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## Lighting Branch Circuit Redesign

As part of a previous study, the lighting systems in four areas of the building have been redesigned (see milestone 2 report). A change in power usage has occurred in each of these four areas: the entry plaza, the lobby, seminar room, and a typical dormitory suite. First the lighting load that has been redesigned was quantified then compared to the lighting load from the new redesigned system. Finally, the comparison allowed for a series of recommended changes to accompany the new lighting system.

## Existing System

In order to determine the effects of the lighting systems changes, first all of the affected circuits had to be listed. In the table below, each of these circuits are listed by space. The fixture types and quantities in the table are only those that were eliminated in the redesign. This way the existing load that has been redesigned was determined for each circuit.

| Existing Lighting Circuits |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Entry Plaza Lighting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fixture Type | HL-3 | EL-1 |  |  |  |  |
| EX-1 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| EX-3 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| EX-4 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |
| EX-5 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Existing Load | 1022.5 | 135 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lobby Lighting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fixture Type | MP1A-1 | MP1A-3 | MP1A-4 | MP1A-8 | EMP1-3 | EMP1-5 |
| F-8 |  | 12 |  | 25 | 7 |  |
| F-9 | 10 | 9 | 1 | 17 | 7 |  |
| F-7E |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |
| F-7F |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Existing Load | 320 | 792 | 32 | 1722 | 1321 | 64 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seminar Room Lighting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fixture Type | MP1A-7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| F-10 | 21 |  |  |  |  |  |
| F-B1 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Existing Load | 1152 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dormitory Suite Lighting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fixture Type | MP*A-\# |  |  |  |  |  |
| F-1 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| F-2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| F-3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| F-4 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| FA | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Existing Load | 370 |  |  |  |  |  |

## Redesigned System

Like with the previous table, next all the fixtures types used in the lighting system redesign needed to be listed. In this new system, almost all of the fixtures were different than those used in the existing system. What was most important in this step was to determine the total load, for each space, that would be added in place of the existing system's lighting load.

| Redesigned Lighting Circuits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fixture Type | Quantity | Watts | Load (VA) | Fixture Type | Quantity | Watts | Load (VA) |
| Lobby Loads |  |  |  | Dormitory Suite Loads |  |  |  |
| L-5 | 30 | 1.4 | 42 | L-1 | 8 | 15.8 | 126.4 |
| L-2b | 15 | 19.8 | 297 | L-2a | 4 | 8.7 | 34.8 |
| L-6a | 5 | 40 | 200 | Total Dorm Suite Load |  |  | 161.2 |
| L-6b | 8 | 64 | 512 |  |  |  |  |
| L-6c | 4 | 87 | 348 | Entry Plaza Loads |  |  |  |
| L-7 | 15 | 4.2 | 63 | LE-1 | 4 | 138 | 552 |
| L-8 | 3 | 37 | 111 | LE-2 | 268 | 1.4 | 375.2 |
| Total Lobby Load |  |  | 1573 | LE-3 | 7 | 8.6 | 60.2 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Entry Plaza Load |  |  | 987.4 |
| Seminar Room Loads |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L-3 | 4 | 30 | 120 |  |  |  |  |
| L-4 | 12 | 98 | 1176 |  |  |  |  |
| L-5 | 33 | 1.4 | 46.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Total Seminar Room Load |  |  | 1342.2 |  |  |  |  |

Next, these loads were applied to the existing circuits for each area. In the case of the seminar room and the dormitory suite, there was only one lighting circuit for these spaces, and the new load was simply placed on that circuit. For the entry plaza, the same load as the existing lighting system was applied to the emergency circuit, and the remaining new load was put on the other exterior lighting circuit used for the existing lighting system. The final space, the lobby, was the most challenging to assign to existing circuits. The table below gives a summary of how different fixtures were placed onto circuits. Fixtures were placed on circuits based which part of the lobby they are located in, where circuits are used in comparable locations as in the existing lighting layout.

| Redesign of Lobby Lighting Circuits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Fixture Type | MP1A-1 | MP1A-3 | MP1A-4 | MP1A-8 | EMP1-3 | EMP1-5 |  |
| L-5 |  |  |  |  | 30 |  |  |
| L-2b | 10 |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |
| L-6a |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |
| L-6b |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  |
| L-6c |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| L-7 |  |  |  | 10 | 4 | 1 |  |
| L-8 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |
| Redesigned Load (VA) | $\mathbf{1 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |  | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{9 5 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 3 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 2}$ |

## Summary

Finally, the loading on all affected circuits was summarized in the following table. This gives a comparison of the load applied by the existing lighting and load from the redesigned lighting system.

| Lighting Circuits Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Circuit Name | Existing Lighting |  | Redesigned Lighting |  | Notes |
| Circuit Name | Existing Load (VA) | Total Circuit Load (VA) | Redesigned Load (VA) | Total Circuit Load (VA) |  |
| HL-3 | 1022.5 | 1935 | 852.4 | 1764.9 | -170.1 VA |
| EL-1 | 135 | 670 | 135 | 670 | same |
| MP1A-1 | 320 | 482 | 198 | 360 | -122 VA |
| MP1A-3 | 792 | 1024 | 0 | 232 | combine with MP1A-4 |
| MP1A-4 | 32 | 800 | 0 | 768 | combine with MP1A-3 |
| MP1A-8 | 1722 | 1806 | 957 | 1041 | -765 VA |
| EMP1-3 | 1321 | 1739 | 413.8 | 831.8 | -907.2 VA |
| EMP1-5 | 64 | 777 | 4.2 | 717.2 | -59.8 VA |
| MP1A-7 | 1152 | 1152 | 1342.2 | 1342.2 | +190.2 VA |
| MP*A-\# | 370 | 370 | 161.2 | 161.2 | reduce from 7 to 4 circuits per floor |

In every space except the seminar room, the lighting load was significantly reduced by using the redesigned lighting systems. For several circuits this allows for some electrical savings to occur alongside the new lighting system.

## ENTRY PLAZA

For this space, the redesigned lighting uses slightly less power than the existing design. This will reduce amount of power needed to provide lighting to the space, but will have no effect on the electrical system layout.

## LOBBY

In the lobby, the reduction of loading was such that two circuits (MP1A-3 and MP1A-4) can be combined and one of those can become a spare circuit. Other circuits in this space will see a decrease in power consumption, but will now need to be changed.

## SEMINAR ROOM

The new lighting system in this space uses slightly more power than the existing design, but no changes are needed to the electrical system.

## DORMITORY SUITES

In the dormitory suites, the lighting load of the new system is about half that of the existing system. This, again, requires less circuits than the existing. With seven dormitory suites per floor (one circuit per room), the new lighting system allows for the new electrical system to use four circuits per floor in the same area.

## Dormitory Riser Redesign

This next study is intended to determine the benefits of distributing power in a different way to the upper dormitory floors of the building. In the existing design, two 500 kVA transformers distribute 208Y-120 through two risers to the upper floors. In this redesign, one riser distributes 480/277 to the upper floors, where it is transformed at each floor to 208Y-120. The following diagram shows a simplified schematic of the two systems for comparison.


## Scope

For this study, certain boundaries had to be set to ensure a consistent comparison between the two systems. The area under investigation includes the circuits that provide lighting and power to floors one through seven in the building. They are fed, in the existing system, from two draw-out breakers in a switchgear in the basement level. This study follows those circuits from switchgear to branch panels. To see these circuits in their full context, see the last page of this document, where the building's complete riser diagram is included with these circuits highlighted.

Also in regards to scope, the basis of this study is focused on the electrical systems. Since this is intended first and foremost as an electrical study, disciplines outside of electrical engineering are noted for possible interaction with this system, but are not investigated.

## Metrics

For this redesign, changes occur in three major areas: wire sizes, equipment, and installation. The latter, installation costs, are based largely on the cost of labor for this project. This falls largely out of the scope of the study, so while it is acknowledged as having a unique effect on each of the two systems, it is not included here. The first two types of changes: wire sizes and equipment are used to quantify the differences between the existing system and the redesigned system.

## EQUIPMENT

Pricing for equipment has simplified in terms of positive or negative costs. Due to the uncertain nature of equipment prices, it has not been quantified in dollar amounts.

## WIRE SIZES

The following rates were applied to calculate the change in cost of wire needed to complete each of the two systems:

| Type\| | Pricing |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | \$ per 1000 ft | \$ per 1 ft (pro-rated) |
| 500 kcmil | 8861.26 | 8.861 |
| 400 kcmil | 7208.95 | 7.209 |
| 350 kcmil | 6401.89 | 6.402 |
| 300 kcmil | 5467.48 | 5.467 |
| 250 kcmil | 4533.51 | 4.534 |
| $4 / 0$ | 3738.09 | 3.738 |
| $3 / 0$ | 2976.79 | 2.977 |
| $2 / 0$ | 2372.84 | 2.373 |
| $1 / 0$ | 1892.93 | 1.893 |
| 1 | 1578.57 | 1.579 |
| 2 | 1220.56 | 1.221 |
| 3 | 975.15 | 0.975 |
| 4 | 778.45 | 0.778 |
| 6 | 503.56 | 0.504 |
| 8 | 327.29 | 0.327 |
| 10 | 203.22 | 0.203 |
| 12 | 132.9 | 0.133 |
| 14 | 86.83 | 0.087 |
| 16 | 65.95 | 0.066 |

Southwire: Distributor List Price Sheet
These prices were pro-rated per foot of wired needed in each feeder. Wire sizes for the existing system were available on the electrical riser diagram. And wire sizes for
the new system were determined using the allowable ampacities listed in NEC 2011: Table 310.12(B)(16) and grounding conductors in Table 250.122.

## Disadvantages

Like with any system, there are several disadvantages to this redesigned system, in comparison to the existing system. First is that moving the transformers up into the occupied floors of the building uses space on those floors; in the existing system, the transformers were in the basement where space wasn't as important. There is however space in the upper floors without significant alterations to the floorplan. Where the largest of the new transformers is height -75.00; width -44.20 ; length -36.23 , and the smallest is height - 48.56; width - 28.22; length - 23.42. Similar to space, each of these transformers will also add extra loading onto the structural system. They can be expected to weigh between 930-1440 pounds each.

## Advantages

However, the advantages to the redesigned system far outweigh the disadvantages. The two transformers in the existing design that are used to feed power to the dormitory floors are way larger than they need to be. By distributing 480/277 instead of 208Y/120, smaller transformers are needed at each floor. This higher voltage also means that smaller wire sizes can be used, creating savings in copper alone. Additionally, this higher voltage also means less voltage drop to the top of the building, which will increase the overall efficiency of the system. Finally, while there are a greater quantity of transformers needed in the redesigned system, there are several pieces of equipment that can be eliminated. The following equipment list breaks out the changes from the existing system to the redesigned system.

| Existing System |  |  | Redesigned System |  |  | Estimated Price <br> Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type | Name | Size | Type | Name | Size | -\$ |
| switchgear |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Draw-out breaker | MDPMP | 800A | Draw-out breaker | MDPNP | 800A |  |
| Draw-out breaker | MDPNP | 800A |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| switchboards |  |  |  |  |  | -\$ |
| Switchboard | MDPMP | 1600A | Switchboard | MDPNP | 1600A |  |
| Switchboard | MDPNP | 1600A |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| transformers |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transformer | T-5 | 500 kVA | Transformer | T-N1 | 225 kVA | +\$ |
| Transformer | T-6 | 500 kVA | Transformer | T-N2 | 112.5 kVA |  |
|  |  |  | Transformer | T-N3 | 112.5 kVA |  |
|  |  |  | Transformer | T-N4 | 112.5 kVA |  |
|  |  |  | Transformer | T-N5 | 112.5 kVA |  |
|  |  |  | Transformer | T-N6 | 112.5 kVA |  |
|  |  |  | Transformer | T-N7 | 112.5 kVA |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| nels |  |  |  |  |  | -\$ |
| Main Circuit Breaker | in NP1 | 400A | Main Circuit Breaker | in NP1 | 500A |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Aside from equipment cost savings, one of the other advantages is savings created by smaller wire sizes. The same portion of each system was evaluated using the wire pricing schedule given earlier in this report. As comparison of both systems is given below.

Existing System Wire Sizes

| Equipment |  |  | Incoming Feed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type | Name | Location | From | Wire Properties |  |  |  |  | Apx. Length | Total Price |
|  |  |  |  | Listed Feed | Quantity | Type | Ground | Price per ft |  |  |
| Switchgear | Switchgear \#2 | M0226 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transformer | T-5 | M0226 | Switchgear \#2 | 2 SETS OF 3-500KCMIL + 1\#1/0G IN 3" C | 6 | 500 kcmil | 1/0 | 55.060 | 35 | \$1,927.12 |
| Transformer | T-6 | M0226 | Switchgear \#2 | 2 SETS OF 3-500KCMIL + 1\#1/0G IN 3" C | 6 | 500 kcmil | 1/0 | 55.060 | 54 | \$2,973.27 |
| Switchboard | MDPMP | M0226 | T-5 | 4 SETS OF 4-500KCMIL + 1\#4/0G IN 3" C | 16 | 500 kcmil | 4/0 | 145.518 | 10 | \$1,455.18 |
| Switchboard | MDPNP | M0226 | T-6 | 4 SETS OF 4-500KCMIL + 1\#4/0G IN 3" C | 16 | 500 kcmil | 4/0 | 145.518 | 10 | \$1,455.18 |
| Panelboard | MP1 | E1206B | MDPMP | 4-500KCMIL + 1\#2G IN 3 1/2" C | 4 | 500 kcmil | 2 | 36.666 | 296 | \$10,853.02 |
| Panelboard | MP2 | E2101 | " " | 4-250KCMIL + 1\#4G IN 3" C | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 260 | \$4,917.25 |
| Panelboard | MP3 | E3101 | " " | " " | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 271 | \$5,125.28 |
| Panelboard | MP4 | E4101 | " " | " " | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 282 | \$5,333.32 |
| Panelboard | MP5 | E5101 | " " | " " | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 293 | \$5,541.36 |
| Panelboard | MP6 | E6101 | " " | " " | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 303 | \$5,730.48 |
| Panelboard | MP7 | E7101 | " " | " " | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 314 | \$5,938.52 |
| Panelboard | NP1 | E1229 | MDPNP | 4-500KCMIL + 1\#2G IN 3 1/2" C | 4 | 500 kcmil | 2 | 36.666 | 88 | \$3,226.57 |
| Panelboard | NP2 | E2228 | " " | 4-250KCMIL + 1\#4G IN 3" C | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 52 | \$983.45 |
| Panelboard | NP3 | E3228 | " " | " " | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 63 | \$1,191.49 |
| Panelboard | NP4 | E4228 | " " | " " | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 74 | \$1,399.52 |
| Panelboard | NP5 | E5228 | " " | " " | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 85 | \$1,607.56 |
| Panelboard | NP6 | E6228 | " " | " " | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 95 | \$1,796.69 |
| Panelboard | NP7 | E7228 | " " | " " | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 106 | \$2,004.72 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Wire Cost |  | \$63,459.99 |

Redesigned System Wire Sizes

| Equipment |  |  | Incoming Feed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type | Name | Location | From | Protection (A) | Wire Properties |  |  |  |  | Apx. Length | Total Price |
|  |  |  |  |  | Listed Feed | Quantity | Type | Ground | Price per ft |  |  |
| Switchgear | Switchgear \#2 | M0226 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Switchboard | MDPNP | M0226 | Switchgear \#2 | 1600 | 4 SETS OF 3-500KCMIL + 1\#4/0G IN 3" C | 12 | 500 kcmil | 4/0 | 110.073 | 10 | \$1,100.73 |
| Transformer | T-N1 | E1229 | MDPNP | 250 | 3-250KCMIL + \#4G IN 2.5" C | 3 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 14.379 | 88 | \$1,265.35 |
| Transformer | T-N2 | E2228 | MDPNP | 150 | 3-\#1/0 + \#6G IN 1.5" C | 3 | 1/0 | 6 | 6.182 | 52 | \$321.48 |
| Transformer | T-N3 | E3228 | MDPNP | 150 | " " | 3 | 1/0 | 6 | 6.182 | 63 | \$389.49 |
| Transformer | T-N4 | E4228 | MDPNP | 150 | " " | 3 | 1/0 | 6 | 6.182 | 74 | \$457.49 |
| Transformer | T-N5 | E5228 | MDPNP | 150 | " " | 3 | 1/0 | 6 | 6.182 | 85 | \$525.50 |
| Transformer | T-N6 | E6228 | MDPNP | 150 | " " | 3 | 1/0 | 6 | 6.182 | 95 | \$587.32 |
| Transformer | T-N7 | E7228 | MDPNP | 150 | " " | 3 | 1/0 | 6 | 6.182 | 106 | \$655.33 |
| Panelboard | MP1 | E1206B | NP1 | 400 | 4-500KCMIL + 1\#2G IN $31 / 2^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{C}$ | 4 | 500 kcmil | 2 | 36.666 | 210 | \$7,699.78 |
| Panelboard | MP2 | E2101 | NP2 | 250 | 4-250KCMIL + 1\#4G IN 3" C | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 210 | \$3,971.62 |
| Panelboard | MP3 | E3101 | NP3 | 250 | " " | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 210 | \$3,971.62 |
| Panelboard | MP4 | E4101 | NP4 | 250 | " " | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 210 | \$3,971.62 |
| Panelboard | MP5 | E5101 | NP5 | 250 | " " | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 210 | \$3,971.62 |
| Panelboard | MP6 | E6101 | NP6 | 250 | " " | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 210 | \$3,971.62 |
| Panelboard | MP7 | E7101 | NP7 | 250 | " " | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 210 | \$3,971.62 |
| Panelboard | NP1 | E1229 | T-N1 | 500 | 2 SETS OF 4-250KCMIL + 1\#2G IN 3 1/2" C | 8 | 500 kcmil | 2 | 72.111 | 10 | \$721.11 |
| Panelboard | NP2 | E2228 | T-N2 | 250 | 4-250KCMIL + 1\#4G IN 3" C | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 10 | \$189.12 |
| Panelboard | NP3 | E3228 | T-N3 | 250 | " " | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 10 | \$189.12 |
| Panelboard | NP4 | E4228 | T-N4 | 250 | " " | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 10 | \$189.12 |
| Panelboard | NP5 | E5228 | T-N5 | 250 | " " | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 10 | \$189.12 |
| Panelboard | NP6 | E6228 | T-N6 | 250 | " " | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 10 | \$189.12 |
| Panelboard | NP7 | E7228 | T-N7 | 250 | " " | 4 | 250 kcmil | 4 | 18.912 | 10 | \$189.12 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Wire Cost |  | \$38,688.07 |

The next two pages contain a complete summary of the components of both the existing system and the redesigned system.


Thesis System


## Short Circuit Analysis

The last part of this electrical study is a short circuit current calculation. This 5-level analysis was used to determine the maximum short circuit current at 5 critical points between switchgear \#2 and branch panel MP2. This branch circuit was selected because it is typical of branch circuits feeding panels MP2-MP7, where this is the branch circuit with the shortest wire lengths. This means that all other branch circuits (for MP3-MP7) will have an equal or lower short circuit current, and can be sized to match panel MP2.

| Level 1: Switchgear Fault Current |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Main Transformer Impedance | $5.75 \%$ |
| Main Transformer Size (kVA) | 3000 |
| Voltage at Switchgear (V) | 480 |
| Full Load Current (FLA) | $3,608.55$ |
| I sc (A) | $62,757.30$ |
| $\%$ motors | $25 \%$ |
| I motor contribution (A) | $3,608.55$ |
| I total sym sc RMS (A) | $66,365.85$ |
| Wire Length | 92 |
| Number of Wires per Phase | 8 |
| C Value | 26706 |
| f | 0.0975 |
| M | 0.9112 |
| I sc sys RMS (A) | $57,181.41$ |
| I motor contribution (A) | $3,608.55$ |
| I total sym sc RMS (A) | $60,789.95$ |



| Level 3: Transformer (T-N2) Fault Current |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| I sc sys RMS (A) from 2 | $56,526.33$ |
| Primary Voltage (V) | 480 |
| Secondary Voltage (V) | 208 |
| Impedance | $2.30 \%$ |
| Transformer Size (kVA) | 112.5 |
|  | $100,000.00$ |
| f | 0.0961 |
| M | 0.9123 |
| I sc sys RMS | $\mathbf{1 1 9 , 0 1 1 . 2 4}$ |


| Level 5: Panel MP2 Fault Current |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Wire Length | 210 |
| Number of Wires per Phase | 1 |
| C Value | 16483 |
| Voltage (V) | 208 |
| f | 8.5252 |
| M | 0.1050 |
| I sc sys RMS (A) | $8,436.52$ |
| \% motors | $0 \%$ |
| I motor contribution (A) | 0 |
| I total sym sc RMS (A) | $\mathbf{8 , 4 3 6 . 5 2}$ |

These calculations were conducted using the Cooper-Bussman method for finding short circuit currents.

## electrical riser diagram



