

DATE: December 18, 2014

TO: James Brown
Warren Coklow
Michael Cronk Jr.
Ray Litt
Ric Preuss
Marian Swint

FROM: Bert McAlister, Acting Chairman

RE: **BOARD OF ELECTRICAL EXAMINERS MEETING**

AGENDA

1. Approval of the minutes of the last meeting
2. Board Hearings
3. Board Considerations
4. Applications for Approvals and Reviews
5. Correspondence
 - Chrysler Apprenticeship Curriculum
6. Unfinished Business:
 - Review of the Board's Mission Statement
 - The Board's Newsletter Articles: Introduction & Jimmi Smith
 - Apprentice Coordinator Forum Update
 - Board's Administrative Rules: Review of revised *Section 406.0*
 - M1 Rail Update
7. New Business
8. Adjournment



MINUTES OF MEETING FOR NOVEMBER 20, 2014

POSITION	MEMBER	PRESENT
ACTING CHAIRMAN	BERT MCALISTER	YES
SECRETARY	MARIAN SWINT	YES
CONTRACTOR		
ELECTRICAL ENGINEER	RAY LITT	YES
ELECTRICAL UTILITY	JAMES BROWN	YES
EX-OFFICIO	MICHAEL CRONK JR.	YES
JOURNEYMAN	RIC PREUSS	YES
MASTER ELECTRICIAN	WARREN COKLOW	YES
PUBLIC LIGHTING REP.		
RESIDENT TAXPAYER	BERT MCALISTER	YES

NOTICE OF THE MEETING WAS POSTED ON THE BULLETIN BOARD, LOCATED IN THE FIRST FLOOR EAST LOBBY, OF THE COLEMAN A. YOUNG MUNICIPAL CENTER, TWO WOODWARD AVENUE.

The meeting convened at 10:04 a.m.

Mr. Durand Capers: Supervising Electrical Inspector was present at the meeting.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

Mr. Litt made a motion to approved the Agenda with an amendment under *Unfinished Business* regarding the Board’s Mission Statement. The motion was seconded by Mr. Preuss. **Motion carried.**

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING:

A motion was made by Mr. Litt and seconded by Mr. Brown to approve the minutes as amended of October 16, 2014: **Motion carried.**

BOARD HEARINGS:

None

BOARD CONSIDERATIONS:

Mr. Dave Bell, Chairman, Board of Rules, **RE: Contractor Fee Recommendation:** Mr. Bell did not appear.

APPLICATIONS FOR APPROVAL/REVIEW

None

EXAMINATIONS/RE-EXAMINATION

None



MINUTES OF MEETING FOR NOVEMBER 20, 2014

APPRENTICE REGISTRATION

Campbell, Nicholas
Flowers, Harold
Jones Sr., Wardell
Lewis, Desmond
Lewis, terrance
Muhammad, Abdul
Smith, Roderick

APPLICANTS NOT APPROVED

None

ELECTRICAL CONTRACTOR'S LICENSES & REGISTRATIONS

Brother Hice Electric	Registration
Ecker Mechanical Contractors	Registration
Main Street Electric & Home Repair	Registration
SG Powerlink	Registration
Vector Services	Registration

JOURNEYMAN ELECTRICIAN

None

MASTER ELECTRICIAN

None

FIRE ALARM CONTRACTOR

None

FIRE ALARM TECHNICIAN'S LICENSE

None

FIRE ALARM APPRENTICE

None

SIGN SPECIALTY CONTRACTOR'S LICENSE

None

SIGN SPECIALIST LICENSE

None



MINUTES OF MEETING FOR NOVEMBER 20, 2014

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. Rokib Myles: DTE Regional Supervisor, DTE RE: Service Releases: Mr. Myles has been invited back to the Board to discuss drafting an informational document that outlines the service reconnect process for customers. Mr. Myles stated that DTE does not provide any details, cost, or direction to their customers regarding service releases. They may provide the contact number for the City of Detroit Electrical Division, or the municipality in which the customer resides, but that is all.

Mr. Myles stated that the customer must understand that this process solely belongs to the City of Detroit, and is not a joint process. The customer calls DTE, the call is then forwarded to an order taking group, the order group creates a work order, then the work order appears in Mr. Myles' system management in-box. The work orders are then assigned to service planners.

The Southeast Division, which services Detroit, has 21 service planners, and 4-5 OFCs (Office Field Coordinators) that mainly deal with residential services, advising, and energizing customers. After reviewing the draft, Mr. Myles stated he will discuss the service release draft with Rodney Cole, DTE Manager in charge of Governmental Affairs. Mr. Cole will make the determination regarding the extent of DTE's participation.

Mr. Litt posed a question: What does a homeowner know about service work, and why isn't a service reconnect permit not automatically required to be secured by an Electrical Contractor?

Mr. McAlister offered an example: If there is a fire at a dwelling, the service drop most likely will be cut by the Fire Department. If the homeowner had a brand new 100 amp service, all the owner needs to know is can the service be safely re-energized by the utility? The owner does not need to have electrical knowledge. The owner is only trying to accomplish getting the service re-energized to receive power to the residence again.

Now if upon inspection, the Inspector finds for example, no grounding to the service, or other discrepancies in the service installation, the Inspector will take the appropriate action, and then the owner will have to secure a homeowner's permit for the work that was performed if eligible. Or, secure the services of a licensed Electrical Contractor at that point.

Mr. Litt feels an Electrical Contractor should be hired right out of the gate. Mr. McAlister stated that if there aren't any violations when the Electrical Inspector comes out to do the inspection, the owner has now spent money on a Contractor when one was not needed. Mr. McAlister stated that Mr. Litt's point is understood in regard to concern over electrical safety. Mr. Brown stated the safety mechanism is the inspection itself.



MINUTES OF MEETING FOR NOVEMBER 20, 2014

UNFINISHED BUSINESS CONT.

Mr. McAlister stated the State Electrical Code addresses the subject of service reconnects. This is not just a City of Detroit requirement.

Mr. Capers stated if the utility cuts off the service for non-payment, a service reconnect will not be required. However, if there has been a fire or a property has been vacant, an inspection should be made. Typically, when properties are vacant for some time, there is a problem with stripping. When stripping has occurred, sometimes wires above the panel may have been cut, and are still energized.

Mr. Myles asked if it is mandatory to get a service reconnect permit? Mr. Capers stated that when a customer comes in for a service reconnect permit he conducts a small interview with the customer to ascertain if this is the correct permit needed. Is there new wiring? A panel changed? A meter enclosure changed? Sometimes a customer will mention they have an Electrical Contractor performing the work. In that case, the homeowner will be denied a service reconnect permit. Mr. Myles suggested that it should be stated on the draft that a service reconnect permit is mandatory.

Ms. Swint proposed to Mr. Myles the idea of having a database on the Electrical Division web page for only DTE to access, and password protected, regarding service release statuses. This database would consist of an alphabetical listing by address and contain the status of the service release in regard to acceptance or denial. This database would also serve as another platform to the fax system currently in place. Ms. Swint has already discussed this proposal with BSEED's Director, Mr. Eric Jones, and a question was posed by him: Does a service release have an expiration date? Mr. Myles stated that a service release does not have an expiration date, and is valid until power has been un-energized.

After further general discussion, Mr. Myles left the meeting for another engagement.

Mr. David Bell joined the meeting.

Mr. David Bell, Chairman, Board of Rules, RE: Electrical Contractor Fees:

Mr. Bell has come to the Board today to discuss the Board's recommendation of parity in regard to Electrical Contractor License fees (\$55) and Electrical Contractor Registration fees (\$25). In past discussions, it has been made known that Contractors outside the City of Detroit (Registrations) represent the majority of the work being performed in the City of Detroit. Also, in regard to Electrical Specialty Licenses (Fire Alarm/Sign Specialty) these Registration fees are currently equal to their City of Detroit Licensed counterparts.

Mr. Bell apologized to the Board for not coming to the meeting last month, and stated there was a scheduling conflict.



MINUTES OF MEETING FOR NOVEMBER 20, 2014

UNFINISHED BUSINESS CONT.

Mr. Bell stated that he will take this before the Board of Rules and address the issue. Fees are supposed to be based on the cost of the service, it should not cost more to provide a service to Detroit based Contractors than Registered Contractors. The paperwork for both of these disciplines are the same. Mr. Bell asked as the reasoning behind the difference in costs. Mr. McAlister stated that when he was with the Department, the Contractor License fee was higher at one time, but was lowered to match the State of Michigan's fees. Since then, the State is charging \$300/three years (\$100 a year) for their Licenses.

Mr. Bell stated another issue in the process of being addressed, is the entire fee schedule. The Law Department is currently reviewing BSEED's fee schedule to make sure customers are not over or under charged. Mr. Litt asked Mr. Bell if there is any more information the Board can provide in order to get parity? For example, how many Licensed Contractors to Registered Contractors? How many dollars are generated by each discipline? Mr. Bell stated that information would be helpful, as well as, a benchmark of fees from at least five of the biggest municipalities in the State of Michigan for comparison.

Mr. Litt inquired as to when Mr. Bell will conduct a meeting of the Board of Rules? Mr. Bell stated it will not be before the first of the new year. Mr. Brown asked what is the cost of the Licensed City of Detroit Contractors to register outside the City? Mr. McAlister stated speaking with Mr. O'Donnell last month, Registrations across the state are typically \$25.

Mr. Bell expressed his personal appreciation of the hard work of the Board, and if there were any further issues.

The secretary asked about the issue of changing Owner's Affidavits from a permit item to a License or Registration in order to be consistent with the State of Michigan. The Owner's Affidavit allows buildings in the City of Detroit that have an electrical staff overseen by a Master Electrician, to pull a permit for the entire year based upon the number of electricians employed. Mr. Bell stated Cobo Hall and Bedrock have expressed a desire to have an annual permit as opposed to the traditional permit offered by the City currently. Mr. Bell stated the City needs to be more in line with the State requirements, which includes annual permitting for all trades.

Mr. Bell stated the limited benchmarking he has done on Owner's Affidavits allow for a certain amount of inspections per affidavit. Anything over that allotment of inspections will require additional permits. Mr. Bell stated he would like to sit down with Mr. Capers to discuss the current Electrical Division requirements in regard to extra permits for an Owner's Affidavit after a certain amount of time. Mr. Capers stated it is based on a case-by-case basis, and what work is being performed.



MINUTES OF MEETING FOR NOVEMBER 20, 2014**UNFINISHED BUSINESS CONT.**

Mr. Bell left the meeting.

Apprentice Coordinator Forum Update: As discussed last month, a tentative guest list has been submitted for review. There was a discussion of updating the PowerPoint presentation to include any new Apprentice requirements and informing the Coordinators of the revised Electrical Division web page. The tentative date for the forum is for the month of April.

Mr. McAlister stated that Mr. Preuss wants to address the Board about the influx of Apprentices slated to come to the City of Detroit with the arrival of the new Hockey arena and Bridge projects. Mr. Litt asked what about the timing? Is April too late for the forum? Mr. Preuss stated that April is when boots will be on the ground. Mr. Litt moved that the Board have a review of the forum information in February and plan to give the forum in March. Mr. Preuss stated that would be fine, but there is a misconception of how many jobs will truly be available. Forum invitations should go out at least two weeks prior to the event. Mr. Preuss suggested tying the forum to City Council President Brenda Jones' Skilled Trades Task Force. The forum is directly related to Ms. Jones' Task Force. Mr. Preuss will speak with Ms. Jones about joining the forum with the Task Force, and will give the Board an update next month. Looking ahead, the February Board meeting will be the due date for the review of the presentation. The forum could be given in lieu of the March Board meeting on the 19th. Mr. Preuss stated that the auditorium is already booked every Thursday for next year. The Board will look to book the auditorium for the week of March 23rd.

Apprentice Residency Update: This matter will be tabled for the January 2015 meeting.

Electrical Newsletter Article: Introduction to the Board: Mr. McAlister submitted an article for the Board's space in the Electrical Division newsletter: *Introduction to the Board*. After review, edits were suggested, and a revision will be re-submitted to the Board next month.

Jimmi Smith Newsletter Article: Mr. McAlister also submitted an article for the newsletter in tribute to the late Jimmi Smith. After review, edits were suggested, and a revision will be re-submitted to the Board next month.

Administrative Rules Revision: Ordinance 604-H Section 406.0: As discussed last month, the Board will take one section to review and revise per month. Mr. McAlister also supplied State of Michigan Licensing Board Description and Functions, and



MINUTES OF MEETING FOR NOVEMBER 20, 2014**UNFINISHED BUSINESS CONT.**

Ms. Swint supplied *Annex H: Administration* from the *2011 National Electrical Code* book for reference. After review of *Section 406.0* (composition of the Board), Mr. Preuss made a motion to remove the Public Lighting Department from the composition of the Board, due to the fact that the Public Lighting Department in the near future will be phased out. The motion was seconded by Mr. Litt. **Motion carried.** Mr. McAlister proposed adding the position of a representative of distributors of electrical apparatus and supplied to stay consistent with the State Electrical Board, as well as, over the years, electrical suppliers have become a viable part of the Electrical Industry. After discussion, Mr. Brown made a motion to view a revised copy of the suggested edits as discussed, and for the Board to vote on the revised copy at next month's meeting. Mr. Litt seconded the motion. **Motion carried.**

NEW BUSINESS

- The Joint Apprentice Training Program (JATC) has a new name: Detroit EITC (Electrical Industry Training Center)
- ***M1 Rail Project First Phase:*** Mr. Preuss gave an overview of the project thus far: There are 3 contractors on site possibly four, they will be working until Thanksgiving, and then resume after the Thanksgiving Parade. As far as manpower, there are not many Apprentices on site.

Unlike previous overhead cantenary systems, the M1 Rail cantenary system will end at every intersection so there will not be any overhead lines at intersections, and instead, be battery operated through the intersections. There will be 20 stations and 11 locations to board the rail which will run from Congress to the Boulevard. It consists of 3.3 miles each way, and will have a maintenance facility operated by electricians at the end of the line funded by Roger Penske.

Mr. Preuss posed a question, who performs the inspection for the M1 Rail? Mr. McAlister stated that the Code addresses this issue. For example, overhead rail systems like railways (overhead cantenary system) are typically not a part of the NEC (National Electrical Code). Mr. Preuss asked about the stations which encompass branch circuits, the secondary side of the transformer, pedestrian walkways, and actuaries. Mr. McAlister stated those examples along with the warehouse's electrical system, and anything that does not have to do with the electrical transmission, will most likely fall under the NEC.

The M1 Rail project most likely will fall in line with how the *People Mover* was handled. Mr. Litt worked on two of the stations for that project. The power to the rails and the *People Mover* car was not permit work. Mr. Litt stated that the Board



MINUTES OF MEETING FOR NOVEMBER 20, 2014**NEW BUSINESS CONT:**

as constituted, is attempting to provide electricity in a safe way for the citizens of Detroit, and therefore, present some concern about how the M1 system is to be inspected for safety. The underground and wiring to the people stations should be inspected.

Mr. McAlister referenced the *2011 NEC Article 90.2 Subsection B Not Covered:*

This Code does not cover the following:

(1) Installations in ships, watercrafts other than floating buildings, railway rolling stock, aircraft, or automotive vehicles other than mobile homes and recreational vehicles.

(2) Installations of railways for generation, transformation, transmission, or distribution of power used exclusively for operation of rolling stock or installations used exclusively for signaling and communications purposes.

Mr. Litt moved that the Acting Chair present the Board's concern about inspection of the electrical systems that are being installed for the M1 Rail System. Mr. McAlister asked what specifically is the concern? Does the Board feel that the rail will be installed without inspections? Mr. Preuss stated they are currently being installed without inspections. They are also pouring concrete over duct bank that has not been inspected by MDOT (Michigan Department of Transportation) or the City of Detroit. According to Mr. Preuss, MDOT has stated that anything south of Adams is the sole responsibility of the City of Detroit. Mr. Preuss seconded Mr. Litt's motion. **Motion Carried.**

Mr. Brown did a short web search and found a reference to light rail system in the State of Oregon. The Oregon Attorney General ruled that light rail systems are not railroads, and are therefore not exempt from inspection to the National Electrical Code. Further research into this issue will of course be required.



MINUTES OF MEETING FOR NOVEMBER 20, 2014

CORRECTIONS:

Under Board Considerations RE: Mr. Dave Bell: In absence of Mr. Bell last month, there was another discussion of the difference of fees between the Electrical Contractor License (\$55) and Electrical Contractor Registration(\$25), therefore the Board would like to recommend parity between the two fees.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MCALISTER

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, January 15, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. in the Conference Room in Room 418 Fourth Floor, Coleman A. Young Municipal Center.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to be brought before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Bert McAlister

Acting Chairman, Board of Electrical Examiners

WM/ms