

N9LYA TECHNICAL GUIDES

---

# Electrical Safety

Safety First in High-Voltage Systems

**Jerome M. Kutche**

**N9LYA**

Second Edition · September 2026

## About This Book

There is no shortage of electrical safety material. Every plant has a binder of it, every new hire sits through a video of it, and most of it is written by someone whose job is to reduce the company's liability, not to keep you specifically intact. That material isn't wrong, exactly. It's incomplete, and it's incomplete in a specific way: it tells you the rule without telling you why the rule exists, what it actually protects against, and where the edges of it are — the situations the poster doesn't cover because the poster has to fit on one page.

I've spent more than thirty years around energized equipment — motor control centers, PLC panels, 480-volt gear, and occasionally things considerably angrier than that. I hold NFPA 70E, lockout/tagout, and arc flash qualifications among thirty-nine professional certifications, and I've done the training, given the training, and been in the room afterward when someone asked "but what if—" and the trainer didn't have a good answer. This book tries to have a good answer.

**Safety here is treated as an engineering subject.** Arc flash is a physics problem — an arcing fault converts electrical energy into thermal energy, pressure, and light, and the numbers on the label are a calculation, not a guess. Shock is a physiology problem — current path and duration determine outcome, and understanding why tells you which precautions matter and which are theater. Lockout/tagout is a systems problem — it works because it removes ambiguity, and it fails in specific, predictable ways when people shortcut it. Treating these as engineering rather than as compliance means you can reason about situations the rulebook didn't anticipate, which is most of them.

**This is not a substitute for your site's program, your qualified-person training, or a real arc flash study.** It's the conceptual foundation underneath those things — the part that, once you actually understand it, makes the rest of the program make sense instead of feeling like arbitrary hoops.

## Who This Is For

**Electricians and industrial electrical/controls technicians** who want the reasoning behind the rules they already follow, and who need to make judgment calls in situations their training didn't explicitly cover.

**Maintenance and controls people** who work adjacent to electrical hazards without being electricians by trade — HVAC techs, mechanics, automation technicians — and who need to know when to stop and call someone qualified.

**Safety professionals and EHS staff** who write and enforce electrical safety programs and want the underlying physics and physiology, not just the standard's section numbers.

**Students and apprentices** heading into an electrical trade, who would rather understand this before their first incident than after.

**Supervisors** who sign off on energized work permits and need to understand what they're actually authorizing.

## How to Use It

Each chapter ends with a **Bench Check** — practical questions and scenarios, not multiple-choice trivia. Work through them; several are deliberately ambiguous, because real electrical work is often ambiguous and the point is to practice the judgment, not memorize an answer key.

Formulas are given in plain notation, the way you'd write them on the back of a work order, not as typeset mathematics. Where I reference specific standards — NFPA 70E, OSHA 1910 Subpart S, IEEE 1584 — I give you the concept and the citation so you can go read the current edition, because standards get revised and this book will eventually be older than the rule it's describing.

## A Word Before You Start

I am going to ask you, more than once in this book, to stop and think before you act on energized equipment. That instruction will sometimes feel like it's slowing down a job that's already behind schedule, with a supervisor standing there, on a piece of equipment you've worked on fifty times without incident.

Fifty times without incident is not the same as safe. It's fifty times you got away with it. The fifty-first time is not statistically special — the equipment doesn't know it's the fifty-first — and the entire discipline of electrical safety exists because "I've done this before" is the thought that precedes a large fraction of serious electrical injuries. Read Chapter 9 before you convince yourself an exception applies to you.

## About the Author

Jerome M. Kutche holds the amateur radio callsign N9LYA, first licensed in 1991 and upgraded to General class in 2003. His interest in electronics was sparked in the early 1970s by a mentor named Frank Kime, and his understanding of interference and grounding owes a great deal to the late Mike Baugh, W8AKF, an RFI mentor of rare patience.

From 1990 to 1996 he worked at Applied Instruments in Indianapolis, building RF test and measurement equipment for the telecommunications and cable television industries, alongside engineers Doyle Haywood, David Polstra, and Jerry Brown.

He then moved into industrial electrical and controls work, accumulating more than three decades across manufacturing, materials, and heavy industry — Allen-Bradley and Siemens PLC systems, motor control centers, plant electrical maintenance and supervision. He holds NFPA 70E, lockout/tagout, arc flash, and thirty-nine other professional certifications.

He has worked amateur radio contacts through the Space Shuttle SAREX program, the Mir space station, and the International Space Station, using a two-watt handheld radio.

## Part I — Understanding the Hazard

### Chapter 1: How Electricity Injures the Body

There are four distinct mechanisms by which electricity hurts people, and they get lumped together in casual conversation as "electrocution" in a way that obscures how different the prevention strategies are.

#### Electric Shock

Current passing through body tissue disrupts the electrical signaling that nerves and muscles use natively. At low levels this is a tingle. At higher levels it causes involuntary muscle contraction — which is why victims of shock often can't let go of the thing shocking them, because the same current that's hurting them is also contracting their gripping muscles. At still higher levels it disrupts the heart's own electrical rhythm, causing ventricular fibrillation, which is the actual cause of death in most fatal shocks. The heart doesn't stop; it quivers uselessly instead of pumping, and without defibrillation it stays that way.

#### Thermal Burns From Current

Body tissue has resistance, and current through resistance generates heat (Chapter 2 covers the numbers). At the point of contact — typically the hands — this produces entry and exit burns that look deceptively minor on the surface while cooking tissue deeper along the current path. **A shock victim with small, unremarkable-looking burns at the contact points needs a hospital evaluation regardless of how they feel**, because internal damage along the current path is invisible from outside.

# How Electrical Energy Injures

Severity depends on path, magnitude, duration, and environment

## SHOCK

Current through body  
Muscle / heart

## ARC FLASH

Thermal energy  
Pressure / light

## ARC BLAST

Pressure wave  
Flying material

## SECONDARY

Falls / impact  
Fire

N9LYA TECHNICAL GUIDES

Figure 1: How electrical energy injures

## Arc Flash Burns

This is a separate mechanism entirely, and Chapter 3 is dedicated to it. An arc flash doesn't require the person to be part of the circuit — they're injured by the byproducts of a fault occurring nearby: thermal radiation, a pressure wave, molten metal, and UV exposure. Most severe arc flash injuries are burns from radiant heat, not from current through the body at all.

## Secondary Injuries

A shock strong enough to cause involuntary muscle contraction can throw someone off a ladder, into machinery, or against a hard surface. Falls and impacts caused by the startle-and-contraction response account for a meaningful fraction of electrical-incident injuries, and they happen even from shocks too mild to be dangerous on their own. This is why working at height near energized equipment carries compounded risk — the fall, not the shock, may be what actually hurts you.

## Why This Taxonomy Matters

Each mechanism has a different prevention strategy. PPE that protects against arc flash thermal energy does very little against shock current — an arc-rated suit is not insulation from contact with a live conductor. Insulated tools and gloves protect against shock and contact burns but do nothing for arc flash radiant energy if you're standing in the flash boundary. **Treating “electrical hazard” as one undifferentiated thing leads people to select the wrong protection for the actual exposure**, which is a documented pattern in incident investigations: PPE present, PPE rated for the wrong hazard.

## Recognizing These Mechanisms in the Field

In practice, these four mechanisms rarely occur in isolation on a real incident report — a serious electrical event frequently combines several. A worker performing a live measurement who contacts an unexpected energized surface may experience shock current through the body at the same moment an arcing fault is initiated by the same contact, producing simultaneous shock injury and arc flash burns, compounded further if the startle response causes a fall from a ladder or platform. Recognizing this in advance changes how you plan a task: PPE and precautions selected for “the shock hazard” alone, without separately considering the arc flash hazard the same contact event could initiate, leave a real gap even when each individual precaution is technically correct for the hazard it was chosen for.

## Bench Check

1. Explain why a shock victim can be unable to release the conductor they're touching.
2. A technician receives a shock from a 120 V circuit, feels fine afterward, and declines medical evaluation. What's the concern with that decision?
3. Name a piece of PPE that protects against shock but not arc flash, and one that does the reverse.
4. Why can an arc flash injure someone who never touches an energized conductor?

## Chapter 2: Shock — Path, Current, and Duration

Three variables determine the outcome of a shock: how much current flows, what path it takes through the body, and how long it flows. Voltage matters only insofar as it determines current through Ohm's law — it's current that does the damage, and body resistance is what stands between a given voltage and a given current.

## Body Resistance Is Not Fixed

Dry, calloused skin might present 100,000 ohms or more. Wet skin, broken skin, or a firm grip that increases contact area can drop that to 1,000 ohms or less — a hundredfold difference from the same voltage source. This is the entire reason “it's only 120 volts” is a dangerous sentence: at high skin

resistance, 120 V produces a barely perceptible current; at low skin resistance — wet hands, a tight grip — the same 120 V can produce a lethal current. The voltage didn't change. The resistance did.

$$I = V / R$$

At 120 V across 1,000 Ω of resistance, current is 120 mA — well into the range associated with ventricular fibrillation. At 120 V across 100,000 Ω, current is 1.2 mA — a mild tingle. Same voltage, hundredfold difference in outcome, entirely a function of skin and contact conditions.

**Current Thresholds**

These figures are approximate and vary by individual, but they're the standard reference ranges used in safety training:

| Current (AC, 60 Hz) | Typical Effect                                                                            |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 mA                | Threshold of perception                                                                   |
| 5-10 mA             | Painful shock, muscle control largely retained                                            |
| 10-20 mA            | "Let-go" threshold exceeded — involuntary muscle contraction, cannot release              |
| 50-100 mA           | Respiratory paralysis possible, severe pain                                               |
| 100-200 mA          | Ventricular fibrillation likely                                                           |
| Above ~200 mA       | Severe burns, sustained heart clamping — sometimes less likely to cause fibrillation than |

That last row surprises people: it is not simply "more current is worse" in a straight line. In the range where the heart is most susceptible to fibrillation, less current is required than at higher currents where the heart may instead be clamped rather than thrown into fibrillation — but at that point the thermal damage is severe regardless. This is a reason not to reason your way through "how much current is actually dangerous" as an engineering tolerance. All of these ranges are dangerous; the table exists to explain mechanism, not to establish a safe threshold.

**Path Through the Body**

Hand-to-hand and hand-to-foot paths are the ones to worry about most, because both cross the chest and can put current directly through the heart. A shock confined to one limb — hand to same-side foot, for instance — is still dangerous but statistically less likely to be immediately fatal than a path that crosses the thorax. **This is part of the reasoning behind the one-hand rule** (covered in Chapter 12): keeping one hand in a pocket when probing a live circuit reduces the chance of a hand-to-hand path across the chest, even though it doesn't eliminate risk.

**Duration**

The let-go threshold matters because below it, a person can voluntarily release the conductor. Above it, the shock continues until something else interrupts it — the breaker trips, someone pulls the person free, or the circuit fails some other way — and duration compounds severity. A shock at a given current sustained for five seconds is meaningfully more dangerous than the same current for a tenth of a second, both because of cumulative thermal effect and because of the timing relationship between AC current and the heart's own electrical cycle: a shock that happens to coincide with a vulnerable point in the heart's rhythm (the T-wave) is disproportionately likely to trigger fibrillation, and a longer shock duration increases the odds of that coincidence.

**AC Versus DC**

AC is generally considered more dangerous than DC at the same voltage for two reasons: the let-go threshold is lower for AC (making it harder to release), and 50/60 Hz AC is particularly effective at disrupting the heart's rhythm because it falls within the frequency range the heart's own electrical system is sensitive to. DC shock tends to cause a single muscular contraction that can throw the victim away from the source — unpleasant and dangerous in its own right (see secondary injuries, Chapter 1) but not the same sustained-grip mechanism as AC.

## Frequency Effects

The 50/60 Hz frequency used in most power distribution worldwide is close to the most dangerous frequency range for triggering ventricular fibrillation in the human heart — a fact that’s essentially a historical accident (early power system frequencies were chosen for reasons related to generator design and lighting flicker, not physiology) rather than a deliberate safety consideration. DC and very high-frequency AC are both generally less prone to triggering fibrillation at equivalent current levels than power-frequency AC, though DC and high-frequency exposure carry their own distinct injury mechanisms and are not therefore “safer” in any general sense — DC shock, for instance, tends to cause sustained tetanic muscle contraction similarly to AC at let-go-threshold currents, and RF energy at sufficient power can cause internal thermal burns without the surface sensation that would normally prompt someone to react. The practical takeaway isn’t a hierarchy of “safer” electrical types; it’s that the specific danger profile of power-frequency AC, which is what the overwhelming majority of industrial and residential shock hazards involve, is a large part of why the current thresholds in this chapter’s table are calibrated the way they are.

## Bench Check

1. Two technicians receive the same measured shock current, one with dry calloused hands and one with wet hands gripping firmly. Why might the outcome differ even though the current was the same?
2. Why is hand-to-hand shock generally considered more dangerous than hand-to-same-side-foot shock?
3. Explain why “more current is always worse” is an oversimplification, using the fibrillation and clamping ranges.
4. Why does shock duration matter beyond the simple accumulation of thermal energy?

## Chapter 3: Arc Flash — Physics and Consequences

An arcing fault occurs when current jumps through air between two points at different potential — a dropped tool bridging a bus, a failed connection, insulation breakdown — instead of following the intended conductive path. The air is briefly ionized into plasma, and the energy released is enormous relative to how briefly it happens.

### What’s Actually Released

An arc flash converts electrical energy into several forms almost simultaneously:

**Thermal radiation.** Arc temperatures can exceed 35,000°F — several times hotter than the surface of the sun — and this radiant heat is the primary cause of arc flash burn injuries. It doesn’t require contact; radiant heat burns skin and ignites clothing at a distance, which is the entire basis of the arc flash boundary concept in Chapter 7.

**Pressure wave.** The rapid expansion of superheated air and vaporized metal creates a blast wave that can be strong enough to throw a person across a room, rupture eardrums, or collapse a lung, independent of any thermal effect.

**Molten metal and shrapnel.** Copper and aluminum bus work vaporizes and resolidifies as droplets that are launched outward, causing both thermal and impact injury and starting fires on contact with combustible material.

**Sound.** Arc flash events are frequently reported by witnesses as being extremely loud — sound pressure levels that can cause hearing damage on their own.

**UV and intense visible light.** Sufficient to cause flash burns to the eyes (arc eye) in unprotected witnesses, similar to welding flash burn, even at a distance that avoids thermal injury.

## Incident Energy

The severity of an arc flash is quantified as **incident energy**, expressed in calories per square centimeter ( $\text{cal}/\text{cm}^2$ ) — the thermal energy that would be delivered to a surface at a specified working distance if an arc occurred. This is the number that drives PPE category selection (Chapter 7) and it is calculated, not estimated by eye, using methods standardized in IEEE 1584. Incident energy depends on available fault current, the duration the fault is allowed to persist before protection clears it, the working distance, and the equipment configuration — which is why identical-looking panels at different points in a distribution system can have wildly different arc flash labels.

## What Drives the Numbers Up

**Available fault current** — more fault current available generally means more energy delivered, though the relationship isn't perfectly linear because higher fault current can also trip protection faster.

**Clearing time** — this is often the dominant factor. A fault cleared in 3 cycles delivers a small fraction of the energy the same fault would deliver if allowed to persist for 30 cycles because a slow, poorly coordinated, or improperly set upstream breaker didn't trip promptly. This is why protective device coordination studies matter as much to arc flash safety as PPE selection does — a well-coordinated system with fast clearing times can have a lower incident energy at 480 V than a poorly coordinated one, even with comparable fault current available.

**Working distance** — incident energy falls off sharply with distance, which is why standing back and using extension tools, remote racking devices, or infrared windows for thermal scanning meaningfully reduces exposure even when the equipment can't be de-energized.

## Consequences

Arc flash burn injuries are frequently severe — deep burns over large body surface areas, given the exposed skin typically present even with some PPE, plus the compounding pressure-wave and shrapnel injuries. Recovery, when survival occurs, often involves extended hospitalization, multiple surgeries, and permanent disability. This is not intended as scare language; it's the actual injury pattern documented in incident data, and it's why arc flash risk assessment is treated as seriously as it is in every modern electrical safety program.

## A Sense of Scale

Numbers help calibrate intuition here, with the caveat that every real value depends entirely on the specific equipment (Chapter 7 and Appendix C cover why). As very rough orientation only: a well-protected, well-coordinated 480 V panel might present an incident energy in the low single digits of  $\text{cal}/\text{cm}^2$ , comparable to a moderate sunburn threshold — uncomfortable and requiring protection, but survivable with appropriate PPE and prompt care. Poorly coordinated or high-fault-current 480 V equipment can reach into the double digits, and medium-voltage equipment (Chapter 19) not uncommonly presents incident energies in the tens of  $\text{cal}/\text{cm}^2$ , in a range where even correctly rated PPE is protecting against a genuinely severe event rather than a minor one. This range — roughly two orders of magnitude between the safest and most hazardous equipment a typical industrial electrician might encounter — is the entire reason equipment-specific labeling exists rather than a single blanket precaution: “electrical panel” alone tells you almost nothing about the actual hazard level without the label or study behind it.

## Bench Check

1. Name three distinct injury mechanisms in a single arc flash event beyond simple burning.
2. Why can two visually identical panels have very different incident energy values?
3. Explain why improving protective device coordination can reduce arc flash risk as much as, or more than, upgrading PPE.
4. Why does working distance matter even when full de-energization isn't possible?

## Chapter 4: Stored Energy — Capacitors, Batteries, and Springs

Lockout/tagout removes the source of electrical energy. It does not automatically remove energy already stored downstream of the disconnect — and stored energy has caused fatalities in equipment that was, by every visible indication, correctly locked out.

### Capacitors

A capacitor bank — power factor correction equipment, DC bus capacitors in a VFD, filter capacitors in a power supply — can hold a dangerous charge for a significant time after the source is removed, especially if the bleeder resistors or discharge circuit designed to drain it have failed. VFD DC bus capacitors are a particularly common trap: the drive's front panel goes dark, looking fully de-energized, while the bus capacitors can retain hundreds of volts for minutes. **Manufacturer documentation for VFDs specifies a minimum wait time before opening the enclosure, and that number exists for exactly this reason** — it is not a conservative suggestion, it's based on the discharge time constant of that specific drive's capacitance and bleeder resistance.

The correct practice is the same as de-energizing any circuit: verify zero energy with a meter rated for the expected voltage, don't trust the wait-time alone, and don't trust the absence of a visible display as proof of discharge.

### Batteries and UPS Systems

Battery banks remain energized regardless of what's locked out upstream, because the battery is an energy source independent of the disconnected supply. UPS systems are a frequent source of confusion here: locking out the utility feed to a UPS does nothing to the battery-backed output, which will continue to be live — sometimes for hours — specifically because that's the entire design intent of a UPS. Work on UPS output circuits requires the UPS itself to be placed in maintenance bypass or the battery disconnected, not just the utility input locked out.

### Mechanical Stored Energy

This chapter is nominally about electrical hazards, but stored mechanical energy shows up constantly in the same equipment and gets missed by people focused narrowly on volts and amps. Springs in circuit breaker charging mechanisms, gas struts, counterweights, and compressed air in pneumatic actuators are all forms of stored energy that a purely electrical lockout doesn't address. A breaker's stored-energy closing spring, if not discharged as part of the lockout procedure, can close the breaker's contacts mechanically even with control power removed. **A complete lockout addresses every form of hazardous energy present, not only electrical** — this is the actual definition used in OSHA's hazardous energy control standard, and it's why a proper lockout/tagout procedure (Chapter 10) is equipment-specific rather than a single generic checklist.

### Induced and Back-Fed Voltage

Two more stored/alternate-source hazards worth naming explicitly:

**Induced voltage** on long parallel conductors — a de-energized circuit running alongside an energized one, particularly at higher voltages or in cable trays with significant parallel run length, can have voltage induced onto it capacitively or inductively even with no direct connection to a source.

**Back-feed** from generators, solar inverters, or interconnected systems that can energize what looks like a de-energized circuit from an unexpected direction. This has become a much larger issue with the growth of distributed generation — a circuit locked out at the main disconnect can still be energized from a rooftop solar system or backup generator feeding into it unless that source is also isolated.

### Bench Check

1. Why can a VFD appear fully de-energized on its display while still presenting a lethal hazard?

2. What's wrong with relying solely on a manufacturer's stated capacitor discharge time without verification?
3. Give an example of stored mechanical energy in electrical equipment that a purely electrical lockout would miss.
4. Explain how a circuit can become energized from an unexpected direction even after the main source is locked out.

## Part II — The Regulatory and Standards Framework

### Chapter 5: OSHA and the Electrical Standards

OSHA doesn't write engineering standards from scratch for electrical work; it adopts and references consensus standards developed by organizations like NFPA and IEEE, then makes compliance with the relevant portions legally mandatory. Understanding which document does what saves a lot of confusion.

#### The Core OSHA References

**29 CFR 1910 Subpart S** covers electrical safety for general industry — design safety standards for electrical systems and safety-related work practices. This is the regulatory backbone; it establishes that you must control hazardous energy and work electrical equipment safely, without necessarily providing the granular how-to.

**29 CFR 1910.147** is the control of hazardous energy standard — lockout/tagout — and it applies beyond electrical hazards to any hazardous energy source (Chapter 4 covered why that scope matters).

**29 CFR 1926 Subpart K** is the construction-industry parallel to Subpart S, with some differences in application relevant to construction sites versus fixed industrial facilities.

#### Where NFPA 70E Fits

OSHA's standards establish the legal requirement for safe work practices but are deliberately written in general, performance-based language — “employers shall ensure” rather than a specific procedure. **NFPA 70E is the consensus standard that provides the actual how:** PPE categories, arc flash boundaries, the specific hierarchy of controls, energized work permit requirements. OSHA doesn't directly cite NFPA 70E by number in most of its electrical text, but compliance officers routinely use it as the recognized standard of practice for determining whether an employer met its general duty obligations, and most serious electrical safety programs are built directly on 70E because it's simply the best available codification of what “safe” means in practice.

This two-layer relationship — OSHA sets the legal floor and the general requirement, NFPA 70E supplies the technical detail — comes up constantly in safety discussions, and it's worth having straight: you can be practically unsafe while technically not violating a specific OSHA citation, because OSHA's language is broad by design. Following 70E closely is how you close that gap.

#### General Duty Clause

Where a specific standard doesn't directly address a hazard, OSHA's General Duty Clause (Section 5(a)(1) of the OSH Act) requires employers to provide a workplace free from recognized hazards likely to cause death or serious harm. This has been used in electrical safety enforcement actions where the specific citation is thin but the hazard and the failure to address it were clear — it's a backstop, not a primary tool, but it matters because “there's no specific rule against it” isn't the same as “it's compliant.”

#### Qualified Versus Unqualified Persons

OSHA and NFPA 70E both use this distinction and it's load-bearing throughout electrical safety practice. A **qualified person** has demonstrated skills and knowledge related to the construction and

operation of the electrical equipment and installations, and has received safety training to recognize and avoid the specific hazards involved — not a job title or a certificate alone, but a demonstrated combination of knowledge and training specific to the equipment in question. An **unqualified person** is everyone else, and unqualified persons are restricted from tasks — approaching energized equipment within certain boundaries, performing energized work — that qualified persons may be authorized to perform under specific conditions.

Being “qualified” on one piece of equipment doesn’t automatically transfer to different equipment — a qualified person on 480 V motor control centers isn’t automatically qualified on medium-voltage switchgear without additional training specific to that equipment.

## Bench Check

1. Explain the relationship between OSHA 1910 Subpart S and NFPA 70E — what does each provide that the other doesn’t?
2. What does “qualified person” mean in this context, and why isn’t it simply a job title?
3. When might the General Duty Clause apply where a specific OSHA electrical standard doesn’t clearly cover a situation?
4. Why might someone qualified on one class of equipment not be automatically qualified on another?

## Chapter 6: NFPA 70E in Practice

NFPA 70E, the Standard for Electrical Safety in the Workplace, is revised on a three-year cycle, and each revision has tended to push further toward de-energized work as the default expectation rather than an option among several. If you learned 70E years ago, it’s worth checking what’s changed — the direction of travel has been consistently toward tighter restriction on energized work, not looser.

### The Core Structure

70E organizes around a few central ideas that repeat throughout the standard:

**Establish an electrically safe work condition (ESWC) whenever feasible.** This isn’t a suggestion buried in the text — it’s the standard’s default expectation, and energized work is meant to be the exception requiring specific justification, not a routine choice made for convenience.

**Risk assessment before work begins**, covering both shock risk and arc flash risk separately, because — as Chapter 1 established — they’re different hazards with different controls.

**The hierarchy of controls** (Chapter 9 covers this in depth) as the framework for selecting protective measures, with elimination and substitution preferred over PPE.

**Energized Electrical Work Permits** required for work inside the restricted approach boundary on energized equipment, except under specific narrow exceptions (testing, troubleshooting, and a short list of others) — and the permit process itself is designed to force a documented justification and sign-off, which is friction by design.

### Approach Boundaries

70E defines boundaries around exposed energized conductors that trigger different protective requirements as you cross them:

**Limited approach boundary** — the distance at which unqualified persons may not cross without being escorted by a qualified person, and beyond which no special electrical PPE is required for a qualified person simply passing by.

**Restricted approach boundary** — closer than the limited boundary; crossing it requires the person to be qualified, to use appropriate shock-protective PPE, and to have a plan for approaching (typically requiring an energized work permit).

**Arc flash boundary** — a distance based on incident energy, at which a second-degree burn would be expected to occur absent protection; this is a thermal boundary and is calculated separately from the shock-based approach boundaries, and it can be larger or smaller than the shock boundaries depending on the equipment and fault current involved. It's entirely possible for the arc flash boundary to extend well beyond the restricted approach boundary on high-fault-current equipment.

These boundaries are typically documented on the equipment's arc flash label alongside the incident energy and required PPE category, which is why reading the label — not assuming you remember what it said last time — is part of every job briefing.

## **The Energized Work Permit**

The permit isn't paperwork theater when used correctly; it forces answers to specific questions before work starts: why can't this be de-energized, what's the justification, what's the incident energy and required PPE, who's approved this specific task. A permit process that's routinely rubber-stamped without genuine engagement with those questions has failed at its actual purpose even if the form gets filled out correctly — the form is a proxy for the thinking, not a substitute for it.

## **Job Briefings**

70E requires a documented briefing before each job involving exposure to electrical hazards, covering the hazards present, the work procedure, special precautions, energy source controls, and PPE requirements. In practice, a good job briefing is a short, specific conversation — not a recitation of the entire standard — that answers “what could go wrong on this specific task today, and what are we doing about it.”

## **How the Standard Has Evolved**

Successive editions of 70E have consistently tightened expectations rather than loosening them. Recent cycles have expanded emphasis on human error as a contributing factor in incidents (recognizing that even correctly-designed procedures fail when human performance factors — fatigue, distraction, complacency from repetition — aren't accounted for), refined the PPE category tables to better reflect real equipment configurations, and pushed harder on the expectation that energized work is justified by genuine infeasibility of de-energizing, not by convenience, with tightened documentation requirements on the energized work permit itself. If your last formal 70E training was several revision cycles ago, meaningful things have likely changed — not just numbers in a table, but the underlying philosophy of what “adequately justified” energized work actually requires. This is a specific, concrete reason refresher training (Chapter 23) matters beyond simply refreshing memory of unchanged material.

## **Bench Check**

1. What is an electrically safe work condition, and why does 70E treat it as the default rather than one option among equals?
2. Explain the difference between the restricted approach boundary and the arc flash boundary — why might one be larger than the other?
3. What specific questions should an energized work permit force someone to answer before approving the work?
4. Why is a genuine job briefing different from simply reciting the safety program?

## **Chapter 7: Arc Flash Labeling and PPE Categories**

Every properly maintained piece of electrical equipment above certain voltage and fault current thresholds should carry an arc flash label, and that label is the primary field reference for what protection a task requires. Reading it correctly, and knowing what to do when it's missing, faded, or apparently wrong, is a core skill.

# End of the free sample

Electrical Safety — Second Edition · by Jerome M. Kutche

That was the first 12 of 52 pages. The full book continues with the practical detail, worked examples and recovery steps that don't fit in a sample.

**Get the full book (\$5.99, PDF + EPUB):**

**<https://booksrus.biz/product/electrical-safety/>**

Also on Gumroad:

**<https://n9lya4.gumroad.com/l/zfflly>**



All 17 Second Edition guides in one bundle for \$89.99:

**[booksrus.biz/product/n9lya-technical-guides-complete-bundle](https://booksrus.biz/product/n9lya-technical-guides-complete-bundle)**

This sample may be shared freely in unmodified form. © Jerome M. Kutche. Second Edition.