

**LOG OF MEETING  
DIRECTORATE FOR ENGINEERING SCIENCES**

SUBJECT: National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA) members meeting with CPSC staff to discuss potential enhancements with ground-fault circuit interrupters (GFCIs)

DATE OF MEETING: February 8, 2007

PLACE OF MEETING: NEMA Headquarters, Rosslyn, Virginia

LOG ENTRY SOURCE: Doug Lee, ESEE *Dan*

DATE OF LOG ENTRY: March 16, 2007

COMMISSION ATTENDEES: Doug Lee, ESEE  
Andrew Trotta, ESEE  
Bob Ochsman, ESHF

NON-COMMISSION ATTENDEES:

Al Scolnik – NEMA  
Joel Saltzman – NEMA  
Harry Massey – NEMA  
Andrei Moldoveanu - NEMA  
Ed Larsen- Schneider El.  
Henry Zylstra – Square D  
Aaron Chase- Leviton  
Steve Campolo – Leviton  
Jack Wells – Pass & Seymour Legrand- Chairman  
Dan Kissane – Pass & Seymour Legrand  
Thomas Packard – Pass & Seymour Legrand  
John Young – Siemens Energy & Automation  
John Goodsell – Hubbell Wiring Device  
William Murphy – Cutler-Hammer/Eaton  
David McDonald – TRC  
John Dougherty – GE  
Tom Odermatt – Cooper Wiring Devices  
Howard Leopold – Cooper Wiring Devices

SUMMARY OF MEETING:

Task Group Chairman Wells welcomed the attendees and stated that the purpose of the meeting was to determine the CPSC staff position on NEMA's proposal on Principles of Limited Auto-monitoring (See attached letter to CPSC staff) and to discuss other safety applications using ground-fault circuit-interrupters (GFCIs).

CPSC staff was asked to comment on the CPSC Engineering Staff Position Paper on GFCIs dated April 20, 2001. CPSC staff stated that the CPSC staff position hasn't fundamentally changed and that the views expressed at the August 2005 NEMA member/CPSC staff meeting are still valid. The CPSC staff was specifically asked to confirm that the following four statements were still valid:

1. GFCIs should provide electric power only when shock protection is also provided.
2. GFCIs should be required to deny power when the reset mechanism has been actuated and the GFCI is inoperable.
3. Power denial technology in some form should become a basic requirement for all GFCIs including circuit breaker and portable types, with an effective date that allows for developing appropriate, cost effective designs.
4. The use of audible and visual indicators to alert consumers to a failed GFCI was evaluated, but alerts may not be effective if a GFCI is located in a panel box or other upstream location that is not near the outlet the consumer is using.

CPSC staff reaffirmed that these statements were still valid. CPSC staff acknowledged that the industry has made considerable improvements in the product and in the voluntary standard to improve safety/reliability with the product. These areas include: miswiring of GFCIs, resistance to exposure effects of wet locations, resistance to power surges, and other improvements. CPSC staff indicated that the references to these items in the staff position paper are no longer valid since new requirements have been added to address these issues. However, CPSC staff stated that the reliance on the consumer for periodic testing and disabling of an inoperative GFCI were still valid concerns. The CPSC staff encouraged NEMA members to provide self/auto testing of the GFCI and not provide power if the GFCI is not capable of providing shock protection for which it is designed.