.2(B)(5)b
NEC 2008	NEC 2008 01	90.2(B)(5)b

Comments: See clerical correction above to show changes from original request. Language changed from 2008 to 2011 NEC. Letter "d" now contains the language in the modified section. Modification no longer necessary.

Detailed Changes:

- Letter "c" became letter "b" and added "energy storage".
- Letter "b" became letters "c" and "d" with modified language above included.

2008 NEC: 90.2(B)(5) Not Covered

This Code does not cover the following:

(5) Installations under the exclusive control of an electric utility where such installations

a. Consist of service drops or service laterals, and associated metering, or

b. Are located in legally established easements or rights-of-way designated by or recognized by public service commissions, utility commissions, or other regulatory agencies having jurisdiction for such installations, or

c. Are on property owned or leased by the electric utility for the purpose of communications, metering, generation, control, transformation, transmission, or distribution of electric energy.

Continued



2020 National Electrical Code
South Carolina Building Codes Council
Proposed Modification Continuations from 2017

2020 NEC: 90.2(B)(5) Not Covered

This Code does not cover the following:

(5) Installations under the exclusive control of an electric utility where such installations

- a. Consist of service drops or service laterals, and associated metering, or
- b. Are on property owned or leased by the electric utility for the purpose of communications, metering, generation, control, transformation, transmission, energy storage, or distribution of electric energy, or
- c. Are located in legally established easements or rights-of-way, or
- d. Are located by other written agreements either designated by or recognized by public service commissions, utility commissions, or other regulatory agencies having jurisdiction for such installations. These written agreements shall be limited to installations for the purpose of communications, metering, generation, control, transformation, transmission, energy storage, or distribution of electric energy where legally established easements or rights-of-way cannot be obtained. These installation shall be limited to federal lands, Native American reservations through the U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Indian Affairs, military bases, lands controlled by port authorities and state agencies and departments, and lands owned by railroads.

7/27: Modification dropped



South Carolina Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation
South Carolina Building Codes Council
 110 Centerview Dr • Columbia • SC • 29210
 P.O. Box 11329 • Columbia • SC • 29211-1329
 Phone: 803-896-4688 • contact.bcc@llr.sc.gov • Fax: 803-896-4814
 llr.sc.gov/bcc

2021 BUILDING CODE MODIFICATION REQUEST FORM

Requirements:

- All requests must be submitted by September 22, 2021.
- Each request for code modification must be submitted separately.
- A cover letter from the local jurisdiction or professional association stating that the individual is authorized to present the proposed amendment; and verification that the proposed amendment has the support of at least a majority of the members of the board or council governing the local jurisdiction or professional association proposing the modification.
- Sufficient test information, studies, data, or other documentation that would be necessary to fully explain and justify the proposed amendment
- For local modification requests only: the physical or climatological basis for the request and the reason that the suggested change would correct the condition.
- A local jurisdiction or professional association shall not propose a modification which will amend, suspend, eliminate or supersede an existing statute, policy, rule or regulation of any state or federal agency per S.C. Regulation 8-240 (H).
- **A completed modification request must be received with all required documentation before it will be reviewed.**

Statewide Modification

Local Modification: _____
 (List all jurisdictions that apply.)

Association/Jurisdiction: Home Builders Association of South Carolina

Address: [REDACTED] Columbia SC 29201
City State Zip

Name: Mark Nix Title/Position: Executive Director

Phone No.: [REDACTED] Email Address: [REDACTED]

Please select the applicable code to be modified:

2020 National Electrical Code

Please list the exact code section, table, figure, or appendix to be modified, and attach a photocopy of the applicable code section: 210.8(A) Dwelling Units



Code section as modified:

(Please strike through language being removed, and put language to be added in parentheses. Use additional pages as needed.)

All 125-volt, ~~single-phase, 15- and 20-ampere through 250-volt~~ receptacles installed in the locations specified in 210.8(A)(1) through (A)(11) and supplied by single-phase branch circuits rated 150 volts or less to ground shall have ground-fault circuit-interrupter protection for personnel.

- 1. Bathrooms
- 2. Garages and also accessory buildings that have a floor located at or below grade level not intended as habitable rooms and limited to storage areas, work areas, and areas of similar use
- 3. Outdoors

Exception to (3): Receptacles that are not readily accessible and are supplied by a branch circuit dedicated to electric snow-melting, deicing, or pipeline and vessel heating equipment shall be permitted to be installed in accordance with 426.28 or 427.22, as applicable.

- 4. Crawl spaces -- at or below grade level
- 5. Basements

Exception to (5): A receptacle supplying only a permanently installed fire alarm or burglar alarm system shall not be required to have ground-fault circuit-interrupter protection.

Informational Note: See 760.41(B) and 760.121(B) for power supply requirements for fire alarm systems.

Receptacles installed under the exception to 210.8(A)(5) shall not be considered as meeting the requirements of 210.52(G).

- 6. Kitchens -- where the receptacles are installed to serve the countertop surfaces
- 7. Sinks -- where receptacles are installed within 1.8 m (6 ft) from the top inside edge of the bowl of the sink
- 8. Boathouses
- 9. Bathtubs or shower stalls -- where receptacles are installed within 1.8 m (6 ft) of the outside edge of the bathtub or shower stall
- 10. Laundry areas

Exception to (1) through (3), (5) through (8), and (10): Listed locking support and mounting receptacles utilized in combination with compatible attachment fittings installed for the purpose of serving a ceiling luminaire or ceiling fan shall not be required to be ground-fault circuit-interrupter protected. If a general-purpose convenience receptacle is integral to the ceiling luminaire or ceiling fan, GFCI protection shall be provided.

- 11. Indoor damp and wet locations

9/28 Study Committee Recommendation: Do not support approval



In 200 characters or less, please briefly describe the justification for this modification request.

This change will require receptacles serving 250-volt appliances, such as stoves and clothes dryers, to have GFCI protection when located in bathrooms, crawl spaces, basements, laundry areas or within 6 feet of sinks, bathtubs or showers. This section previously applied to receptacles up to 125 volts only.

See attached for additional explanation.

Per Regulation 8-240(E)(5), please list the persons with their titles and affiliations, known at the time of submittal, who will provide testimony in favor of the amendment. Due to the possibility of virtual hearings, **all information in the table below is required** to ensure proper notification. Use additional pages as needed.

Name	Title	Affiliation	Phone Number	Email Address
Mark Nix	Executive Director	HBA of SC		
Andy Barber	HBASC Codes Chairman	HBA of SC		

Affirmation

I certify that all information in this form, including all supplementary documents submitted with this form, are true and correct to the best of my knowledge after undertaking due diligence to determine their accuracy.

Signature: Mark Nix  Digitally signed by Mark Nix
Date: 2021.08.10 16:13:45 -04'00' Date: _____

Title: Executive Director



GFCI's for 250-Volt Receptacles

This change will require receptacles serving 250-volt appliances, such as stoves and clothes dryers, to have GFCI protection when located in bathrooms, crawl spaces, basements, laundry areas or within 6 feet of sinks, bathtubs or showers. This section previously applied to receptacles up to 125 volts only.

The unfortunate event used as the sole substantiation for the change involved an older stove with both an appliance manufacturing error as well as an installation error. This change goes beyond requiring belt and suspenders safety provisions. Those were already in place, and it took both to fail for the incident to occur.

The proposed requirement of GFCI protection for all 250-volt receptacles is too broad and not supported by the committee's substantiation. According to the [NFPA article](#) used to support the change, the appliance in question was "an older installation, one predating today's requirement to install an equipment grounding conductor in the branch circuit to the range". It sounds like the tragedy was only possible with older wiring. This is another example that shows new construction and updated electrical systems do not constitute the same dangers as those in older homes.

The committee contends that 250-volt receptacles present similar hazards as 125-volt convenience receptacles and this is not true. 250-volt receptacles are installed behind the range or dryer without being readily accessible to the consumer. 250-volt appliances are plugged in and left for the operation of the appliance, but 125-volt receptacles are generally accessible to the consumer. If the consumer chose to, they could use a convenience receptacle for extension cords or other appliance use, whereas a 250-volt receptacle is specific to that appliance.



South Carolina Building Codes Council

110 Centerview Dr • Columbia • SC • 29210

P.O. Box 11329 • Columbia • SC • 29211-1329

Phone: 803-896-4688 • contact.bcc@llr.sc.gov • Fax: 803-896-4814

llr.sc.gov/bcc

2021 BUILDING CODE MODIFICATION REQUEST FORM

Requirements:

- All requests must be submitted by September 22, 2021.
- Each request for code modification must be submitted separately.
- A cover letter from the local jurisdiction or professional association stating that the individual is authorized to present the proposed amendment; and verification that the proposed amendment has the support of at least a majority of the members of the board or council governing the local jurisdiction or professional association proposing the modification.
- Sufficient test information, studies, data, or other documentation that would be necessary to fully explain and justify the proposed amendment
- For local modification requests only: the physical or climatological basis for the request and the reason that the suggested change would correct the condition.
- A local jurisdiction or professional association shall not propose a modification which will amend, suspend, eliminate or supersede an existing statute, policy, rule or regulation of any state or federal agency per S.C. Regulation 8-240 (H).
- **A completed modification request must be received with all required documentation before it will be reviewed.**

Statewide Modification

Local Modification: _____

(List all jurisdictions that apply.)

Association/Jurisdiction: Home Builders Association of South Carolina

Address: [Redacted] Columbia SC 29201
City State Zip

Name: Mark Nix Title/Position: Executive Director

Phone No.: [Redacted] Email Address: [Redacted]

Please select the applicable code to be modified:

2020 National Electrical Code

Please list the exact code section, table, figure, or appendix to be modified, and attach a photocopy of the applicable code section: 210.8(A)(5) Dwelling Units

**Code section as modified:**

(Please strike through language being removed, and put language to be added in parentheses. Use additional pages as needed.)

210.8(A)(5) Dwelling Units

(5) ~~Basements Unfinished portions or areas of the basement not intended as habitable rooms~~

Exception to (5): A receptacle supplying only a permanently installed fire alarm or burglar alarm system shall not be required to have ground-fault circuit-interrupter protection.

Substantiation of actual problems in finished basements was not provided to support expanding this requirement beyond unfinished basements. Not all basements are subject to damp or wet conditions and should not be subject to the same rules as ones that are.

Expanding GFCI coverage to all areas of finished basements even where no water is to be expected is not justified. Finished areas of basements are not as hazardous as bathrooms or kitchens where people use small appliances near sinks and tubs, and no data was presented to prove otherwise. GFCI receptacles were first required in the 1987 edition of the code and expanded to the entire unfinished area of basements in the following edition. There has been no reason to expand coverage to all basements for the past 30 years, which shows there is no known benefit to requiring finished basements to be covered by GFCIs.

The committee statement claims that “basements whether finished or unfinished are prone to moisture including flooding”, but that statement best reflects conditions in older homes. As written, this would affect all new houses but only older homes which have their basement electrical systems updated or expanded. (Building codes have added requirements to address moisture in basements. Newer homes require drain tile and water proofing materials which go beyond the traditional parging mortar of the past.) If the concern is centered on the conditions of older homes, then an expansion of GFCI protection should focus on such homes and not include new construction.

9/28 Study Committee Recommendation: Support approval amending language to match the modification request submitted for 2021 IRC E3902.5. See below for modification as it will read in the 2020 NEC, with changes in red.

210.8(A)(5) Basements.

Exception **No. 1** to (5): A receptacle supplying only a permanently installed fire alarm or burglar alarm system shall not be required to have ground-fault circuit-interrupter protection.

Exception No. 2 to (5): Receptacles in walk-out basements are excluded from this requiremnt.



In 200 characters or less, please briefly describe the justification for this modification request.

see above.

Per Regulation 8-240(E)(5), please list the persons with their titles and affiliations, known at the time of submittal, who will provide testimony in favor of the amendment. Due to the possibility of virtual hearings, **all information in the table below is required** to ensure proper notification. Use additional pages as needed.

Name	Title	Affiliation	Phone Number	Email Address
Mark Nix	Executive Director	HBA of SC		
Andy Barber	HBASC Codes Chairman	HBA of SC		

Affirmation

I certify that all information in this form, including all supplementary documents submitted with this form, are true and correct to the best of my knowledge after undertaking due diligence to determine their accuracy.

Signature: Mark Nix Digitally signed by Mark Nix Date: 2021.08.10 16:13:11 -04'00' Date: _____

Title: Executive Director



South Carolina Building Codes Council

110 Centerview Dr • Columbia • SC • 29210

P.O. Box 11329 • Columbia • SC • 29211-1329

Phone: 803-896-4688 • contact.bcc@llr.sc.gov • Fax: 803-896-4814

llr.sc.gov/bcc

2021 BUILDING CODE MODIFICATION REQUEST FORM

Requirements:

- All requests must be submitted by September 22, 2021.
Each request for code modification must be submitted separately.
A cover letter from the local jurisdiction or professional association stating that the individual is authorized to present the proposed amendment; and verification that the proposed amendment has the support of at least a majority of the members of the board or council governing the local jurisdiction or professional association proposing the modification.
Sufficient test information, studies, data, or other documentation that would be necessary to fully explain and justify the proposed amendment
For local modification requests only: the physical or climatological basis for the request and the reason that the suggested change would correct the condition.
A local jurisdiction or professional association shall not propose a modification which will amend, suspend, eliminate or supersede an existing statute, policy, rule or regulation of any state or federal agency per S.C. Regulation 8-240 (H).
A completed modification request must be received with all required documentation before it will be reviewed.

[X] Statewide Modification

[] Local Modification: _____

(List all jurisdictions that apply.)

Association/Jurisdiction: Home Builders Association of South Carolina

Address: [Redacted] Columbia SC 29201
City State Zip

Name: Mark Nix Title/Position: Executive Director

Phone No.: [Redacted] Email Address: [Redacted]

Please select the applicable code to be modified:

2020 National Electrical Code

Please list the exact code section, table, figure, or appendix to be modified, and attach a photocopy of the applicable code section: 210.8(F) Outdoor Outlets

**Code section as modified:**

(Please strike through language being removed, and put language to be added in parentheses. Use additional pages as needed.)

~~210.8(F) Outdoor Outlets.~~

~~All outdoor outlets for dwellings, other than those covered in 210.8(A)(3), Exception to (3), that are supplied by single-phase branch circuits rated 150 volts to ground or less, 50 amperes or less, shall have ground-fault circuit-interrupter protection for personnel.~~

~~Exception: Ground-fault circuit-interrupter protection shall not be required on lighting outlets other than those covered in 210.8(C).~~

Reason:

GFCIs are shown to be effective where a corded product is plugged into a standard "convenience" receptacle in a wet or damp location. However, this requirement is for condenser units, which are hardwired.

Data was not provided to supports expanding the use of GFCI protection on these circuits. The event used as substantiation was a result of an unqualified individual performing an electrical installation they never should have attempted. The NEC should not mandate GFCI protection for all outdoor outlets based on very specific unfortunate circumstances.

This requirement is extremely broad and will result in many unintended consequences. For example, it has not been determined if all A/C condenser units will operate on a GFCI protected circuit as sufficient testing has not been conducted. If the condenser unit is affected by high humidity and trips the GFCI, it could result in unhealthy conditions and property damage inside the home due to heat, humidity and mold growth, especially where the home is unoccupied for an extended period. There is also the potential for unwanted tripping and compatibility issues with heat pumps.

Branch circuit extensions or modifications would require the addition of GFCI protection for old condenser units, and it is not known whether the existing equipment is compatible with GFCI This requirement also applies to hardwired connections for effluent pumps and other types of lift station pumps with outdoor connections.

9/28 Study Committee Recommendation: Support approval



In 200 characters or less, please briefly describe the justification for this modification request.

See above

Per Regulation 8-240(E)(5), please list the persons with their titles and affiliations, known at the time of submittal, who will provide testimony in favor of the amendment. Due to the possibility of virtual hearings, **all information in the table below is required** to ensure proper notification. Use additional pages as needed.

Name	Title	Affiliation	Phone Number	Email Address
Mark Nix	Executive Director	HBA of SC	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Andy Barber	HBASC Codes Chairman	HBA of SC		

Affirmation

I certify that all information in this form, including all supplementary documents submitted with this form, are true and correct to the best of my knowledge after undertaking due diligence to determine their accuracy.

Signature: Mark Nix  Digitally signed by Mark Nix
Date: 2021.08.10 16:12:41 -04'00' Date: _____

Title: Executive Director



South Carolina Building Codes Council

110 Centerview Dr • Columbia • SC • 29210

P.O. Box 11329 • Columbia • SC • 29211-1329

Phone: 803-896-4688 • contact.bcc@llr.sc.gov • Fax: 803-896-4814

llr.sc.gov/bcc

2021 BUILDING CODE MODIFICATION REQUEST FORM

Requirements:

- All requests must be submitted by September 22, 2021.
- Each request for code modification must be submitted separately.
- A cover letter from the local jurisdiction or professional association stating that the individual is authorized to present the proposed amendment; and verification that the proposed amendment has the support of at least a majority of the members of the board or council governing the local jurisdiction or professional association proposing the modification.
- Sufficient test information, studies, data, or other documentation that would be necessary to fully explain and justify the proposed amendment
- For local modification requests only: the physical or climatological basis for the request and the reason that the suggested change would correct the condition.
- A local jurisdiction or professional association shall not propose a modification which will amend, suspend, eliminate or supersede an existing statute, policy, rule or regulation of any state or federal agency per S.C. Regulation 8-240 (H).
- **A completed modification request must be received with all required documentation before it will be reviewed.**

Statewide Modification

Local Modification: _____

(List all jurisdictions that apply.)

Association/Jurisdiction: Home Builders Association of South Carolina

Address: [Redacted] Columbia SC 29201
City State Zip

Name: Mark Nix Title/Position: Executive Director

Phone No.: [Redacted] Email Address: [Redacted]

Please select the applicable code to be modified:

2020 National Electrical Code

Please list the exact code section, table, figure, or appendix to be modified, and attach a photocopy of the applicable code section: 210.12 Arc-Fault Circuit-Interrupter Protection



Code section as modified:

(Please strike through language being removed, and put language to be added in parentheses. Use additional pages as needed.)

210.12 Arc-Fault Circuit-Interrupter Protection. Arc-fault circuit-interrupter protection shall be provided as required in 210.12(A), (B), and (C). The arc-fault circuit interrupter shall be installed in a readily accessible location.

(A) **Means of Protection Dwelling Units.** ~~All 120-volt, single-phase, 15- and 20-ampere branch circuits supplying outlets or devices installed in dwelling unit kitchens, family rooms, dining rooms, living rooms, parlors, libraries, dens, bedrooms, sunrooms, recreation rooms, closets, hallways, laundry areas, or similar rooms or areas shall be protected by any of the means described in 210.12(A)(1) through (6):~~

(A) **Branch Circuit Extensions or Modifications -- Dwelling Units and Dormitory Units.** In any of the areas specified in 210.12(A) ~~or~~ (B), where branch-circuit wiring is modified, replaced, or extended, the branch circuit shall be protected by one of the following:

9/28 Study Committee Recommendation: Support approval striking "kitchens" and "laundry" and leaving all other language. See below.

210.12 Arc-Fault Circuit-Interrupter Protection. Arc-fault circuit-interrupter protections shall be provided as required in 210.12(A), (B), (C), and (D). The arc-fault circuit interrupter shall be installed in a readily accessible location.

(A) **Dwelling Units.** All 120-volt, single-phase, 15- and 20-ampere branch circuits supplying outlets or devices installed in dwelling unit ~~kitchens,~~ family rooms, dining rooms, living rooms, parlors, libraries, dens, bedrooms, sunrooms, recreation rooms, closets, hallways, ~~laundry areas,~~ or similar rooms or areas shall be protected by any of the means described in 210.12(A) (1) through (6):



In 200 characters or less, please briefly describe the justification for this modification request.

This amendment removes the requirement for AFCI devices for residential dwelling units, including one- and two-family homes, while leaving it in place for hotels, motels and dormitories. The requirement for AFCIs applies predominantly to new homes, although the strongest association with electrical distribution fires was observed in dwellings over 40 years old. The data did not show that AFCIs were necessary when they were first introduced into the electrical code, and it has not supported the devices' continued expansion in the code. See attached for additional reasoning.

Per Regulation 8-240(E)(5), please list the persons with their titles and affiliations, known at the time of submittal, who will provide testimony in favor of the amendment. Due to the possibility of virtual hearings, **all information in the table below is required** to ensure proper notification. Use additional pages as needed.

Name	Title	Affiliation	Phone Number	Email Address
Mark Nix	Executive Director	HBA of SC		
Andy Barber	HBASC Codes Chairman	HBA of SC		

Affirmation

I certify that all information in this form, including all supplementary documents submitted with this form, are true and correct to the best of my knowledge after undertaking due diligence to determine their accuracy.

Signature: Mark Nix  Digitally signed by Mark Nix
Date: 2021.08.10 16:11:00 -04'00' Date: _____

Title: Executive Director



Reason:

This amendment retains the provisions of the 2017 NEC. AFCIs were first introduced in the 1999 edition of the National Electrical Code (NEC) with an effective date of Jan. 1, 2002. Code Making Panel 2, which had responsibility over branch circuits where AFCIs are addressed, largely based its approval of the code change on several U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) reports. **However, the number of incidents cited at the time were several times higher than in later reports, and where the data showed that AFCIs would have a minimal benefit, the results were ignored.** The resulting expected benefits led to AFCI requirements being included in the NEC, but were overblown.

The problems with the rationale were so evident that even electrical manufacturers spoke against the proposal. During the 1998 code development cycle comment period, manufacturers' representatives stated that a large body of information was available to support rejecting an AFCI mandate. The main issue: the electrical problems AFCIs are designed to prevent occur overwhelmingly in older dwellings.

When the Home Was Built Is Important

A CPSC epidemiological study, "Residential Electrical Distribution System Fires," showed that 85% of fires of electrical origin occur in homes that are more than 20 years old. This means that the bulk of these homes were wired in accordance with the 1965 or earlier editions of the NEC. Further, they were wired with products manufactured to product safety standards of a similar vintage. In the years since, numerous changes have been made in both the NEC and product safety standards which mitigate against similar fires in newer homes—even as they age.

The June 2015 issue of the U.S. Fire Administration's Topical Fire Report Series reported "A strong relationship between housing age and the rate of electrical fires has been observed, **with housing over 40 years old having the strongest association with electrical distribution fires** [emphasis added]." The median age of one- and two-family housing in the U.S. is 40 years. The share of housing units built before 1970 is 39%, and those built before 1950 is 18%. According to a study conducted by the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, dwellings built before 1965 may still have fuses instead of circuit breakers, and those built before 1945 may still have knob and tube wiring.

These older homes were also wired with a very limited number of receptacle outlets, resulting in extensive use of extension cords or improper alterations and additions to the original electrical system, both recognized fire hazards. In addition, they are more likely to have outdated appliances, space heaters or other characteristics that might lead to a greater risk of a fire starting. Newer homes have fire blocking, hardwired smoke alarms and egress windows installed to today's codes, all of which increase the chances of surviving a fire. **Even as homes built to today's residential code get older, they will continue to provide protection for families through their improved safety.**



While questions regarding construction code requirements intended to increase the safety of homes cannot, and should not, be decided solely on the issue of cost, it is reasonable to ask if there is a demonstrated need for the requirement or if an acceptable level of safety can be achieved through other, less expensive means. The cost of an incremental increase in the margin of safety can be quite high.

Higher regulatory costs have real consequences for working American families. These regulations end up pushing the price of housing beyond the means of many teachers, police officers, firefighters and other middle-class workers. Nationally, for every \$1,000 increase in the price of a home, about 150,000 households are priced out of the market for a median-priced new home. The added cost of \$300-\$400 for AFCIs may not sound like much when compared to the overall cost of a home, but this is only one of many regulations which adds cost for new homebuyers. Every \$838 increase in construction costs adds an additional \$1,000 to the final price of the home.

Mandating costly incremental increases in safety will only protect those who can afford them and will often decrease safety for those who cannot. Families who cannot qualify to purchase homes due to the increased costs from mandatory code requirements such as AFCIs will have to live in housing that is less safe, because that housing was built to less stringent code requirements.

The total cost to home buyers to install AFCIs is over \$430,000,000—per year. This is 24 times the cost of damage per year, and it is clear that requiring AFCIs in new construction will not prevent all damage. This is due to the fact that AFCIs cannot prevent all fires and, more importantly, that electrical fires occur overwhelmingly in older houses.

From 1980 to 2015 there has been a significant drop in the number of reported fires, injuries and fatalities in the United States. During that time period the number of fires has dropped by 50 percent and fatalities have dropped by about the same margin, even as the population increased. The decline was sharpest during the 1980s before AFCIs were introduced. This further supports the importance of encouraging homeowners to move up to newer homes without the added burden of increased regulation.



Code section as modified:

(Please strike through language being removed, and put language to be added in parentheses. Use additional pages as needed.)

~~230.67 Surge Protection:~~

~~230.67(A) Surge-Protective Device:~~

~~All services supplying dwelling units shall be provided with a surge-protective device (SPD).~~

~~230.67(B) Location:~~

~~The SPD shall be an integral part of the service equipment or shall be located immediately adjacent thereto.~~

~~Exception: The SPD shall not be required to be located in the service equipment as required in (B) if located at each next level distribution equipment downstream toward the load.~~

~~230.67(C) Type:~~

~~The SPD shall be a Type 1 or Type 2 SPD.~~

~~230.67(D) Replacement:~~

~~Where service equipment is replaced, all of the requirements of this section shall apply.~~

Reason:

The code-making panel did not provide adequate substantiation to clearly identify a risk to equipment or safety concern to warrant this new requirement. Surge protection is currently permitted by the code and can provide a value to the end user, but it should remain up to the consumer as to whether the benefit is worth the investment. There are also potential issues with mandating currently available surge-protection products in all cases. The new language does not specify which conductors are to be protected or what the minimum short circuit current rating, the minimum nominal discharge current rating or the voltage protection rating should be. Market pressures will dictate that the lowest level of protection is installed in most cases, severely limiting the effectiveness of the devices. There is also no guarantee that the devices remain in service, further negating any possible advantages of this new mandate.

During the code development process, the code making panel rejected several public comments to expand the surge-protection requirement to all occupancies and multiple levels of protection because they lacked substantiation. Yet the committee did not provide technical data in their statement showing a problem existed that required this change.

8/19 Study Committee Recommendation: Support approval



In 200 characters or less, please briefly describe the justification for this modification request.

See above.

Per Regulation 8-240(E)(5), please list the persons with their titles and affiliations, known at the time of submittal, who will provide testimony in favor of the amendment. Due to the possibility of virtual hearings, **all information in the table below is required** to ensure proper notification. Use additional pages as needed.

Name	Title	Affiliation	Phone Number	Email Address
Mark Nix	Executive Director	HBA of SC	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Andy Barber	HBASC Codes Chairman	HBA of SC		

Affirmation

I certify that all information in this form, including all supplementary documents submitted with this form, are true and correct to the best of my knowledge after undertaking due diligence to determine their accuracy.

Signature: Mark Nix Digitally signed by Mark Nix Date: 2021.08.10 16:12:19 -04'00' Date: _____

Title: Executive Director



South Carolina Building Codes Council

110 Centerview Dr • Columbia • SC • 29210

P.O. Box 11329 • Columbia • SC • 29211-1329

Phone: 803-896-4688 • contact.bcc@llr.sc.gov • Fax: 803-896-4814

llr.sc.gov/bcc

2021 BUILDING CODE MODIFICATION REQUEST FORM

Requirements:

- All requests must be submitted by September 22, 2021.
Each request for code modification must be submitted separately.
A cover letter from the local jurisdiction or professional association stating that the individual is authorized to present the proposed amendment; and verification that the proposed amendment has the support of at least a majority of the members of the board or council governing the local jurisdiction or professional association proposing the modification.
Sufficient test information, studies, data, or other documentation that would be necessary to fully explain and justify the proposed amendment
For local modification requests only: the physical or climatological basis for the request and the reason that the suggested change would correct the condition.
A local jurisdiction or professional association shall not propose a modification which will amend, suspend, eliminate or supersede an existing statute, policy, rule or regulation of any state or federal agency per S.C. Regulation 8-240 (H).
A completed modification request must be received with all required documentation before it will be reviewed.

[X] Statewide Modification

[] Local Modification: _____

(List all jurisdictions that apply.)

Association/Jurisdiction: Home Builders Association of South Carolina

Address: [Redacted] Columbia SC 29201
City State Zip

Name: Mark Nix Title/Position: Executive Director

Phone No.: [Redacted] Email Address: [Redacted]

Please select the applicable code to be modified:

Select One

Please list the exact code section, table, figure, or appendix to be modified, and attach a photocopy of the applicable code section: 406.4(D)(4) Arc-Fault Circuit-Interrupter Protection.



Code section as modified:

(Please strike through language being removed, and put language to be added in parentheses. Use additional pages as needed.)

406.4(D)(4) Arc-Fault Circuit-Interrupter Protection. Where a receptacle outlet is located in any areas specified in 210.12(A) ~~or~~ (B), a replacement receptacle at this outlet shall be one of the following:

1. A listed outlet branch-circuit type arc-fault circuit-interrupter receptacle
2. A receptacle protected by a listed outlet branch-circuit type arc-fault circuit-interrupter type receptacle
3. A receptacle protected by a listed combination type arc-fault circuit-interrupter

type circuit breaker Exception No. 1: Arc-fault circuit-interrupter protection shall not be required

where all of the following apply:

1. The replacement complies with 406.4(D)(2)(b).
2. It is impracticable to provide an equipment grounding conductor as provided by 250.130 (C).
3. A listed combination type arc-fault circuit-interrupter circuit breaker is not commercially available.
4. GFCI/AFCI dual function receptacles are not commercially available.

Exception No. 2: Section 210.12(B), Exception shall not apply to replacement of receptacles.

9/28 Study Committee Recommendation: Do not support approval



In 200 characters or less, please briefly describe the justification for this modification request.

This amendment removes the requirement for AFCI devices to be installed in residential dwelling units, including one- and two-family homes, when a receptacle is replaced, but does not remove it for dormitories.

See attached for more information.

Per Regulation 8-240(E)(5), please list the persons with their titles and affiliations, known at the time of submittal, who will provide testimony in favor of the amendment. Due to the possibility of virtual hearings, **all information in the table below is required** to ensure proper notification. Use additional pages as needed.

Name	Title	Affiliation	Phone Number	Email Address
Mark Nix	Executive Director	HBA of SC		
Andy Barber	HBASC Codes Chairman	HBA of SC		

Affirmation

I certify that all information in this form, including all supplementary documents submitted with this form, are true and correct to the best of my knowledge after undertaking due diligence to determine their accuracy.

Signature: Mark Nix  Digitally signed by Mark Nix
Date: 2021.08.10 16:10:14 -04'00' Date: _____

Title: Executive Director

**Reason:**

This amendment retains the provisions of the 2017 NEC. AFCIs were first introduced in the 1999 edition of the National Electrical Code (NEC) with an effective date of Jan. 1, 2002. Code Making Panel 2, which had responsibility over branch circuits where AFCIs are addressed, largely based its approval of the code change on several U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) reports. **However, the number of incidents cited at the time were several times higher than in later reports, and where the data showed that AFCIs would have a minimal benefit, the results were ignored.** The resulting expected benefits led to AFCI requirements being included in the NEC, but were overblown.

The problems with the rationale were so evident that even electrical manufacturers spoke against the proposal. During the 1998 code development cycle comment period, manufacturers' representatives stated that a large body of information was available to support **rejecting** an AFCI mandate. The main issue: the electrical problems AFCIs are designed to prevent occur overwhelmingly in older dwellings.

When the Home Was Built Is Important

A CPSC epidemiological study, "Residential Electrical Distribution System Fires," showed that 85% of fires of electrical origin occur in homes that are more than 20 years old. This means that the bulk of these homes were wired in accordance with the 1965 or earlier editions of the NEC. Further, they were wired with products manufactured to product safety standards of a similar vintage. In the years since, numerous changes have been made in both the NEC and product safety standards which mitigate against similar fires in newer homes—even as they age.

The June 2015 issue of the U.S. Fire Administration's Topical Fire Report Series reported "A strong relationship between housing age and the rate of electrical fires has been observed, **with housing over 40 years old having the strongest association with electrical distribution fires** [emphasis added]." The median age of one- and two-family housing in the U.S. is 40 years. The share of housing units built before 1970 is 39%, and those built before 1950 is 18%. According to a study conducted by the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, dwellings built before 1965 may still have fuses instead of circuit breakers, and those built before 1945 may still have knob and tube wiring.

These older homes were also wired with a very limited number of receptacle outlets, resulting in extensive use of extension cords or improper alterations and additions to the original electrical system, both recognized fire hazards. In addition, they are more likely to have outdated appliances, space heaters or other characteristics that might lead to a greater risk of a fire starting. Newer homes have fire blocking, hardwired smoke alarms and egress windows installed to today's codes, all of which increase the chances of surviving a fire. **Even as homes built to today's residential code get older, they will continue to provide protection for families through their improved safety.**

While questions regarding construction code requirements intended to increase the safety of homes cannot, and should not, be decided solely on the issue of cost, it is reasonable to ask if there is a demonstrated need for the requirement or if an acceptable level of safety can be achieved through other, less expensive means. The cost of an incremental increase in the margin of safety can be quite high.

Higher regulatory costs have real consequences for working American families. These regulations end up pushing the price of housing beyond the means of many teachers, police officers,



firefighters and other middle-class workers. Nationally, for every \$1,000 increase in the price of a home, about 150,000 households are priced out of the market for a median-priced new home. The added cost of \$300-\$400 for AFCIs may not sound like much when compared to the overall cost of a home, but this is only one of many regulations which adds cost for new homebuyers. Every \$838 increase in construction costs adds an additional \$1,000 to the final price of the home.

Mandating costly incremental increases in safety will only protect those who can afford them and will often decrease safety for those who cannot. Families who cannot qualify to purchase homes due to the increased costs from mandatory code requirements such as AFCIs will have to live in housing that is less safe, because that housing was built to less stringent code requirements.

The total cost to home buyers to install AFCIs is over \$430,000,000—per year. **This is 24 times the cost of damage per year**, and it is clear that requiring AFCIs in new construction will not prevent all damage. This is due to the fact that AFCIs cannot prevent all fires and, more importantly, that electrical fires occur overwhelmingly in older houses.

From 1980 to 2015 there has been a significant drop in the number of reported fires, injuries and fatalities in the United States. During that time period the number of fires has dropped by 50 percent and fatalities have dropped by about the same margin, even as the population increased. The decline was sharpest during the 1980s before AFCIs were introduced. This further supports the importance of encouraging homeowners to move up to newer homes without the added burden of increased regulation.



South Carolina Building Codes Council

110 Centerview Dr • Columbia • SC • 29210

P.O. Box 11329 • Columbia • SC • 29211-1329

Phone: 803-896-4688 • contact.bcc@llr.sc.gov • Fax: 803-896-4814

llr.sc.gov/bcc

2021 BUILDING CODE MODIFICATION REQUEST FORM

Requirements:

- All requests must be submitted by September 22, 2021.
Each request for code modification must be submitted separately.
A cover letter from the local jurisdiction or professional association stating that the individual is authorized to present the proposed amendment; and verification that the proposed amendment has the support of at least a majority of the members of the board or council governing the local jurisdiction or professional association proposing the modification.
Sufficient test information, studies, data, or other documentation that would be necessary to fully explain and justify the proposed amendment
For local modification requests only: the physical or climatological basis for the request and the reason that the suggested change would correct the condition.
A local jurisdiction or professional association shall not propose a modification which will amend, suspend, eliminate or supersede an existing statute, policy, rule or regulation of any state or federal agency per S.C. Regulation 8-240 (H).
A completed modification request must be received with all required documentation before it will be reviewed.

[X] Statewide Modification

[] Local Modification: _____

(List all jurisdictions that apply.)

Association/Jurisdiction: Home Builders Association of South Carolina

Address: [Redacted] Columbia SC 29201
City State Zip

Name: Mark Nix Title/Position: Executive Director

Phone No.: [Redacted] Email Address: [Redacted]

Please select the applicable code to be modified:

2020 National Electrical Code

Please list the exact code section, table, figure, or appendix to be modified, and attach a photocopy of the applicable code section: 406.9(C) Bathtub and Shower Space

**Code section as modified:**

(Please strike through language being removed, and put language to be added in parentheses. Use additional pages as needed.)

406.9(C) Bathtub and Shower Space.

Receptacles shall not be installed within ~~a zone measured 900 mm (3 ft) horizontally and 2.5 m (8 ft) vertically from the top of the bathtub rim or shower stall threshold. The identified zone is all-encompassing and shall include the space or~~ directly over ~~the a~~ bathtub or shower stall.

Exception: In bathrooms with less than the required zone the receptacle(s) shall be permitted to be installed opposite the bathtub rim or shower stall threshold on the farthest wall within the room.

Reason:

Current code prohibits receptacles from being located directly above a bathtub or in a shower stall. In addition, receptacles in bathrooms are required to be GFCI protected, so further restrictions on their location are not needed.

The submitter of the code change claimed the original language was unclear, but it was easily understood in most cases. And the new language will cause non-uniform enforcement, because it can be interpreted in different ways. Specifically, the zone where receptacles are prohibited extends 3 ft from the bathtub rim. The rim is located on all sides of a bathtub, so does the zone extend 3 ft horizontally in every direction? Note the zone is "all-encompassing" which is defined as "including everything". This language seems to prohibit a receptacle from being installed within that zone even if there is a wall separating the end of the bathtub from the vanity. A receptacle is even more likely to be prohibited where a fixed glass panel separates the tub or shower from the area where a homeowner would like a receptacle.

Receptacles in proximity to bathtub and shower spaces is addressed for manufactured and mobile homes in the code as well, but distance restrictions are not included. The requirements for site-built homes should not be more restrictive than for manufactured and mobile homes.

9/28 Study Committee Recommendation: Do not support approval



In 200 characters or less, please briefly describe the justification for this modification request.

Receptacles Near Bathtub and Shower Spaces

This change prohibits all receptacles from within 3 feet of any bathtub or shower stall unless the bathroom dimensions are too small to provide that clearance.

See above for additional reasoning.

Per Regulation 8-240(E)(5), please list the persons with their titles and affiliations, known at the time of submittal, who will provide testimony in favor of the amendment. Due to the possibility of virtual hearings, **all information in the table below is required** to ensure proper notification. Use additional pages as needed.

Name	Title	Affiliation	Phone Number	Email Address
Mark Nix	Executive Director	HBA of SC		
Andy Barber	HBASC Codes Chairman	HBA of SC		

Affirmation

I certify that all information in this form, including all supplementary documents submitted with this form, are true and correct to the best of my knowledge after undertaking due diligence to determine their accuracy.

Signature: Mark Nix  Digitally signed by Mark Nix
Date: 2021.08.10 16:11:24 -04'00' Date: _____

Title: Executive Director



South Carolina Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation
South Carolina Building Codes Council
110 Centerview Dr • Columbia • SC • 29210
P.O. Box 11329 • Columbia • SC • 29211-1329
Phone: 803-896-4688 • contact.bcc@llr.sc.gov • Fax: 803-896-4814
llr.sc.gov/bcc

2021 BUILDING CODE MODIFICATION REQUEST FORM

Requirements:

- All requests must be submitted by September 22, 2021.
Each request for code modification must be submitted separately.
A cover letter from the local jurisdiction or professional association stating that the individual is authorized to present the proposed amendment; and verification that the proposed amendment has the support of at least a majority of the members of the board or council governing the local jurisdiction or professional association proposing the modification.
Sufficient test information, studies, data, or other documentation that would be necessary to fully explain and justify the proposed amendment
For local modification requests only: the physical or climatological basis for the request and the reason that the suggested change would correct the condition.
A local jurisdiction or professional association shall not propose a modification which will amend, suspend, eliminate or supersede an existing statute, policy, rule or regulation of any state or federal agency per S.C. Regulation 8-240 (H).
A completed modification request must be received with all required documentation before it will be reviewed.

[X] Statewide Modification

[] Local Modification: (List all jurisdictions that apply.)

Association/Jurisdiction: Home Builders Association of South Carolina

Address: [Redacted] Columbia SC 29201
City State Zip

Name: Mark Nix Title/Position: Executive Director

Phone No.: [Redacted] Email Address: [Redacted]

Please select the applicable code to be modified:

2020 National Electrical Code

Please list the exact code section, table, figure, or appendix to be modified, and attach a photocopy of the applicable code section: 406.12 Tamper-Resistant Receptacles



Code section as modified:

(Please strike through language being removed, and put language to be added in parentheses. Use additional pages as needed.)

~~406.12 Tamper-Resistant Receptacles.~~ All 15- and 20-ampere, 125- and 250-volt nonlocking-type receptacles in the areas specified in 406.12(1) through (7) shall be listed tamper-resistant receptacles.

- ~~(1) Dwelling units in all areas specified in 210.52 and 550.13.~~
- ~~(2) (1) Guest rooms and guest suites of hotels and motels.~~
- ~~(3) (2) Child care facilities.~~
- ~~(4) (3) Preschools and elementary education facilities.~~
- ~~(5) (4) Business offices, corridors, waiting rooms and the like in clinics, medical and dental offices, and outpatient facilities.~~
- ~~(6) (5) Subset of assembly occupancies described in 518.2 to include places of waiting transportation, gymnasiums, skating rinks, and auditoriums.~~
- ~~(7) (6) Dormitories~~

Exception to (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6), ~~and (7)~~: Receptacles in the following locations shall not be required to be tamper resistant:

- (1) Receptacles located more than 1.7m (5-1/2 ft) above the floor.
- (2) Receptacles that are part of a luminaire or appliance.
- (3) A single receptacle or a duplex receptacle for two appliances located within the dedicated space for each appliance that, in normal use, is not easily moved from one place to another and that is cord-and-plug connected in accordance with 400.10(A)(6), (A)(7), or (A)(8).
- (4) Non-grounding receptacles used for replacements as permitted in 406.4(D)(2)(a).

9/28: Withdrawn by HBA of SC



In 200 characters or less, please briefly describe the justification for this modification request.

This amendment removes the requirement for tamper-resistant receptacles in one- and two-family homes. See attached for additional information.

Per Regulation 8-240(E)(5), please list the persons with their titles and affiliations, known at the time of submittal, who will provide testimony in favor of the amendment. Due to the possibility of virtual hearings, **all information in the table below is required** to ensure proper notification. Use additional pages as needed.

Name	Title	Affiliation	Phone Number	Email Address
Mark Nix	Executive Director	HBA of SC	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Andy Barber	HBASC Codes Chairman	HBA of SC		

Affirmation

I certify that all information in this form, including all supplementary documents submitted with this form, are true and correct to the best of my knowledge after undertaking due diligence to determine their accuracy.

Signature: Mark Nix  Digitally signed by Mark Nix
Date: 2021.08.10 16:10:37 -04'00' Date: _____

Title: Executive Director

**Reason:**

This amendment retains the provisions of the 2017 NEC. This requirement was added in the 2008 edition of the National Electrical Code (NEC) and is not based on sound technical information which adequately substantiates that it will result in protecting small children from burns or injury. During the revision cycle leading up to the 2008 edition the supporting documentation for the proposal was based on the summarization of several National Electronic Injury Surveillance System reports from 1991-2001. The NEISS system gathers its data by sampling a group of monitored hospitals for the total number of injuries treated. They then take these figures and calculate the estimated national average.

Public comment from electrical contractors criticized the conclusions drawn from the report. They stated that the report did not identify if the incidents were occurring in newer or older homes. Older homes generally have more electrical hazards which can lead to a higher incidence of shocks.

The NEISS reports also did not provide any supporting information of where the child was located at the time the injury occurred, much less that all incidents occurred in dwelling units or if any child safety devices were present at the time the injury occurred. There is no scientific research available which has proven tamper-resistant (TR) receptacles are more effective than other safety devices that are currently available on the market. The fact sheet, produced by the National Fire Protection Association, states that TR receptacles are preferred over plastic safety caps for the reason that the caps **may** be lost and **may** be a choking hazard for some ages. However, the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) suggests the use of outlet safety covers on their website [Childproofing Your Home- 12 Safety Devices to Protect Your Children](#), and safety covers available in stores today are large enough not to constitute a choking hazard. It's fair to say CPSC would not advocate their use if there were safety concerns.

Another concern that was shared by many on the technical review committee was the amount of force that must be applied to insert plugs into the tamper-resistant device and how it will affect the elderly community. The devices are designed in a way that the springs will not open unless the prongs are properly aligned with the shutters and are receiving equal amounts of pressure. Many on the panel voiced concern that there was a lack of product testing showing whether there will be an impact to the aging community's ability to use the new devices.

Notes/additional background:

During the 2008 revision Cycle, the National Electrical Manufacturers Association submitted the proposal to require tamper-resistant receptacles in all areas of a dwelling as indicated in Article 210.52 of the NEC. Over 29 negative comments were submitted in response to the proposal and all 29 comments were rejected by the technical committee. The negative comments were submitted by electrical contractors, electrical inspectors, and some manufacturers. Below is a list of concerns that were raised:

1. The required force to insert cords into the device may prove too much for the elderly or disabled.
2. There is no scientific data directly comparing current available safety devices to tamper-resistant receptacles to support the claim that TR are more effective and will reduce the number of accidents.
3. That the proponent should provide data listing the areas of the dwelling where injuries have occurred, thereby proving the need for tamper receptacle in areas such as attics, crawlspaces, mechanical rooms, countertops and other areas where the receptacles are normally out of reach of children.
4. At the time the proposal was approved, it was unknown whether any manufacturers were producing tamper-resistant devices that were compatible or integrated with arc-



- fault and ground-fault circuit interrupters.
5. The supporting documentation submitted by the proponent clearly stated “the results of these incidents are rarely fatal”, and that further research should be conducted along with more product development before any such mandate should be implemented.
 6. That the technical committee should remember, the code is not able to protect each person, in every situations, from every conceivable harm and should not be used as a tool to differ the responsibilities of the parent or caregiver who should be monitoring the children.
 7. That the substantiation lacked any credible justification for disallowing the use of plastic safety caps other than claiming that they could be lost or become a choking hazard.
 8. Why limit tamper-resistant receptacles to dwellings? There are several other occupancies that do not require these devices, yet children are present and the receptacles are accessible.
 9. Tamper-resistant receptacles should be an option for dwellings that children occupy and not mandatory for dwellings where children are not present.