

Report of the Committee on

Fire Hose

Stephen Gilbert, *Chair*
Los Angeles, CA [SE]

Milan J. Dotlich, II, Underwriters Laboratories Inc., IL [RT]
Ray K. Farm, City of Corvallis Fire Department, OR [U]
Thomas G. Farruggia, Illinois Fire Extinguisher Company Inc., IL [IM]
 Rep. National Assn. of Fire Equipment Distributors
Robert M. Harcourt, Snap-tite Hose, Inc., PA [M]
David V. Haston, US Department of Agriculture, CA [RT]
Paul R. Kaveler, Ameren Services, MO [U]
 Rep. Edison Electric Institute
Lawrence B. King, FM Global/FM Approvals, RI [I]
Gregory Kozey, Kochek Company, Inc., CT [M]
Duane Leonhardt, Mercedes Textiles Ltd., Canada [M]
 Rep. Fire Equipment Manufacturers' Association
Larry Linton, Washington Township Volunteer Fire Department, IN [L]
Terry Powers, San Diego Fire/Rescue Department, CA [U]
David J. Pritchard, Pritchard & Associates (NC), Inc., NC [SE]
Mark Saner, Akron Brass, OH [M]
John W. Stacey, Bellevue Fire Department, NE [E]
 Rep. International Association of Fire Chiefs
Joe Stonecypher, Kidde Fire Fighting, TX [M]
Tim J. Vanderlip, Los Angeles County Fire Department, CA [U]

Alternates

Paul E. Albinger, Jr., Elkhart Brass Manufacturing Company, Inc., IN [M]
 (Alt. to Duane Leonhardt)
Byron J. Sarago, Detroit Edison Company, MI [U]
 (Alt. to Paul R. Kaveler)

Staff Liaison: **Carl E. Peterson**

Committee Scope: This Committee shall have primary responsibility for documents on the size and design of fire hose connections, and the performance, maintenance, and selection of all types of fire hose, couplings, nozzles, and accessory equipment.

This list represents the membership at the time the Committee was balloted on the text of this edition. Since that time, changes in the membership may have occurred. A key to classifications is found at the front of this book.

The Report of the Technical Committee on **Fire Hose** is presented for adoption.

This Report was prepared by the **Technical Committee on Fire Hose** and proposes for adoption, amendments to NFPA 1961, **Standard on Fire Hose**, 2002 edition. NFPA 2002 is published in Volume 11 of the 2004/2005 National Fire Codes and in separate pamphlet form.

This Report has been submitted to letter ballot of the **Technical Committee on Fire Hose**, which consists of 17 voting members. The results of the balloting, after circulation of any negative votes, can be found in the report.

1961-1 Log #CP6
(Entire Document) **Final Action: Accept**

Submitter: Technical Committee on Fire Hose
Recommendation: Reverse the metric units and the English units so the English units are first. Also show metric pressure in kilopascals (kPa) rather than bars. 1 bar = 100 kPa.
Substantiation: The NFPA Manual of Style now allows English Units first with the metric equivalent in parenthesis and the committee wants to show English units first in this document. The metric for pressure is sometimes in bars and sometimes in kPa. KPa is more common in North America.
Committee Meeting Action: Accept
Number Eligible to Vote: 17
Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16
Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

1961-2 Log #CP5
(Chapter 2 and Annex B) **Final Action: Accept**

Submitter: Technical Committee on Fire Hose
Recommendation: In Chapter 2:
 Update the edition date for ASTM D 412 to 2002.
 Update the edition date for ASTM D573 to 2004.
 Update the edition date for FM Class Number 2111 to 1999.
 Update the edition date for UL 19 to 2001.
 In Annex B:
 Update the edition date for A-A-59226 to June 11, 2003.
 Update the edition date for NSF 61 to October 22, 2003.
Substantiation: Some of the referenced publications in Chapter 2 and Annex B have newer editions.
Committee Meeting Action: Accept
Number Eligible to Vote: 17
Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16
Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

1961-3 Log #1
(2.3.5) **Final Action: Accept in Principle in Part**

Submitter: David V. Haston, USDA Forest Service
Recommendation: Revise text to read as follows:
 2.3.5 USDA Publication. ~~U-S:~~ USDA Forest Service, San Dimas Technology and Development Center, San Dimas, CA 91773.
 USDA Forest Service Specification 5100-186 E , Forest Service Specification for Fire Hose, Cotton-Synthetic, Lined, Woven Jacket, 1 inch and 1 1/2 inch - October 1996 .
USDA Forest Service Specification 5100-187. Forest Service Specification for Fire Hose. Lightweight Synthetic, Lined, Woven Jacket.
Substantiation: USDA Forest Service specifications are revised periodically. Once a specification has been revised, the previous revision is obsolete and no longer available.
 USDA Forest Service specification 5100-187 is cited elsewhere in 1961 and therefore should be referenced in Chapter 2.
Committee Meeting Action: Accept in Principle in Part
 Change US to USDA and change the reference to USDA Forest Service Specification 5100-186 from revision C to revision D.
 Do not add the reference to USDA Forest Service Specification 5100-187.
Committee Statement: The NFPA Manual of Style requires reference to a specific edition of a document as the requirements of that edition are what was available for the committee to consider and include as a reference.
 USDA Forest Service Specification 5100-187 is not cited in the body of the standard and therefore is not being cited in Chapter 2.
Number Eligible to Vote: 17
Ballot Results: Affirmative: 15 Negative: 1
Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.
Explanation of Negative:
 VANDERLIP, T.: I hold a negative vote to the Committee Statement where the USDA Forest Service Specification 5100-187 is not cited in the body of the standard.
 I agree with Submitter, David V. Haston, USDA Forest Service, in the statement:
USDA Forest Service specification 5100-187 is cited elsewhere in NFPA1961 and therefore should be referenced in Chapter 2.
 Specification 5100-187 is cited in the body of the standard in sections 4.4.2 and 4.4.11.2.

1961-4 Log #CP1
(3.3.1 Elongation) **Final Action: Accept**

Submitter: Technical Committee on Fire Hose
Recommendation: Add a definition for elongation to read as follows:
 Elongation. The percent a section of hose increased in length from an initial measurement with the hose pressurized at 10 psi (6.9 kPa) to a final measurement with the hose pressurized at its proof test pressure.
Substantiation: The term elongation is used in the standard without a definition and questions have been raised as to a definition.
Committee Meeting Action: Accept
Number Eligible to Vote: 17
Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16
Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

1961-5 Log #CP3
(3.3.2 Rise) **Final Action: Accept**

Submitter: Technical Committee on Fire Hose
Recommendation: Add a definition for rise to read as follows:
 Rise. The maximum distance measured from the surface of a test table to the underside of the hose that a length of hose lifts off that table when it is pressurized at its proof test pressure.
Substantiation: The term rise is used in the standard without a definition and questions have been raised as to a definition.
Committee Meeting Action: Accept
Number Eligible to Vote: 17
Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16
Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.
Comment on Affirmative:
 KING, L.: Acceptable with 6.2.1 - 6.2.5 in place.

1961-6 Log #CP2
(3.3.3 Twist) **Final Action: Accept**

Submitter: Technical Committee on Fire Hose
Recommendation: Add a definition for twist to read as follows:
 Twist. The number of revolutions the free end of a 50 ft (15 m) length of hose rotates when it is pressurized from an initial pressure at 10 psi (6.9 kPa) to its proof test pressure with one end held stationary and the other end allowed to move freely.
Substantiation: The term twist is used in the standard without a definition and questions have been raised as to a definition.
Committee Meeting Action: Accept
Number Eligible to Vote: 17
Ballot Results: Affirmative: 15 Negative: 1
Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.
Explanation of Negative:
 HASTON, D.: The proposed language implies that the length of hose being tested is 50 ft. The requirement in Paragraph 4.2.7.1 is for "...twist in turns per 15 m (50 ft)..."
 Suggest that "50 ft (15 m) length" be deleted from proposed definition.

1961-7 Log #12
(3.3.3.1, 4.1.9, 4.1.9.6, 4.3.9, 4.4.7.1, 4.4.8.3, 4.4.11.3, 5.4.5, 5.6.5, Chapter 6) **Final Action: Reject**

Submitter: Denyse DuBrucq, AirWars Defense
Recommendation: Revise text to read as follows:
3.3.3.1 Cryogenic transfer hose, which can carry Liquid Nitrogen and maintain flexibility, natural fiber or segmented metal lined with Malden fleece a best guess.
4.1.9 Other than water hoses.
4.1.9.1 Liquid nitrogen transfer hoses.
4.3.9 Requirements for Occupancy Use Cryogenic Hose. Occupancy Use of Cryogenic Hose should be a minimum of one inch (1 in.) diameter with unimpeding nozzle.
4.4.7.1 Requirements for Forestry Hose. Forestry hose must be a minimum of two inch (2 in.) diameter ID cryogenic-hose with unimpeding nozzle.
4.4.8.3 Twist of Cryogenic Hose. Cryogenic Hose should package flat and be unrolled without turning, as with a wheel delivery device.
4.4.11.3 Flexibility and Compressibility of Cryogenic Hose. For best packing for storage and on Fire Truck, Cryogenic Hose should collapse to flat and be rolled on a spindle of at least three inches (3 in.) diameter. This prevents tucking or pleating near center.
5.4.5 Lining Adhesion. If natural fiber sleeve is best, any Malden Mills

Fleece included should be woven into fabric of the hose. The diameter measurement is Interior Dimension measured from first thread of expanded material.

5.6.5 Marking Cryogenic Hose. Cryogenic hose markings should be stripes around the hose to be three-inch (3 in.) stripes not more than twelve inches (12 in.) apart of neon-purple color.

Chapter 6 Test Categories
Functional Life - beyond which the cryogenic hose MUST be replaced.
Flexible cycle live over 100,000.
Elasticity minimum negligible.
Temperature characteristics carrying liquid between -210° and -195.8° Centigrade.
Brittleness
Temperature cycle life
Abrasion resistance
Flexibility
Longitudinally
Crosswise
Crushability cycle life
Exterior temperature
Rate of gas penetration of hose material per linear foot
(High rate is desirable to prevent vapor lock)

Figures to be provided prior to publication of proposal changes.

[No figures provided]

Substantiation: Since liquid nitrogen techniques are available - hose standards for liquid nitrogen conveyance must be added to this code.

Committee Meeting Action: Reject

Committee Statement: The requirements for hose for special agent systems is not within the scope of the fire hose committee. This proposal should be directed to the committee on use of inert gases for fire protection. The committee also notes that the proposal is incomplete as no figures were provided as mentioned in the recommendation and the recommendations for Chapter 6 are just subject headings.

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

1961-8 Log #CP4
(3.3.4 Warp)

Final Action: Accept

Submitter: Technical Committee on Fire Hose

Recommendation: Add a definition for warp to read as follows:

Warp. The maximum distance any portion of a hose deviates from a straight line running from the center of the fitting at one end to a point on the center of the hose 50 ft (15 m) from that fitting, with the hose pressurized at its proof test pressure.

Substantiation: The term warp is used in the standard without a definition and questions have been raised as to a definition.

Committee Meeting Action: Accept

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

Comment on Affirmative:

KING, L.: Acceptable with 6.2.1 - 6.2.5 in place.

1961-9 Log #16
(4.0 (New))

Final Action: Accept in Principle

Submitter: Duane Leonhardt, Mercedes Textiles Ltd.

Recommendation: Add new text to read as follows

4.0.1 All hose shall have an expected service life of 10 years maximum under normal operating conditions.

Substantiation: Substantial testing has been conducted by various hose manufacturers' and their findings show reason and cause for a max service life of 10 years. Test indicated a significantly increased risk of failure after this time period. Analysis included burst test, ozone degradation, liner adhesion, hose strength, normal wear patterns and UV degradation of fibers. Participations in this study included the following FEMA members: Angus Fire Armor, Mercedes Textiles, National Fire Hose, Neidner Ltd., North American Hose Corp., and Snap-Title Hose. The term "Service Life" is defined in NFPA 1981. This recommendation is also supported in MIL-HBK-695D Rubber Products Recommended Shelf Life, reference page 18 under MIL-H-24580 Hose Assembly Fire fighting, showing a storage life of 5 years. This same Mil Document also references other hose materials and assemblies (MIL-H-52262) recommending a storage life of 3 to 10 years.

Committee Meeting Action: Accept in Principle

Add a new annex as A.1.1 to read as follows:

All fire hose has an expected service life. That life will depend on a number of factors such as the initial quality of the hose, the type of service to which it

is subjected, and the care it receives during its life. Users should develop a fire hose inspection and care program based on NFPA 1962, Standard for the Inspection, Care, and Use of Fire Hose, Couplings, and Nozzles and the Service Testing of Fire Hose. That program should also address the retirement of fire hose.

One of the reasons for keeping good records of fire hose as required by NFPA 1962 is to evaluate how different fire hoses perform over time. This will provide the experience the users need to help them determine what a useful service life is for different types of hose and make decisions on when fire hose should be retired.

Limited testing of in-service fire hose by the Fire Equipment Manufacturers Association indicated an increased risk of failure after a 10 year time period. The testing looked at the reduction in burst pressure, ozone degradation, liner adhesion and degradation, hose strength, normal wear patterns and UV degradation of fibers.

While all users should establish their own retirement schedule, fire departments should give careful consideration to a 10-year maximum service life under normal operating conditions.

Committee Statement: NFPA 1961 is for the design and construction of new fire hose. The committee does not feel it is within the scope of this standard to establish a mandatory requirement for retirement of fire hose. While the amount of use and care of the hose varies tremendously from fire department to fire department, the committee does want to encourage fire departments to set up a proactive retirement program for fire hose. The Annex material is designed to provide guidance to fire departments in establishing such a program.

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

Comment on Affirmative:

GILBERT, S.: Change the last paragraph before "Committee Statement" to: While all users should establish their own retirement schedule, fire departments should give careful consideration to a maximum service life under normal operating conditions, i.e., 10 years.

I do not think we are ready to choose a definitive time period for service life and different constructions may dictate different service lives. We need to examine what service life the metrics of our present aging tests are designed to predict. A manufacturer may wish to develop his own service life.

VANDERLIP, T.: I hold an affirm vote with comment to the Committee Statement where the committee does want to encourage fire departments to set up a proactive retirement program for fire hose.

Fire departments and users should utilize the hose inspection and care program based on NFPA 1962. The results of an individual section of fire hose subjected to annual inspection and service testing should remain the basis for retirement of that section. Fire hose construction has developed into many styles and types, all having varying service life between 6 and 20 years depending on that particular model's construction, type of service life to which it was subjected, and the care it receives during its life. This end user has found that one of the main service life factors to be the construction style and components which make up that model. In general, thermoplastic lined hose presents the shortest service life and nitrile extrusion presents the longest service life. To elude that ALL hose has a service life of 10 years could result in a false sense of service life to the end user.

I agree with the Submitter, Duane Leonhardt, Mercedes Textiles Ltd., suggesting a recommended shelf life in support of MIL-HBK-695D, however this should be addressed in NFPA 1962 to anyone who stores hose after manufacturing and prior to usage, such as vendors and end users.

1961-10 Log #15
(4.1.9 (New))

Final Action: Reject

Submitter: Duane Leonhardt, Mercedes Textiles Ltd.

Recommendation: Add a new 4.1.9 to read as follows:

4.1.9 The tensile strength of any elastomeric material shall not decrease by more than 20 percent of the specified value in 5.4.7.1 and the elongation shall not decrease by more than 50 percent of the specified value in 5.4.7.1, when tested in accordance with Section 6.7 after five years. Lining adhesion rate shall not degrade by more than 20 percent of specified value in 5.4.5 when tested in accordance with 6.6.1, after 5 years of service.

Substantiation: Consistent with requirement in Suction Hose section and also defines a time requirement presently not defined. Lining adhesion was not addressed and is a vital component of the hose.

Committee Meeting Action: Reject

Committee Statement: NFPA 1961 is for new fire hose and the proposal as written would require all attack hose designs to be aged for 5 years and then tested. This is unrealistic. The standard calls for an oven aging test for elastomer materials which is to simulate the aging of those materials in field use. At the current time, the committee does not know of an adhesion aging test that can be used to simulate 5 or 10 years of field use for aging the adhesion of the liner to the jacket.

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16
Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

1961-11 Log #17
 (4.2.10 (New))

Final Action: Reject

Submitter: Duane Leonhardt, Mercedes Textiles Ltd.
Recommendation: Add a new 4.2.10 to read as follows:

4.2.10 The tensile strength of any elastomeric material shall not decrease by more than 20 percent of the specified value in 5.4.7.1 and the elongation shall not decrease by more than 50 percent of the specified value in 5.4.7.1, when tested in accordance with Section 6.7 after 5 years. Lining adhesion rate shall not degrade by more than 20 percent of specified value in 5.4.5 when tested in accordance with 6.6.1, after 5 years of service.

Substantiation: Consistent with requirement in Suction Hose section and also defines a time requirement presently not defined. Lining adhesion was not addressed and is a vital component of the hose.

Committee Meeting Action: Reject

Committee Statement: NFPA 1961 is for new fire hose and the proposal as written would require all supply hose designs to be aged for 5 years and then tested. This is unrealistic. The standard calls for an oven aging test for elastomer materials which is to simulate the aging of those materials in field use. At the current time, the committee does not know of an adhesion aging test that can be used to simulate 5 or 10 years of field use for aging the adhesion of the liner to the jacket.

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

1961-12 Log #19
 (4.3.9 (New))

Final Action: Reject

Submitter: Duane Leonhardt, Mercedes Textiles Ltd.
Recommendation: Add a new 4.3.9 to read as follows

4.3.9 The tensile strength of any elastomeric material shall not decrease by more than 20 percent of the specified in value in 5.4.7.1 and the elongation shall not decrease by more than 50 percent of the specified value in 5.4.7.1, when tested in accordance with Section 6.7 after 5 years. Lining adhesion rate shall not degrade by more than 20% of specified value in 5.4.5 when tested in accordance with 6.6.1, after 5 years of service.

Substantiation: Consistent with requirement in Suction Hose section and also defines a time requirement presently not defined. Lining adhesion was not addressed and is a vital component of the hose.

Committee Meeting Action: Reject

Committee Statement: NFPA 1961 is for new fire hose and the proposal as written would require all occupant use hose designs to be aged for 5 years and then tested. This is unrealistic. The standard calls for an oven aging test for elastomer materials which is to simulate the aging of those materials in field use. At the current time, the committee does not know of an adhesion aging test that can be used to simulate 5 or 10 years of field use for aging the adhesion of the liner to the jacket.

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

1961-13 Log #2
 (4.4.1)

Final Action: Accept in Principle

Submitter: David V. Haston, USDA Forest Service

Recommendation: Revise text to read as follows:

4.4.1* The maximum weight of 100 ft (30 m) of lined, cotton-synthetic woven reinforcement forestry fire hose shall be 20.5 lb (9.3 kg) for 1-inch (25-mm) hose and 27 lb (12.3 kg) for 1 1/2 inch (38 mm) 15 m (50 ft) of a lined, cotton-synthetic woven reinforcement forestry fire hose shall be 4.9 kg (10.9 lb) for 25 mm (1 in.) hose and 6.7 kg (14.8 lb) for 38 mm (1 1/2 in.) hose.

Substantiation: Federal wildland agencies and most state and local agencies procure hose in 100 ft lengths not 50 ft. The standard should reflect the length of hose used by the majority of wildland agencies.

This requirement is consistent with USDA specification 5100-186.

Committee Meeting Action: Accept in Principle

Revise 4.4.1 to read as follows:

The maximum weight of a lined, cotton-synthetic woven reinforcement forestry fire hose assembly shall be:

- (1) 20.5 lb (9.3 kg) for for 100 ft (30 m) of 1-inch (25-mm) hose
- (2) 27 lb (12.3 kg) for for 100 ft (30 m) of 1 1/2 inch (38 mm) hose
- (3) 10.9 lb (4.9 kg) for 50 ft (15 m) of 1-inch (25-mm) hose
- (4) 14.8 lb (6.7 kg) for 50 ft (15 m) of 1 1/2 inch (38 mm) hose

Committee Statement: The committee is agreeable to adding the weights for 100 ft (30 m) fire hose assemblies but feels it is important to keep the weight

requirements for 50 ft (15 m) hose assemblies as well.

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

1961-14 Log #3
 (4.4.2)

Final Action: Accept in Principle

Submitter: David V. Haston, USDA Forest Service

Recommendation: Revise text to read as follows:

4.4.2* The maximum weight of 100 ft (30 m) of lined, synthetic woven reinforcement forestry fire hose shall be 9.5 lb (4.3 kg) for 1-inch (25-mm) hose and 16 lb (7.3 kg) for 1 1/2 inch (38 mm) 15 m (50 ft) of a lined, synthetic woven reinforcement forestry fire hose shall be 2.3 kg (5 lb) for 25 mm (1 in.) hose and 3.6 kg (8 lb) for 38 mm (1 1/2 in.) hose.

Substantiation: Federal wildland agencies and most state and local agencies procure hose in 100 ft lengths not 50 ft. The standard should reflect the length of hose used by the majority of wildland agencies.

This requirement is consistent with USDA specification 5100-186.

Committee Meeting Action: Accept in Principle

Revise 4.4.2 to read as follows:

4.4.2* The maximum weight of a lined, synthetic woven reinforcement forestry fire hose assembly shall be:

- (1) 9.5 lb (4.3 kg) for for 100 ft (30 m) of 1-inch (25-mm) hose
- (2) 16 lb (7.3 kg) for for 100 ft (30 m) of 1 1/2 inch (38 mm) hose
- (3) 5 lb (2.3 kg) for 50 ft (15 m) of 1-inch (25-mm) hose
- (4) 8 lb (3.6 kg) for 50 ft (15 m) of 1 1/2 inch (38 mm) hose

Committee Statement: The committee is agreeable to adding the weights for 100 ft (30 m) fire hose assemblies but feels it is important to keep the weight requirements for 50 ft (15 m) hose assemblies as well.

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

1961-15 Log #4
 (4.4.8.1)

Final Action: Accept

Submitter: David V. Haston, USDA Forest Service

Recommendation: Revise text to read as follows:

4.4.8.1 The maximum twist in turns per 50 ft (15 m) 15 m (50 ft) shall not exceed 12 turns for 1 inch hose and 8 turns for 1 1/2 inch hose .

Substantiation: The twist requirement should be differentiated between 1 inch and 1 1/2 inch forestry fire hose. 8 turns per inch is commonly achieved with commercially available 1 1/2 inch forestry fire hose.

This requirement is consistent with USDA specifications 5100-186 and 5100-187.

Committee Meeting Action: Accept

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

1961-16 Log #13
 (4.4.12 (New))

Final Action: Reject

Submitter: Duane Leonhardt, Mercedes Textiles Ltd.

Recommendation: Add a new 4.4.12 to read as follows:

4.4.12 The tensile strength of any elastomeric material shall not decrease by more than 20 percent of the specified value in 5.4.7.1 and the elongation shall not decrease by more than 50 percent of the specified value in 5.4.7.1, when tested in accordance with Section 6.7 after 5 years. Lining adhesion rate shall not degrade by more than 20 percent of specified value in 5.4.5 when tested in accordance with 6.6.1, after 5 years of service.

Substantiation: Consistent with requirement in Suction Hose section and also defines a time requirement presently not defined. Lining adhesion was not addressed and is a vital component of the hose.

Committee Meeting Action: Reject

Committee Statement: NFPA 1961 is for new fire hose and the proposal as written would require all forestry fire hose designs to be aged for 5 years and then tested. This is unrealistic. The standard calls for an oven aging test for elastomer materials which is to simulate the aging of those materials in field use. At the current time, the committee does not know of an adhesion aging test that can be used to simulate 5 or 10 years of field use for aging the adhesion of the liner to the jacket.

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

1961-17 Log #18
(4.5.6.1)

Final Action: Reject

Submitter: Duane Leonhardt, Mercedes Textiles Ltd.

Recommendation: Revise as follows:

4.5.6.1 The tensile strength of any elastomeric material shall not decrease by more than 20 percent of the original specified value in 5.4.7.1 and the elongation shall not decrease by more than 50 percent of the specified original value in 5.4.7.1, when tested in accordance with Section 6.7 after 5 years, lining adhesion rate shall not degrade by more than 20 percent of specified value in 5.4.5 when tested in accordance with 6.6.1 after 5 years of service.

Substantiation: Consistent with requirement in Suction Hose section and also defines a time requirement presently not defined. Lining adhesion was not addressed and is a vital component of the hose.

Committee Meeting Action: Reject

Committee Statement: NFPA 1961 is for new fire hose and the proposal as written would require all suction hose designs to be aged for 5 years and then tested. This is unrealistic. The standard calls for an oven aging test for elastomer materials which is to simulate the aging of those materials in field use. At the current time, the committee does not know of an adhesion aging test that can be used to simulate 5 or 10 years of field use for aging the adhesion of the liner to the jacket.

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

1961-18 Log #CP9
(4.5.6.1, 4.5.6.2 and 4.5.7)

Final Action: Accept

Submitter: Technical Committee on Fire Hose

Recommendation: Renumber 4.5.6.1 as 4.5.7 and change the reference from 6.7 to 6.8.

Renumber 4.5.6.2 as 4.5.8.

Renumber 4.5.7 as 4.5.7.1 and delete the reference to 5.4.7.4.

Substantiation: Current 4.5.7 belongs with 4.5.6.1 and is a separate issue from 4.5.6 so it is being renumbered as 4.5.7.

Current 4.5.6.2 is also a different issue than 4.5.6 and 4.5.6.1 so it should not be included under those paragraphs. With the change of reference in 4.5.6.1 (renumbered as 4.5.7) the reference to 5.4.7.4 is not needed.

Committee Meeting Action: Accept

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

1961-19 Log #CP13
(4.5.11 (New))

Final Action: Accept

Submitter: Technical Committee on Fire Hose

Recommendation: Add a new paragraph to read as follows:

4.5.11 Suction hose shall comply with the requirements of sections 7.1 and 7.2.

Substantiation: The section on quality control and inspections should apply to all hose including suction hose.

Committee Meeting Action: Accept

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

Comment on Affirmative:

VANDERLIP, T.: I hold an affirm vote with comment to the Recommendation that Suction hose shall comply with requirements of sections 7.1 and 7.2.

Hard Suction hose should also be included to comply with the requirements set forth in section 7.3.1 *Proof Pressure Testing* as all hard suction hose has a "Working Pressure" rating and can become subject to positive pressure. Proof Pressure testing will ultimately test for coupling slippage.

1961-20 Log #CP10
(5.2.1.1)

Final Action: Accept

Submitter: Technical Committee on Fire Hose

Recommendation: Add a new 5.2.1.1 to read as follows:

The length of hose from which the burst sample has been taken shall be permitted to be 3 ft (1 m) shorter than the required length as stated in 5.2.1.

Substantiation: The standard does not currently allow an exception for a

shorter length of hose which results when a 3 ft (1 m) sample is taken for the burst test. This will rectify that and allow that section to meet the length requirements of the standard.

Committee Meeting Action: Accept

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

1961-21 Log #5
(5.3.6)

Final Action: Accept in Principle

Submitter: David V. Haston, USDA Forest Service

Recommendation: Revise text to read as follows:

5.3.6 When mildew treatment for the reinforcement is provided, the hose manufacturer shall certify that the mildew treatment meets the requirements of USDA Forest Service Specification 5100-186 C, Forest Service Specification for Fire Hose, Cotton-Synthetic, Lined, Woven Jacket, 1 inch and 1 1/2 inch. **Substantiation:** USDA Forest Service specifications are revised periodically. Once a specification has been revised, the previous revision is obsolete and no longer available.

Committee Meeting Action: Accept in Principle

Keep the letter reference to the revision but update it to the current revision which is "D".

Committee Statement: The NFPA Manual of Style requires reference to a specific edition of a document.

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

1961-22 Log #CP11
(5.5.1, 5.5.2 and 5.5.3)

Final Action: Accept

Submitter: Technical Committee on Fire Hose

Recommendation: Revise 5.5.1(1) and (2) to read as follows:

(1) Abrasion resistance and can pass the Abrasion Test in UL 19, Lined Fire Hose and Hose Assemblies; and the Abrasion Test defined in FM Class Number 2111, Factory Mutual Approval Standard for Fire Hose ; ~~or equivalent~~

(2) Heat resistance and can pass the Heat-Resistance Test in UL 19, Lined Fire Hose and Hose Assemblies; and the Heat Resistance Test in FM Class Number 2111, Factory Mutual Approval Standard for Fire Hose ; ~~or equivalent~~

Revise 5.5.2(1) and (2) to read as follows:

(1) Abrasion resistance and can pass the Abrasion Test in UL 19, Lined Fire Hose and Hose Assemblies; and the Abrasion Test defined in FM Class Number 2111, Factory Mutual Approval Standard for Fire Hose ; ~~or equivalent~~

(2) Heat resistance and can pass the Heat-Resistance Test in UL 19, Lined Fire Hose and Hose Assemblies; and the Heat Resistance Test in FM Class Number 2111, Factory Mutual Approval Standard for Fire Hose ; ~~or equivalent~~

Revise 5.5.3(1) to read as follows:

(1) Abrasion resistance and can pass the Abrasion Test in UL 219, Lined Fire Hose for Interior Standpipes, UL-19, Lined Fire Hose and Hose Assemblies; ~~and the Abrasion Test defined in FM Class Number 2111, Factory Mutual Approval Standard for Fire Hose; or equivalent~~

Substantiation: The committee is deleting the allowance for equivalency as it not possible to determine what an equivalent test method is. It is also requiring the attack hose and supply hose meet the abrasion resistance and heat resistance requirements of both UL 19 and FM 2111 as these are different test methods and could produce different results.

In 5.5.3, the correct reference to a UL standard should be UL 219. FM 2111 does not have abrasion requirements for occupant use hose.

Committee Meeting Action: Accept

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

1961-23 Log #14
(5.6.1)

Final Action: Accept in Principle

Submitter: Duane Leonhardt, Mercedes Textiles Ltd.

Recommendation: Revise as follows:

5.6.1* Each length of fire hose, (3.3.4) , shall be indelibly marked in letters and figures at least 25 mm (1 in.) high with the manufacturer's identification, the country of origin, the month and the year of manufacture, and the words 'service test to [the service test pressure the hose is designed to] bar (psi) per NFPA 1962 [Standard for the Care, Use, and Service Testing of Fire Hose Including Couplings and Nozzles.]'

Substantiation: Provides more guidance as to what is required in the markings. The country of origin information is necessary in order to evaluate the risk accepted when using imported products where, should failure occur, there is no recourse for recovery of product liability losses. In addition, permanent

country of origin marking is necessary in determining the standards incorporated in the design and production of hose products (e.g., NFPA, UL and/ or FM standards). It should also be noted that the temporary country of origin markings (small self-adhesive labels or carton only marking) as required for US Customs country of origin marking requirements are not permanent or “indelible” in nature, and therefore may not remain a part of the product for the duration of its service life.

Committee Meeting Action: Accept in Principle

Add the requirement for the country of origin to be shown on the hose.

Committee Statement: The reference to the paragraph for the definition of fire hose (3.3.4) is not needed.

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 14 Negative: 2

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

Explanation of Negative:

KING, L.: FM Approvals does not feel a “country of origin” marking is necessary. However, if more than one manufacturing site exists for one model hose, a designation should be provided to indicate the manufacturing site of the hose length.

PRITCHARD, D.: In all conscience I cannot vote positive for that proposal. My reason is that it is punitive to all Fire Hose Manufacturers that currently import products into the USA honestly and comply with the 2003 CFR Title 19 Part 134.

This code clearly states that goods shall be clearly and indelibly marked with country of origin. Fire hoses in particular are required by law to have these markings clearly displayed on the product. I would refer you to the following Web page for clarification of this :

http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/cfr/waisidx_03/19cfr134_03.html

Nothing NFPA includes in this area will prevent an unscrupulous manufacturer from carrying on his deception. If the heresy mentioned in our meeting were true, I would have thought it an easy remedy for a person, with evidence, to advise US Customs. My experience in this area is that they are very attentive to these things and the penalties are punitive.

On the subject of liability, All North American Distribution and Manufacturing organizations are already required to carry large amounts of liability insurance. No labeling, or lack of it has any relevance in this. I believe we are getting confused here about what the NFPA 1961 Standard should be about.

The statement regarding temporary labeling referred I think to couplings. We should address that when we revise NFPA 1963.

1961-24 Log #CP8
(6.1.3)

Final Action: Accept

Submitter: Technical Committee on Fire Hose

Recommendation: Delete the paragraph.

Substantiation: The nondestructive hydrostatic tests are not always done with the couplings installed and ready for delivery. Paragraph 7.3.1 requires the hose to be proof tested after it is coupled and that covers the intent of the committee in insuring the couplings are on correctly.

Committee Meeting Action: Accept

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

1961-25 Log #CP7
(6.3)

Final Action: Accept

Submitter: Technical Committee on Fire Hose

Recommendation: Revise section 6.3 to read as follows:

6.3 Elongation, Twist, Warp, and Rise Tests.

6.3.1* The elongation test, twist test, warp test, and rise test shall be permitted to be run at the same time the proof test is being run.

6.3.2 If the tests are to be run at a different time than while the proof test is being run, the hose shall be set up for testing as required by 6.2.1 through 6.2.5.

6.3.3 Elongation Test.

6.3.3.1 The length of the hose shall be measured between the inside edges of the couplings and recorded to the nearest 1 in. (25 mm).

6.3.3.2 The pressure in the hose shall be raised as described in 6.2.8 to the proof test pressure.

6.3.3.3* When the hose warps to any appreciable extent and particularly when the allowable limit of elongation is approached, the length at final pressure shall be measured by following the contour of the hose.

6.3.3.4 For hose that does not warp to any extent, the measurement shall be permitted to be taken parallel to the edge of the test table.

6.3.3.5 All measurements shall be taken from the inside edges of the fittings.

6.3.3.6 The elongation of the hose shall be calculated as the percent change from the initial measurement taken at 10 psi (69 kPa) to the final measurement taken at the proof test pressure.

6.3.4 Twist Test.

6.3.4.1 The pressure in the hose shall be raised as described in 6.2.8 to the proof test pressure.

6.3.4.2 The amount of twist shall be measured by following a color line in the hose or by noting, in the period during which the pressure is being raised, the turns of the fitting at the free end of the hose.

6.3.4.3 The amount of twist shall be recorded to the nearest one-eighth turn or 45 degrees.

6.3.4.4 The direction of twist shall be reported as right or left with a right twist being in the direction that would tend to tighten the couplings.

6.3.5 Warp Test.

6.3.5.1 The pressure in the hose shall be raised as described in 6.2.8 to the proof test pressure.

6.3.5.2 For hose having a nominal length of 50 ft (15 m), the amount of warping shall be the maximum deviation of any portion of the hose from a straight line running from the center of the fitting at one end to the center of the fitting at the other end of the hose.

6.3.5.3* For hose having a nominal length greater than 50 ft (15 m) and up to 100 ft (30 m), the amount of warping shall be the maximum deviation of a 50 ft (15 m) portion of the hose from a straight line starting from the center of the fitting at one end and running to a point on the center of the hose 50 ft (15 m) from that fitting.

6.3.5.4 The warp shall be measured as the distance from the referenced straight line to the center line of the hose at the point of maximum deviation.

6.3.5.5 If the first measurement of warping is excessive, the position of the hose relative to the water supply shall be permitted to be reversed, end for end, and the test for warping repeated.

6.3.6 Rise Test.

6.3.6.1 The pressure in the hose shall be raised as described in 6.2.8 to the proof test pressure.

6.3.6.2 The distance that the hose rises above the test table shall be measured to the nearest 1 in. (25 mm) and recorded as the rise.

Add an annex to 6.3.1 to read:

A.6.3.1 As the elongation test, twist test, warp test, and rise test all require the hose to be pressurized to its proof pressure, these 4 tests are generally done concurrently with the proof test.

Renumber A.6.3.3 as A.6.3.3.3 to read:

A.6.3.3.3 For this purpose, an edge of the table should be marked off in feet and inches (meters and centimeters). Warping in hose tests is the deviation from a straight line running from fitting to fitting in a plane parallel to the surface on which the hose rests.

Add an annex to 6.3.5.3 to read:

A.6.3.5.3 Where hose lengths exceed 50 ft. (15 m), measurement of two segments of the hose will be required to determine the maximum warp, one from the fitting on one end to a point 50 ft (15 m) from that fitting and a second from the fitting on the other end to a point 50 ft (15 m) from that fitting. If the length of the hose is greater than 50 ft (15 m) but less than 100 ft (30 m), some of the hose near its longitudinal center will be included in each segment.

Split 6.2.5 into two separate requirements as follows:

6.2.5 While at 0.7 bar (10 psi), the hose shall be straightened out.

6.2.6 The length of the hose shall be measured between the inside edges of the couplings and recorded to the nearest 25 mm (1 in.).

Renumber 6.2.6 through 6.2.9 as 6.2.7 through 6.2.10

In 5.2.2 change the reference to 6.2.6.

In 6.4.6 change the reference to 6.2.8.

Substantiation: Section 6.3 currently has 4 test method intermixed and is being reorganized to clarify the 4 distinct tests: the elongation test, twist test, warp test, and rise test. While these are typically done concurrently with the proof test, they can and sometimes need to be done separately. The reorganized text clarifies the procedure if one or more of the tests is conducted separately.

Paragraph 6.2.5 is being split into 2 requirements to better support cross references to the separate requirements in the reorganized 6.3 as well as 5.2.2.

Committee Meeting Action: Accept

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

Comment on Affirmative:

KING, L.: Acceptable with 6.2.1 - 6.2.5 in place.

1961-26 Log #6
(6.3.2.3 (New))

Final Action: Reject

Submitter: David V. Haston, USDA Forest Service

Recommendation: Add new text to read as follows:

6.3.2.3 For a hose having a nominal length greater than 50 ft (15 m), the amount of twist shall be measured in a 50 ft (15 m) portion of the hose having the greatest amount of twist.

Substantiation: Clarification needed. For hose lengths greater than 50 ft, the portion of the hose being measured for twist needs to be clarified. That is, the portion of the hose having the most twist should be measured.

Committee Meeting Action: Reject

Committee Statement: The committee feels the text is clear in 4.4.8.1 regarding the amount of twist allowed.

Number Eligible to Vote: 17
Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16
Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

1961-27 Log #8
(6.13.x (New))

Final Action: Accept in Principle

Submitter: David V. Haston, USDA Forest Service
Recommendation: Add new text to read as follows:

6.13.x If the hose being tested is cotton-synthetic woven reinforcement fire hose, the 20 inch (.51 m) test sample shall be prepared with a small pinprick every 1 inch (25 mm) longitudinal and parallel to the fold on each side, to allow air to escape during compression of the test sample. The pin pricks shall be located 0.4 inch +/-0.1 inch (10 mm +/-2.5 mm) from each fold on each side of the hose. Each pin prick shall penetrate at least 1 thickness and may penetrate both thickness of hose.

Substantiation: This requirement will allow trapped air to escape during the compression test, giving a true indication of the hose compressibility.

This requirement is consistent with USDA specification 5100-186.

Committee Meeting Action: Accept in Principle

Add new text 6.13.4 to read as follows:

6.13.4 The 20 inch (0.51 m) test sample shall be prepared with a small pinprick every 1 inch (25 mm) longitudinally and parallel to the fold on each side to allow air to escape during compression of the test sample.

6.13.4.1 The pin pricks shall be located 0.4 inch +/-0.1 inch (10 mm +/-2.5 mm) from each fold on each side of the hose.

6.13.4.2 Each pin prick shall penetrate at least 1 thickness and may penetrate both thickness of hose.

Renumber 6.13.4 through 6.13.6 as 6.13.5 through 6.13.7.

Committee Statement: The committee feels this allowance should be made for both cotton-synthetic woven reinforcement fire hose and synthetic woven reinforcement fire hose.

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

1961-28 Log #7
(6.13.6)

Final Action: Accept

Submitter: David V. Haston, USDA Forest Service

Recommendation: Revise text to read as follows:

6.13.6 If the hose being tested is synthetic woven reinforcement fire hose, the test sample shall be compressed until there is a distance of 0.63 inch (16 mm) +/-2.7 mm (0.5 in.) between the plates and the amount of load required to achieve this compression recorded.

Substantiation: Synthetic forestry fire hose manufactured with improved heat and abrasion resistance will not meet the current compression requirement. The compression distance should be increased from 0.50 to 0.63 in order to give end users more choice in NFPA-compliant forestry fire hose.

This requirement is consistent with USDA specification 5100-187.

Committee Meeting Action: Accept

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

1961-29 Log #CP12
(7.1.3 and 7.4)

Final Action: Accept

Submitter: Technical Committee on Fire Hose

Recommendation: Renumber 7.1.3 as 7.1.4 and revise to read as follows:

7.1.4 Production Records of hydrostatic inspection and tests required by this standard shall be kept complete and available to the purchaser when requested at the time of purchase.

Renumber 7.4 as 7.1.3 and revise to read as follows:

7.1.3 When requested at the time of purchase, the manufacturer shall provide the purchaser with certification that the fire hose or fire hose assembly furnished has been tested and is in compliance with the requirements of this standard.

Substantiation: These two paragraphs are being located together as they are related and apply to quality control issues. If the purchaser wants documentation certification that the fire hose meets the standard or records of the hydrostatic tests, the manufacturer needs to know and provide that at the time of purchase.

Paragraph 7.1.3 is being revised to just include hydrostatic test results as all the production records are extensive and not necessarily related just to the hose being purchased by a specific fire department.

Committee Meeting Action: Accept

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

Comment on Affirmative:

KING, L.: FM Approvals Quality Assurance Procedures requires that production and manufacturing quality assurance and test records are kept on file for two years as a condition for maintaining FM Approval.

1961-30 Log #9
(A.4.4.1)

Final Action: Accept in Principle

Submitter: David V. Haston, USDA Forest Service

Recommendation: Revise text to read as follows:

A.4.4.1 This requirement is consistent with USDA Forest Service Specification 5100-186 E, Forest Service Specification for Fire Hose, Cotton-Synthetic, Lined, Woven Jacket, 1 inch and 1 1/2 inch.

Substantiation: USDA Forest Service specifications are revised periodically. Once a specification has been revised, the previous revision is obsolete and no longer available.

Committee Meeting Action: Accept in Principle

Keep the letter reference to the revision but update it to the current revision which is "D".

Committee Statement: The NFPA Manual of Style requires reference to a specific edition of a document.

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

1961-31 Log #10
(A.4.4.2)

Final Action: Accept in Principle

Submitter: David V. Haston, USDA Forest Service

Recommendation: Revise text to read as follows:

A.4.4.2 This requirement is consistent with USDA Forest Service Specification 5100-187 a, Forest Service Specification for Fire Hose, Lightweight Synthetic, Lined, Woven Jacket, 1 inch and 1 1/2 inch.

Substantiation: USDA Forest Service specifications are revised periodically. Once a specification has been revised, the previous revision is obsolete and no longer available.

Committee Meeting Action: Accept in Principle

Keep the letter reference to the revision but update it to the current revision which is "C".

Committee Statement: The NFPA Manual of Style requires reference to a specific edition of a document.

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

1961-32 Log #11
(B.1.2.3)

Final Action: Accept in Principle

Submitter: David V. Haston, USDA Forest Service

Recommendation: Revise text to read as follows:

B.1.2.3 USDA Publication. ~~USDA~~ ~~U.S.~~ Forest Service, San Dimas Technology and Development Center, San Dimas, CA 91773.

USDA Forest Service Specification 5100-186 E, Forest Service Specification for Fire Hose, Cotton-Synthetic, Lined, Woven Jacket, 1 inch and 1 1/2 inch ~~October 1996~~.

USDA Forest Service Specification 5100-187 a, Forest Service Specification for Fire Hose, Lightweight Synthetic, Lined, Woven Jacket, 1 inch and 1 1/2 inch ~~October 1996~~.

Substantiation: USDA Forest Service specifications are revised periodically. Once a specification has been revised, the previous revision is obsolete and no longer available.

Committee Meeting Action: Accept in Principle

Make the changes requested but keep and update the letter references to the revisions. The current revision of USDA Forest Service Specification 5100-186 is "D" and the current revision of USDA Forest Service Specification 5100-187 is "C".

Committee Statement: The NFPA Manual of Style requires reference to a specific edition of a document as the requirements of that edition are what was available for the committee to consider and include as a reference.

Number Eligible to Vote: 17

Ballot Results: Affirmative: 16

Ballot Not Returned: 1 Harcourt, R.

**FORM FOR COMMENTS ON NFPA REPORT ON PROPOSALS
2006 FALL REVISION CYCLE
FINAL DATE FOR RECEIPT OF COMMENTS: 5:00 pm EST, 3/3/2006**

For further information on the standards-making process, please contact the Codes
and Standards Administration at 617-984-7249

For technical assistance, please call NFPA at 617-770-3000

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Log #: _____

Date Rec'd: _____

Please indicate in which format you wish to receive your ROP/ROC **electronic** **paper** **download**
(Note: In choosing the download option you intend to view the ROP/ROC from our Website; no copy will be sent to you.)

Date _____ Name _____ Tel. No. _____

Company _____

Street Address _____ City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Please Indicate Organization Represented (if any) _____

1. a) NFPA Document Title _____ NFPA No. & Year _____

b) Section/Paragraph _____

2. Comment on Proposal No. (from ROP): _____

3. Comment recommends: (check one) new text revised text deleted text

4. Comment (include proposed new or revised wording, or identification of wording to be deleted): (Note: Proposed text should be in legislative format: i.e., use underscore to denote wording to be inserted (inserted wording) and strike-through to denote wording to be deleted (~~deleted wording~~)). _____

5. Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Comment: (Note: State the problem that will be resolved by your recommendation; give the specific reason for your comment including copies of tests, research papers, fire experience, etc. If more than 200 words, it may be abstracted for publication.) _____

6. Copyright Assignment

a) I am the author of the text or other material (such as illustrations, graphs) proposed in this Comment.

b) Some or all of the text or other material proposed in this Comment was not authored by me. Its source is as follows: (please identify which material and provide complete information on its source) _____

I hereby grant and assign to the NFPA all and full rights in copyright in this Comment and understand that I acquire no rights in any publication of NFPA in which this Comment in this or another similar or analogous form is used. Except to the extent that I do not have authority to make an assignment in materials that I have identified in (b) above, I hereby warrant that I am the author of this comment and that I have full power and authority to enter into this assignment.

Signature (Required) _____

PLEASE USE SEPARATE FORM FOR EACH COMMENT • NFPA Fax: (617) 770-3500

Mail to: Secretary, Standards Council, National Fire Protection Association, 1 Batterymarch Park, P.O. Box 9101, Quincy, MA 02269
11/1/2005

Notice of Intent to Make a Motion (NITMAM)

Sequence of Events Leading to Issuance of an NFPA Committee Document

Step 1 Call for Proposals

▼ Proposed new Document or new edition of an existing Document is entered into one of two yearly revision cycles, and a Call for Proposals is published.

Step 2 Report on Proposals (ROP)

▼ Committee meets to act on Proposals, to develop its own Proposals, and to prepare its Report.

▼ Committee votes by written ballot on Proposals. If two-thirds approve, Report goes forward. Lacking two-thirds approval, Report returns to Committee.

▼ Report on Proposals (ROP) is published for public review and comment.

Step 3 Report on Comments (ROC)

▼ Committee meets to act on Public Comments to develop its own Comments, and to prepare its report.

▼ Committee votes by written ballot on Comments. If two-thirds approve, Reports goes forward. Lacking two-thirds approval, Report returns to Committee.

▼ Report on Comments (ROC) is published for public review.

Step 4 Technical Report Session

▼ “*Notices of intent to make a motion*” are filed, are reviewed, and valid motions are certified for presentation at the Technical Report Session. (“Consent Documents” that have no certified motions bypass the Technical Report Session and proceed to the Standards Council for issuance.)

▼ NFPA membership meets each June at the Annual Meeting Technical Report Session and acts on Technical Committee Reports (ROP and ROC) for Documents with “certified amending motions.”

▼ Committee(s) vote on any amendments to Report approved at NFPA Annual Membership Meeting.

Step 5 Standards Council Issuance

▼ Notification of intent to file an appeal to the Standards Council on Association action must be filed within 20 days of the NFPA Annual Membership Meeting.

▼ Standards Council decides, based on all evidence, whether or not to issue Document or to take other action, including hearing any appeals.

The Technical Report Session of the NFPA Annual Meeting

The process of public input and review does not end with the publication of the ROP and ROC. Following the completion of the Proposal and Comment periods, there is yet a further opportunity for debate and discussion through the Technical Report Sessions that take place at the NFPA Annual Meeting.

The Technical Report Session provides an opportunity for the final Technical Committee Report (i.e., the ROP and ROC) on each proposed new or revised code or standard to be presented to the NFPA membership for the debate and consideration of motions to amend the Report. The specific rules for the types of motions that can be made and who can make them are set forth in NFPA's rules which should always be consulted by those wishing to bring an issue before the membership at a Technical Report Session. The following presents some of the main features of how a Report is handled.

What Amending Motions are Allowed. The Technical Committee Reports contain many Proposals and Comments that the Technical Committee has rejected or revised in whole or in part. Actions of the Technical Committee published in the ROP may also eventually be rejected or revised by the Technical Committee during the development of its ROC. The motions allowed by NFPA rules provide the opportunity to propose amendments to the text of a proposed code or standard based on these published Proposals, Comments and Committee actions. Thus, the list of allowable motions include motions to accept Proposals and Comments in whole or in part as submitted or as modified by a Technical Committee action. Motions are also available to reject an accepted Comment in whole or part. In addition, Motions can be made to return an entire Technical Committee Report or a portion of the Report to the Technical Committee for further study.

The NFPA Annual Meeting, also known as the World Safety Conference and Exposition®, takes place in June of each year. A second Fall membership meeting was discontinued in 2004, so the NFPA Technical Report Session now runs once each year at the Annual Meeting in June.

Who Can Make Amending Motions. Those authorized to make these motions is also regulated by NFPA rules. In many cases, the maker of the motion is limited by NFPA rules to the original submitter of the Proposal or Comment or his or her duly authorized representative. In other cases, such as a Motion to Reject an accepted Comment, or to Return a Technical Committee Report or a portion of a Technical Committee Report for Further Study, anyone can make these motions. For a complete explanation, NFPA rules should be consulted.

The filing of a Notice of Intent to Make a Motion. Before making an allowable motion at a Technical Report Session, the intended maker of the motion must file, in advance of the session, and within the published deadline, a Notice of Intent to Make a Motion. A Motions Committee appointed by the Standards Council then reviews all notices and certifies all amending motions that are proper. The Motions Committee can also, in consultation with the makers of the motions, clarify the intent of the motions and, in certain circumstances, combine motions that are dependent on each other together so that they can be made in one single motion. A Motions Committee report is then made available in advance of the meeting listing all certified motions. Only these Certified Amending Motions, together with certain allowable Follow-Up Motions (that is, motions that have become necessary as a result of previous successful amending motions) will be allowed at the Technical Report Session.

Consent Documents. Often there are codes and standards up for consideration by the membership that will be non-controversial and no proper Notices of Intent to Make a Motion will be filed. These "Consent Documents" will bypass the Technical Report Session and head straight to the Standards Council for issuance. The remaining Documents are then forwarded to the Technical Report Session for consideration of the NFPA membership.

Important Note: *The filing of a Notice of Intent to Make a Motion is a new requirement that takes effect beginning with those Documents scheduled for the Fall 2005 revision cycle that reports to the June 2006 Annual Meeting Technical Report Session. The filing of a Notice of Intent to Make a Motion will not, therefore, be required in order to make a motion at the June 2005 Annual Meeting Technical Report Session. For updates on the transition to the new Notice requirement and related new rules effective for the Fall 2005 revision cycle and the June 2006 Annual Meeting, check the NFPA website.*

Action on Motions at the Technical Report Session. In order to actually make a Certified Amending Motion at the Technical Report Session, the maker of the motion must sign in at least an hour before the session begins. In this way a final list of motions can be set in advance of the session. At the session, each proposed Document up for consideration is presented by a motion to adopt the Technical Committee Report on the Document. Following each such motion, the presiding officer in charge of the session opens the floor to motions on the Document from the final list of Certified Amending Motions followed by any permissible Follow-Up Motions. Debate and voting on each motion proceeds in accordance with NFPA rules. NFPA membership is not required in order to make or speak to a motion, but voting is limited to NFPA members who have joined at least 180 days prior to the session and have registered for the meeting. At the close of debate on each motion, voting takes place, and the motion requires a majority vote to carry. In order to amend a Technical Committee Report, successful amending motions must be confirmed by the responsible Technical Committee, which conducts a written ballot on all successful amending motions following the meeting and prior to the Document being forwarded to the Standards Council for issuance.

Standards Council Issuance

One of the primary responsibilities of the NFPA Standards Council, as the overseer of the NFPA codes and standards development process, is to act as the official issuer of all NFPA codes and standards. When it convenes to issue NFPA documents it also hears any appeals related to the Document. Appeals are an important part of assuring that all NFPA rules have been followed and that due process and fairness have been upheld throughout the codes and standards development process. The Council considers appeals both in writing and through the conduct of hearings at which all interested parties can participate. It decides appeals based on the entire record of the process as well as all submissions on the appeal. After deciding all appeals related to a Document before it, the Council, if appropriate, proceeds to issue the Document as an official NFPA code or standard. Subject only to limited review by the NFPA Board of Directors, the Decision of the Standards Council is final, and the new NFPA code or standard becomes effective twenty days after Standards Council issuance. The illustration on page 9 provides an overview of the entire process, which takes approximately two full years to complete.