



National Fire Protection Association

1 Batterymarch Park, Quincy, MA 02169-7471
Phone: 617-770-3000 • Fax: 617-770-0700 • www.nfpa.org

MEMORANDUM

TO: NFPA Technical Committee on Sprinkler System Discharge Criteria

FROM: Joanne Goyette

DATE: March 25, 2011

SUBJECT: NFPA 13 (AUT-SSD) **SUPPLEMENTAL ROP TC FINAL** Ballot Results (A2012)

The Final Results of the NFPA 13 Supplemental ROP Letter Ballot are as follows:

25 Members Eligible to Vote
2 Not Returned (A. Hogan and T. McNamara)
22 Affirmative on All
1 Negative (D. Hopkins) (on one or more proposals as noted in the attached report)
0 Abstentions

There are two criteria necessary to pass ballot [(1) affirmative $\frac{2}{3}$ vote and (2) simple majority].

- (1) The number of affirmative votes needed for the proposal to pass is **16**.
 $25 \text{ eligible to vote} - 2 \text{ not returned} - 0 \text{ abstentions} = 23 \times 0.66 = 15.18$
- (2) In all cases, an affirmative vote of at least a simple majority of the total membership eligible to vote is required. This is the calculation for simple majority:
 $[25 \text{ eligible} \div 2 = 12.5 = \mathbf{(13)}]$

Reasons for negative votes, etc. from alternate members are not included unless the ballot from the principal member was not received.

According to the final ballot results, all ballot items received the necessary $\frac{2}{3}$ required affirmative votes to pass ballot.

13-587 A.12.12, 12.12.1.2(a) (Log # CP306)

Negative

Hopkins, Jr., D. Complete test data was not provided to facilitate review.

Affirmative with Comment

Baker, Jr., W. I agree that the protection options for a particular storage arrangement would be better served when a sprinkler having a minimum K-factor of 11.2 (160) utilizes a nominal temperature rating of 160F (70C), however according to the substantiation all tests were conducted with the ignition location between 4 upright sprinklers. Before we agree to the design guidelines that have been offered in this submittal it would be wise to see what the test results would be if the ignition location were located under a single upright sprinkler. The reason why I offer this is because testing conducted at FM Global has indicated that for an upright sprinkler the worst-case fire condition may be one that originates under the sprinkler as opposed to between two or more. For example, I have seen situations where the number of sprinklers that operate during a fire can more than double (i.e. 25 AS vs. 10 AS) when you maintain all parameters of a test to be the same for an upright sprinkler except you move the ignition location from between sprinklers to under one sprinkler. I would hate for the Committee to agree to these design guidelines only to find out later that they need to be changed based on simply an ignition location scenario. Bottom line is that for a K11.2 (K160) upright sprinkler I agree that nominally rated 160F (70C) sprinklers are better than nominally rated 280F (140C) sprinklers, but the ignition location is actually best-case for upright sprinklers as opposed to worst-case for upright sprinklers and therefore subsequent testing could indicate that the design area should be larger than currently indicated in this submittal.