



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 Installation Criteria

FROM: Joanne Goyette

DATE: March 25, 2011

SUBJECT: NFPA 13 (AUT-SSI) ROP TC FINAL Ballot Results (A2012)

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

- 30 Members Eligible to Vote**
- 2 Not Returned** (M. Kirn and L. Slocum)
- 11 Affirmative on All**
- 16 Negatives** (H. Bahadori, W. Baker, P. Brown, R. Caputo, D. Dornbos, R. Gerdes, E. Joyce, L. Keeping, C. Ketner, J. Lake, G. Laverick, K. Linder, M. Meehan, T. Miller, P. Schwab, and T. Victor) (on one or more proposals as noted in the attached report)
- 1 Abstention** (R. McPhee) (on one or more proposals as noted in the attached report)

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 **18**.
30 eligible to vote - 2 not returned - 1 abstentions = $27 \times 0.66 = 17.82$
- (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:
[30 eligible \div 2 = 15 + 1 = **(16)**]

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.

13-1 Entire Document (Log # 189)

Affirmative with Comment

Linder, K. While I don't think a separate version of the standard is needed, I agree that the metric conversions still need work. We have a metrics task group and staff to deal with this and hopefully most of the issues can be fixed between now and the ROC meeting.

13-6 1.1.2 (Log # 36)

Affirmative with Comment

McPhee, R. Since the reference to 'within the building' in the current wording doesn't necessarily cover exterior ignitions arising from exposure fires, it would seem more appropriate if the proposal were accepted in principle and the wording revised to read: "1.1.2 This standard is written with the assumption that the sprinkler system shall be designed to protect against a single fire originating within or on the exterior of the building."

13-16 3.X, A.3.X (Log # CP407)

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. While I agree with this action, I would offer an editorial comment that, in the last sentence of the Annex text, the term "architectural features" should be revised to "structural and architectural features", since many obstructions which can cause shadow areas, such as the referenced building columns, are structural elements.

McPhee, R. A scan of NFPA 13-2010 reveals no references to 'shadow area', but a number of references are made to 'dry shadow' and 'floor area on the other side of the obstruction'. It is only through the changes proposed this cycle, i.e., Logs #358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, and 364, that such a concept is established and applied within the standard.

However, a scan of the proposed new text to be added (see referenced Logs) uses the new term 'shadowed area', not 'shadow' area', to designate the concept.

In Clause 3.x, the preferred term should be revised to read 'shadowed area'.

Further, the wording of the definition should be revised to reflect that the shadowed area is what is expected to be the dry area during sprinkler activation. Consider:

'3.x Shadowed area. The portion of floor area that is expected to remain dry due to blockage of sprinkler discharge by an obstruction or building architectural feature.'

And with this concept established, the term 'shadowed area' should be substituted for the number of references made to 'dry shadow' and 'floor area on the other side of the obstruction' in other current parts of the text.

13-18 3.2.3 Listed (Log # 127)

Affirmative with Comment

Lake, J. While this particular action is beyond the scope of the Technical Committee on Sprinkler System Installation, it is worthy of consideration at the Standards Council level, and the proponent is encouraged to provide a Public Comment in order to complete the process and allow for an appeal.

13-20 3.3.x Continuous Obstruction, Non-Continuous Obstruction (New) (Log # 190)

Negative

Brown, P. The proposal does describe the main aspect of the obstruction and these terms are used pervasively throughout Chapter 8.

Caputo, R. Proposal does in fact describe the pertinent aspect of the obstruction and these terms are used pervasively throughout Chapter 8. Definition and clarity are needed beyond that which is provided by Webster's Collegiate Dictionary.

13-22 3.3.5.4 Smooth Ceiling (Log # 450)

Negative

Brown, P. A.3.7.2 provides examples for unobstructed construction. These definitions are useful but the proposal is needed for clarity to differentiate smooth ceiling with acceptable irregularities. This also correlates to the 3 in. used in Section 8.5.4.1.2 to establish deflector distance.

Caputo, R. A.3.7.2 provides examples for unobstructed construction. These definitions are useful but the proposal is needed for clarity to differentiate smooth ceilings with acceptable irregularities.

13-24 3.3.6 Concealed Spaces, Small Openings, Cloud Ceilings, 8.15, A.8.15 (Log # CP406)

Affirmative with Comment

Brown, P. Testing in support of the computer modeling should be performed to allow us to base this on solid scientific data. In particular, I am concerned about defining small openings without knowing how heat below the ceiling will operate sprinklers above wit small openings.

Caputo, R. This is a huge amount of new material which will have a significant and valuable impact on design and installation practices... it would be nice to see some actual testing in support of the computer modeling so we may base this on solid scientific data. In particular, I am concerned about defining small openings without knowing how heat below the ceiling will operate sprinklers above with small openings. Currently, the standard allows a sprinkler to be located 18" above the center of a 48" cloud ceiling panel with limited openings along all four walls. I can't imagine this providing fire control or good fire protection practice. (Shielding?)

Gerdes, R. This is a great start in addressing the issue. I intend to support this proposal with further refinement.

Keeping, L. While I agree with the Committee Action, based on the task group's report, I must point out that the report on the fire modelling, that is referenced in the new A.8.15.23.3, was not distributed to all of the members of the TC. This omission needs to be rectified prior to the Comment Closing date.

Lake, J. Presently the support for this proposed change is only a series of fire modeling. The modeling process was not completed at the time of the ROP meeting and no report was submitted to the committee. This is a significant change to the document and will require not only fire modeling but successful full scale fire testing in order to convince me that changes proposed will not negatively impact the overall protection provided by the sprinkler system.

13-25 3.3.7 Control Valve (New) (Log # 44)

Affirmative with Comment

Brown, P. NFPA 13 should not have to provide commentary on what types of valves are not control valves. Perhaps a definition in the body is useful but the annex material is not needed in the installation standard just because the NFPA 25 TC added it to clarify inspection, testing and maintenance requirements.

Caputo, R. NFPA 13 should not have to provide commentary on what types of valves are not control valves. Perhaps a definition in the body is useful but the annex material is not needed in the installation standard just because the NFPA 25 TC added it to clarify inspection, testing and maintenance requirements.

13-31 3.3.18 (Log # CP415)

Negative

Victor, T. This revised definition is necessary as it will help clarify the limitations of a system as it applies to NFPA 13 and 25.

13-33 3.4.1.1 Premixed Antifreeze Solution, 7.6 (Log # CP404)

Negative

Miller, T. This proposal eliminates the historical small antifreeze systems that have been in this standard for over 50 years. The committee should have never permitted the installation of large antifreeze systems that were not specifically tested and listed. This change about 10 years ago is what lead to the present problem.

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. While this proposal is absolutely needed in lieu of the current TIA No. 10-1 (Log #1000) and I generally agree with the substance, I remain uncomfortable with some of the elements:

- The properties of 48% glycerin and 38% propylene glycol are not represented in Table A.7.6.2.1, so information that is needed for design and for out in the field is still missing.
 - The need for the premixed solutions to be prepared by a manufacturer, rather than by any other agency remains unconvincing. To date questions that have been asked remain unanswered and the information provided on this subject has been all anecdotal, whereas as a definitive technical report is needed.
 - Further testing and/or research using standard spray sprinklers, rather than just the residential types, is needed.
-

13-35 3.4.3 Combined Dry Pipe - Preaction Sprinkler System (Log # 500)

Affirmative with Comment

Lake, J. While this particular issue is still very much in a state of change, the committee would do well not to simply accept or reject a particular proposal or wait for the public to submit comments. A task group should be established to review all of the variations of language between the TIAs, ROP and what is sure to be numerous public comments and provide one coherent document for the technical committee to consider at the ROC stage.

13-39 3.5 Various Definitions, 9.3.3, and A.9.3.3 (New) (Log # 515)

Negative

Brown, P. I agree with Mr. Lavericks statement on the loop having not been evaluated for seismic applications by UL and a search of the FM Approvals did not reveal any listings for the device.

Laverick, G. The proposed definition of a Seismic Loop specifies that the assembly is listed for its capability to accommodate movement and intend to bridge a seismic separation. These devices are Listed by UL specifically to accommodate movement due to thermal expansion of the piping and have not been evaluated by UL for seismic applications. The remainder of the revisions to the various sections in the proposal refer to a listed seismic loop. The Committee should be aware that this loop has not been evaluated for seismic applications by UL and a search of the FM Approvals did not reveal any listings for this device. For previous editions of the standard, the Committee was aware of this situation, they had reviewed seismic data provided, and accepted the product as a means to bridge the seismic separation. That is the reason for the current wording. Based on this, the proposal should not be accepted.

13-47 3.9.1.5 Clearance (Log # 180)

Abstain

McPhee, R. Cannot vote on this item as another referenced Proposal (13-48) is not available, which would allow confirmation of Committee Action.

13-54 4.3 (Log # 239)

Affirmative with Comment

Brown, P. The determination of who may perform these tasks is established by the individual states, municipalities or even nations as the standard becomes more widely used abroad. The NFPA designation of Certified Fire Protection Specialist should most certainly qualify one as much as being named the Engineer of Record as it applies to proven special knowledge of systems design and application.

13-60 Chapter 6 (Log # 243)

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. While I agree with the Committee Action, I must point out that the referenced supporting material was not distributed to all of the members of the TC. This omission needs to be rectified prior to the Comment Closing date.

13-62 6.1 (Log # 3)

Abstain

McPhee, R. Cannot vote on this item as the Committee Action references another proposal [13-254 (Log 401)], which offers no clear indication of the action on Item 13-62.

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. While I agree with the Committee Action, there is a typographical error in the Committee Statement. I believe that the referenced Committee Action should be Proposal 13-67, (Log #CP401) rather than Proposal 13-254 (Log #401).

13-67 6.1.1.3 (Log # CP401)

Negative

Laverick, G. Revisions to the existing 6.1.1.3 completely change the meaning of this section to require only plastic piping to be listed. All other equipment will not require listing which we believe is not the intent of this revision.

The new 6.1.1.6.1 requires modifications in chemical or materials to the equipment in tables 6.3.1.1 and 6.4.1 to be compatible and contained in the listing instructions. However, the equipment referenced in tables (except for plastic piping) is not required to be listed and therefore the information will not be required.

Affirmative with Comment

Meehan, M. This proposal only addresses the existing known problems and does not address the underlying issue of incompatible materials being manufactured and listed for installation. The building owners, the public and our industry deserve better.

Schwab, P. I believe this is a step in the right direction. However, the only way to ensure that all items are compatible is to require that all products used in sprinkler systems be listed. This includes components as well as items such as lube, thread sealants, antifreeze, etc.

13-68 6.1.3.1 (New) (Log # 47)

Affirmative with Comment

Schwab, P. The editor of the handbook needs to correct the commentary for this section as it conflicts with the committee's action.

13-69 6.2.1 (Log # 392)

Negative

Bahadori, H. Sprinklers could be damaged during removing and reinstalling.

Dornbos, D. I vote to reject the proposal. Compliance with the limitation "...as long as the sprinkler has not been damaged..." is unrealistic and not possible to assure. Installation of new out-of-the-box sprinklers provides assurance that the sprinklers being installed successfully passed integrity tests and inspection required by the listing agencies immediately prior to being packed for shipment. Re-installing sprinklers that have been removed, subjected to uncontrolled temporary storage and then re-installed does not provide that assurance and requires reliance on judgment of personnel not necessarily knowledgeable in recognizing latent damage that can result from uncontrolled handling and storage. Inspection for damage AFTER re-installation may be impossible. We should follow guidance provided in 6.2.1: "Only new sprinklers shall be installed."

Keeping, L. I believe that the committee should reconsider and reject this proposal. In the latest edition of NFPA 25 their TC added text about cleaning sprinklers using compressed air or a vacuum, provided that the equipment does not touch the sprinkler. The concern here is that touching the sprinkler could damage it. With this Action however, a person would now be allowed physically remove the sprinkler from a fitting, handle it, store it, possibly rinse it off with water and then later reinstall it following a cursory inspection. Such an inspection would be unlikely to reveal any damage to the sprinkler (ie. deformation or scratches on a glass bulb, etc), so this process should not be allowed. Only new sprinklers should be used to replace ones that have been removed.

13-71 6.2.1 (Log # 510)

Negative

Dornbos, D. The proposal should be accepted. Installation of new out-of-the-box sprinklers provides assurance that the sprinklers being installed successfully passed integrity tests and inspection required by the listing agencies immediately prior to being packed for shipment. Re-installing sprinklers that have been removed, subjected to uncontrolled temporary storage and then re-installed does not provide that assurance and requires reliance on judgment of personnel not necessarily knowledgeable in recognizing latent damage that can result from uncontrolled handling and storage.

Keeping, L. I believe that this proposal should have been accepted, or perhaps Proposal 13-75, (Log #388) instead. Please see my negative comment on Proposal 13-69, (Log #392).

13-72 6.2.1.1 (Log # 307)

Negative

Bahadori, H. Sprinklers could be damaged during removing and reinstalling.

Dornbos, D. The proposal should be rejected. Installation of new out-of-the-box sprinklers provides assurance that the sprinklers being installed successfully passed integrity tests and inspection required by the listing agencies immediately prior to being packed for shipment. Re-installing sprinklers that have been removed, subjected to uncontrolled temporary storage and then re-installed does not provide that assurance and requires reliance on judgment of personnel not necessarily knowledgeable in recognizing latent damage that can result from uncontrolled handling and storage. We should follow guidance provided in 6.2.1: "Only new sprinklers shall be installed."

Keeping, L. Please see my negative comment on Proposal 13-69, (Log #392).

13-73 6.2.1.1 (New) (Log # 48)

Negative

Bahadori, H. Sprinklers could be damaged during removing and reinstalling.

Dornbos, D. See my Explanation of Negative on Proposal 13-72 (Log #307).

Keeping, L. Please see my negative comment on Proposal 13-69, (Log #392).

13-75 6.2.1.1 and A.6.2.1.1 (New) (Log # 388)

Negative

Keeping, L. I believe that this proposal should have been accepted, or perhaps Proposal 13-71 (Log #510) instead. Please see my negative comment on Proposal 13-69 (Log #392).

Affirmative with Comment

Bahadori, H. Sprinklers could be damaged during removing and reinstalling.

13-77 6.2.3.5 and 6.2.3.6 (Log # 181)

Negative

Joyce, II, E. I agree with the submitter as he is trying make clear that ESFR's are K = 14 or greater and CMSA's (the old large drop) have a K = 11.2 as mentioned in the annex of chapter # 3 for the def. of CMSA.

13-80 6.2.6.4.3 (Log # 49)

Negative

Schwab, P. This is an instruction that pertains to the system after it has been put in service. This provision is not appropriate in NFPA 13 and should be deleted.

Victor, T. I agree with the submitter that this is a maintenance requirement that should not be in NFPA 13. NFPA 25 addresses the replacement of covered sprinklers in 5.4.1.7.2 where it states "Coverings shall be replaced when deposits or residue accumulate."

13-81 6.2.7.4 (New) (Log # 457)

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. While I agree with this action, I would offer an editorial comment that, instead of just "recessed escutcheon" the text should say "recessed escutcheon or concealed sprinkler cover plate", because cover plates have often been mistakenly caulked or glued as well.

13-84 6.2.9.7 (Log # 504)

Negative

Brown, P. I agree with the submitter's reason. The list of spare sprinklers needs to be on a list that will remain readable.

13-86 6.3.1.1.1 (Log # 447)

Negative

Dornbos, D. The proposal should be accepted. The annex figure referenced in the committee statement does not provide adequate clarification needed.

Lake, J. If it the intent of the committee to permit underground piping to extend into the building then the standard should state it plainly, not rely on a Annex figure to allude to such an approval. If 1 foot is an acceptable replacement for "short duration" the committee should Accept in Principle and state that.

Schwab, P. The committee statement to reference Figure A.10.6.5 solves the issue for Ductile Iron Pipe only. The detail is very specific and only illustrates ductile iron pipe. However, the committee statement means one can extend C-900 piping above grade even though it is outside the listing of that pipe.

13-89 6.3.6.4 (Log # 498)

Negative

Keeping, L. I believe that this proposal should have been accepted. The proponent is correct, all of the rules for bending pipe and tube should be placed in the same section.

13-93 6.5.2 (Log # 535)

Negative

Baker, Jr., W. I have my doubts about how onerous this would be to implement; having said that perhaps this would be acceptable language for the Annex as a minimum.

Brown, P. This proposal recommends a best practice which is easily followed in any fabrication shop. At the very least, this should have been considered as an A.I.P. and added to the annex section A.6.5.2.

Caputo, R. This proposal recommends a best practice which is easily followed in any fabrication shop. At the very least, the committee should have considered A.I.P. and added this valuable material for the annex section A.6.5.2. I believe this proposal should have been accepted.

13-94 6.5.3 (Log # 202)

Affirmative with Comment

Brown, P. The word "include" should be substituted for the word "contained" in the proposed 6.5.3.1 (grammatical).

Caputo, R. The word "include" should be substituted for the word "contained" in the proposed 6.5.3.1 (grammatical).

13-99 6.8.1.2 (Log # 192)

Negative

Laverick, G. Threadless connections have been used on listed hydrants and will likely be available on listed fire department connections. There is no substantiation provided that indicates that threadless connections are not essential parts of a sprinkler system that does not require listing. The AHJ should not be in the position to judge acceptability without third party verification and follow-up testing. NFPA 1963 includes design requirements and numerous tests to address safety concerns of the fire service personnel and to determine the connection functions as intended when required. Verification of the applicable threadless connection requirements and the fire department connection requirements when installed as part of a fire department connection assembly by listing the product, is critical to the safety of this device.

13-100 6.8.4 (Log # 23)

Negative

Gerdes, R. This proposal makes perfect sense. Without signage how do the fire responders know which fire department connection to use. I am not aware of the current building codes requiring such signage.

13-103 7.1.1, 7.2.1, 7.3.1.3, and 8.17.3.3 (Log # 550)

Negative

Keeping, L. I believe that the Committee should reconsider and accept this proposal. While I stand corrected on the availability of some listed gauges for higher pressures, I now contend that the number of manufacturers and the ranges that they offer are very limited. Further I dispute the part of the Committee Statement that says gauges are a critical part of a sprinkler system. As per 6.1.1.5, components that do not affect system performance do not require a listing and a failure of a gauge will not affect the system performance, anymore than a drain valve would. If the pressure gauges on NFPA 20 fire pump installations or the air compressors for dry pipe systems aren't required to be listed, I see no reason why any gauge would need to be. All that might be required is some minimum specifications regarding size, range, etc such as in 4.10 of NFPA 20.

13-110 7.2.3.1.2 (Log # 308)

Negative

Keeping, L. I believe that this proposal should have been accepted. The proponent is correct, the 15 seconds requirement for a dry system that protects dwelling units is sandwiched between the text about water delivery calculation programs and 7.2.3.7, about water delivery time via test manifolds. It would be much better to have the 15 seconds requirement in a new 7.2.3.1.2, as a companion to the dwelling unit requirement of 7.2.3.1.1.

13-113 7.2.3.9.1 and 7.2.3.9.2 (New) (Log # 551)

Negative

Dornbos, D. I vote to reject the proposal. Drilling a hole through the clapper of a check valve may negate the listing of the check valve. Such a field modification is not visible from outside the valve and may result in unintended consequences if the valve is installed elsewhere. An alternative method to communicate downstream pressure to the upstream side of the clapper is to use bypass trim with a union fitted with an appropriate orifice plate.

Schwab, P. The requirement for a bypass drain around the check valve is too restrictive. A drain on the downstream side of the check valve is adequate.

13-115 7.2.4.8.2 (Log # 219)

Negative

Victor, T. I agree with the submitter. He is clarifying that there is a quick opening device that does not require an external anti-flooding device, nor does it utilize an internal anti-flooding device. Without this clarification, the AHJ may require the installation of an external anti-flooding device that is unnecessary.

13-119 7.2.6 (Log # 238)

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. While I agree with the Committee Action, I must point out that the referenced supporting material was not distributed to all of the members of the TC. This omission needs to be rectified prior to the Comment Closing date.

Also, there is a typographical error in the Committee Statement. I believe that the second referenced Committee Action should be Proposal 13-121 (Log #CP402) rather than Proposal 13-41 (Log #402).

13-121 7.2.6 (Log # CP402)

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. While I generally agree with this new text, I am uncomfortable with the term "or other approved gas" and recommend that it be deleted. What gases other than air or nitrogen are foreseen for use in dry-pipe or preaction systems - helium or argon or neon? Why??? What benefit would those rare and expensive gases serve in a sprinkler system?

13-129 7.2.6.5.2 (Log # 435)

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. Based on the NFPA 13 - 2002 and 2007 edition ROP and ROC actions on this matter, I agree with the Committee Action to reject this proposal, however I do not believe that the Committee Statement properly addresses the proponents concern, as per the substantiation that was presented.

13-149 7.6.1.5 (Log # CP403)

Negative

Miller, T. The small antifreeze systems have been eliminated by TIA to the current edition and potentially for the next revision. Large antifreeze systems, unless specifically tested and listed, should never have been allowed by this standard. When the committee allowed these systems about 10 years ago, we introduced the present problem. The TIA limits and proposed limits on concentration have resulted in antifreeze systems, including the small volume ones, being eliminated from most areas because of the potential temperatures being lower than that accommodated by the maximum allowed concentration.

13-150 7.6.2.1 (Log # 244)

Negative

Meehan, M. The existing standard is very clear and will not allow any antifreeze solutions other than glycerin and PC. This language now contradicts TIA 10-2 that allows alternative listed anti-freeze solutions.

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. The need for the premixed solutions to be prepared by a manufacturer, rather than by any other agency remains unconvincing. To date questions that have been asked remain unanswered and the information provided on this subject has been all anecdotal, whereas as a definitive technical report is needed.

13-155 7.7 and A.7.7 (Log # 389)

Negative

Schwab, P. Circulating closed-loop systems are maintenance problems and are not worth the added effort. These types of systems should no longer be allowed.

13-165 8.2 (Log # 532)

Negative

Baker, Jr., W. The substantiation indicates that there is no technical justification to make this change, yet there was really no justification for the guidelines we have today. There are codes outside the United States that allow for larger sprinkler system sizes than what is indicated by NFPA 13; would these codes potentially provide technical justification? If so, then I will offer them as justification at the ROC.

Gerdes, R. The proposal has merit. Hydraulics are not an issue and this could save on installation costs. Many jurisdictions will not adopt new standards that cost more. We need to balance increased costs in new standards. The hazard of larger area being out of service is minimal.

13-167 8.2.1.1 (New) and 8.2.3 (Log # 390)

Negative

Baker, Jr., W. See comments on Log 532.

Gerdes, R. This proposal has merit. The proponent has provided sufficient justification for the proposal.

13-172 8.3.3 (Log # 19)

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. While I agree with the Committee Action to reject the proposal, I do not believe that the issue of mixing residential sprinklers and quick response sprinklers as discussed in 8.4.5.3 has been properly dealt with. The Committee Statement which says that "this may need more work to clarify the requirements and allowances" is unsatisfactory, since it is the Committee's responsibility to provide that clarification.

13-176 8.4.3(5) (Log # 438)

Negative

Keeping, L. After reading Proposal 13-131 from the last cycle, I believe that the Committee made a mistake, both then and now. The Action on 13-131 was to Accept, so Note 5 should have ended with "without specific listing". Notwithstanding the subsequent Committee Statement, if EC sidewall sprinklers are to be required to be specifically listed for sloped ceiling installations, even when they are installed at the high point and aimed downwards along the slope, as per 8.9.4.2.2, then a conflict has been created in the standard, because standard sidewall spray sprinklers are not required to have a similar specific listing.

13-178 8.4.6.1 (Log # 313)

Negative

Keeping, L. The Action taken here by the SSI TC seems to be in conflict with the Actions taken by the SSD TC, who decided that ESFR and CMSA sprinklers at the ceiling can be used in conjunction with in-rack sprinklers under solid shelves (Proposals 13-343 (Log #368) and 13-453 (Log #370)). These matters need to be reconsidered and coordinated by the two Committees.

13-181 8.4.7.4 (Log # 315)

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. While I agree with the Committee Action taken here by the SSI TC, it seems to be in conflict with the Action taken by the SSD TC on Proposal 13-389 (Log #449), where it was decided that all CMSA sprinkler design schemes (ie. using either standard response or quick response types) at the ceiling can be used to protect light hazard occupancies. These matters need to be reconsidered and coordinated by the two Committees.

13-182 8.4.9.1 (Log # 114)

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. While I agree with this action, I would offer an editorial comment that in the new Table 8.4.9.1 (b) all of the metric values need to be properly rounded (ie. the metric value equivalent to 40°F should be 4°C rather than 4.4° and the metric equivalent to 4 inches should be 100 mm rather than 104).

13-189 8.5.5.4 (Log # 318)

Negative

Miller, T. No technical justification was provided to eliminate the minimum distance to the wall or obstruction. These large thermal masses will delay sprinkler operation and minimum distance must be maintained. The remainder of the revision is acceptable.

13-190 8.5.6 (Log # 187)

Negative

Brown, P. I agree with the submitter's substantiation. The item pointed out by the committee is covered in A.8.6.6.

13-191 8.5.7.1 (Log # 214)

Negative

Brown, P. Skylight criteria is addressed in 8.5, how can the ceiling pocket criteria of 8.6 be applied.

Caputo, R. Skylight criteria has been intentionally separated from ceiling pocket criteria so we should not say the issue is addressed in 8.6. This proposal should be accepted in my opinion.

Keeping, L. I believe that this matter should have been given more consideration. The proponent is correct, as per the current requirement of 8.5.7.1, if one skylight is within 10 feet of another it should be sprinklered. As was sort of pointed out in the Committee Statement however, being that a skylight is a form of ceiling pocket, 8.6.7.2(4) is in conflict with this, and any number of unprotected skylights can be located within 10 feet of each other as long as their cumulative sizes do not exceed 1000 cu. ft.

13-192 Table 8.6.2.2.1(a) (Log # 320)

Affirmative with Comment

McPhee, R. Need to be clear that the title of the new Table is not changed from the current one. No title was included in the proposed new version.

Also, editorially, the description in the left column in the final row should read: 'Combustible concealed spaces with members less than 3 ft on center in accordance with 8.6.4.1.4.'

13-196 8.6.4.1.4 and 8.6.2.2.1.1 (Log # 319)

Affirmative with Comment

McPhee, R. Also, editorially, the new text should read: 'In concealed spaces with members less than 3 ft on center meeting the requirements of 8.6.4.1.4...'

13-198 8.6.4.3 (Log # 437)**Negative**

Gerdes, R. This is common practice and accepted by codes as noted in the proposal. Maybe a reference or requirement on design flow and number of operating sprinklers is appropriate. This is similar to Proposal 13-599 which I support.

13-200 8.6.5.2.1.2 (Log # 188)**Affirmative with Comment**

Brown, P. Committee action should be A.I.P. since the proposal was modified.

Caputo, R. Committee action should be A.I.P. since the proposal was modified.

13-202 8.6.5.3.3 (Log # 24)**Affirmative with Comment**

Keeping, L. I agree that this proposal should have been rejected, because I believe the concept of width vs. length is almost universally understood, however I disagree with the Committee Statement for the rejection. The referenced Proposal 13-24, Log #CP406 is about concealed spaces, small openings and ceiling clouds and is not directly related to the subject of obstructions that are over 4 feet wide, which has been addressed in the standard for many many years.

13-204 8.6.5.4 (Log # 359)**Negative**

Bahadori, H. No technical substantiation has been submitted.

Keeping, L. There are several things wrong with this Action:

- First, according to my notes, the TC did not accept the 27 ft² value, but retained the 15 ft² that was originally proposed. At 27 ft², there is a conflict with the Action for similar proposals 13-209 to 13-223 (Log # 360 to Log #364) which accepted only 15 ft² for other types of sprinklers.

- Second, according to my notes, the TC did not accept the illustrations.

- Third, the TC decided to limit the application of shadow areas to light and ordinary hazard occupancies with quick response sprinklers. However, as per the proponents substantiation and as per the Task Group's explanation, shadow areas are created by obstructions to sprinklers that are correctly installed as per the "Three Times Rule" of 8.6.5.2.1.3. Therefore, since the 8.6.5.2.1.3 applies to all standard spray upright and pendent sprinklers, shadow areas are already allowed for all occupancies protected with that type of sprinkler, so they cannot be limited to just L.H. and O.H. occupancies with Q/R sprinklers.

Affirmative with Comment

McPhee, R. Figure A.6.5.4 should be entitled, i.e., Example of shadowed area.

13-205 8.6.6.1, 8.7.6, 8.8.6.1, and A.8.6.6 (Log # 377)**Negative**

Miller, T. There was no technical justification presented to support the change. The change would allow storage on shelves above the reach of sprinkler water spray that would burn uncontrolled generating heat and toxic gases. Fire could also extend opening an excessive number of sprinklers resulting in failure of the entire system.

13-209 8.7.5.4 and A.8.7.5.4 (Log # 360)**Negative**

Bahadori, H. No technical substantiation has been submitted.

Keeping, L. I believe that this matter needs to be reconsidered. The TC decided to limit the application of shadow areas to installations with quick response sprinklers. However, as per the proponents substantiation and as per the Task Group's explanation, shadow areas are created by obstructions to sprinklers that are correctly installed as per the "Three Times Rule" of 8.7.5.2.1.3. Therefore, since the 8.7.5.2.1.3 applies to all standard sidewall spray sprinklers, shadow areas are already allowed for all standard sidewall spray sprinklers, so they cannot be limited to the Q/R type.

13-212 8.8.5.4 (New) (Log # 361)**Negative**

Bahadori, H. No technical substantiation has been submitted.

Keeping, L. I believe that this matter needs to be reconsidered. TC decided to limit the application of shadow areas to light and ordinary hazard occupancies with quick response sprinklers. However, as per the proponents substantiation and as per the Task Group's explanation, shadow areas are created by obstructions to sprinklers that are correctly installed as per the "Four Times Rule" of 8.8.5.2.1.3. Therefore, since the 8.8.5.2.1.3 applies to all extended coverage upright and pendent sprinklers, shadow areas are already allowed for all occupancies protected with that type of sprinkler, so they cannot be limited to just L.H. and O.H. occupancies with Q/R sprinklers.

13-215 8.9.5.4 (New) (Log # 362)

Negative

Keeping, L. I believe that this matter needs to be reconsidered. The TC decided to limit the application of shadow areas to just light and ordinary hazard occupancies with quick response sprinklers. However, as per the proponents substantiation and as per the Task Group's explanation, shadow areas are created by obstructions to sprinklers that are correctly installed as per the "Four Times Rule" of 8.9.5.2.1.3. Therefore, since the 8.9.5.2.1.3 applies to all extended coverage sidewall sprinklers, shadow areas are already allowed for all occupancies protected with that type of sprinkler, so they cannot be limited to just L.H. and O.H. occupancies with Q/R sprinklers.

Affirmative with Comment

McPhee, R. It is not clear from the Committee Action whether the new Figures are to be added as well.

13-219 8.10.4.4 (New) (Log # 455)

Affirmative with Comment

Schwab, P. The committee should refer to which part of the deflector to measure to.

13-221 8.10.6.4 (New) (Log # 363)

Negative

Bahadori, H. No technical substantiation has been submitted.

13-223 8.10.7.4 (New) (Log # 364)

Negative

Bahadori, H. No technical substantiation has been submitted.

13-224 8.10.8.2(4) (Log # 56)

Negative

Miller, T. No technical justification was provided by the committee for deleting the requirement. Based upon the text in the standard for ceiling pockets with other types of sprinklers, the same limit for the volume of ceiling pockets within the compartment should apply.

13-226 8.11.4.1.2(2) (Log # 324)

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. While I am in agreement with this action, with regard to the upright K-11.2 and K-16.8 CMSA sprinklers that are available today, there are also pendent K-19.6 and K-25.2 CMSA sprinklers available now, so I think that some further consideration of this matter may still be needed.

13-227 8.11.5.2.2 (Log # 533)

Negative

Bahadori, H. No test data has been provided to demonstrate the discharge will not be affected.

Linder, K. While the change is probably OK, no data was submitted to justify the change other than "testing by FM."

13-228 8.12.2.2.3, 8.12.2.2.4, 8.12.3.1(3), and 8.12.3.1(4) (Log # 326)

Negative

Baker, Jr., W. An obstruction is an obstruction and there is no technical justification to limit the option of moving the sprinkler(s) to only those obstructions created by building structural elements. It should be left to the building owner, AHJ and the contractor to decide if moving the sprinkler or moving the obstruction is the best way to address the obstruction issue. Limiting the option of moving the sprinkler to only structural elements is unnecessarily restrictive and eliminates what may be a far easier and less costly alternative.

13-234 8.12.5.3.2.1 (Log # 537)

Negative

Miller, T. The design of automatic sprinkler systems is beyond the scope of owners, leasing agents, and some AHJ's. Sprinkler systems are now life safety systems and as the submitter noted, national engineering association have defined design as the practice of engineering. The Committee's reason for the rejection is not based on technical merit, engineering and science.

13-235 8.13 (Log # 158)

Affirmative with Comment

Bahadori, H. The responsibility should not be passed to the owners and their designated representatives who are not technically qualified.

13-236 8.15.x (New) (Log # 399)

Negative

Gerdes, R. The proponent has demonstrated the lack of fire hazard and history. The standard has an exception for electrical equipment rooms. The Committee has recommended approval of Proposal 13-251. While being practical, allowing persons to use elevators does not make the situation safer than this proposal.

Keeping, L. In light of the action taken on Proposal 13-251 (Log #371), this matter should be reconsidered. If it is feasible to omit sprinklers from elevator machine rooms that control (occupied) elevators for occupant evacuation or for fire fighter use, then it should equally be allowed to omit them from (unoccupied) elevators that are used in other premises, as long as the same restrictions are applied.

13-238 8.15.1.2 (Log # 527)

Affirmative with Comment

Gerdes, R. I support the effort of the committee's task group in Proposal 13-24. During the Comment period this should get resolved.

13-239 8.15.1.2 (Log # 530)

Negative

Gerdes, R. As with previous cycles I believe there is some merit in the proposal, as shown in the previously submitted fire test data.

McPhee, R. The Technical Committee did not provide any specific response or direction to the proponent with regard to additional testing or sprinkler arrangement that they (the proponent) might include in planned fire testing, which would provide alternative arrangements compared to earlier fire test information reviewed by the Committee. In addition, the fire test information previously reviewed indicates that some minimal sprinkler protection arrangement in such a space would offer sufficient fire protection.

13-240 8.15.1.2.7 (Log # 159)

Negative

Gerdes, R. There is merit in the proposal, regardless if a roof/ceiling assembly or another location.

Keeping, L. I believe that this matter should be reconsidered. As I understand it, if a space that is filled with insulation, be it between floors or between a ceiling and a roof, or wherever it is within a building, has a minimum 2 inch air gap at the upper surface, a fire would not be able to sustain itself. Therefore, the current requirement to fill a space completely with insulation is not completely necessary and a 2 inch gap, comparable to the one in 8.15.1.2.17, should be allowed in 8.15.1.2.7.

13-245 8.15.1.6 (Log # 568)

Negative

Keeping, L. I believe that the committee should reconsider and reject this proposal. As per A.3.7.2, bar joist construction is a just form of unobstructed construction and with or without combustible upper surfaces, concealed spaces with bar joist have been successfully protected with standard spray sprinklers since the type was first developed. No reports of failures of SSP or SSU sprinklers under bar joist spaces has been reported and no real substantiation for the switch to "concealed space sprinklers" has been offered, There is no justification for NFPA 13 to require this special type of sprinkler in any type of ceiling spaces other than those for which those special sprinklers were expressly designed and tested to protect.

McPhee, R. There was no technical information provided with this proposal that would indicate that standard spray sprinklers installed in such spaces with bar joist construction would not provide acceptable protection.

13-249 8.15.3.3 (Log # 331)

Negative

Gerdes, R. The additional sprinkler protection is not necessary. The stair enclosure will be required to have the same rating the fire barrier with the same opening protection. We do not require additional sprinklers at every door in a fire barrier. While the change clarifies the issue my argument is essentially to delete the section entirely.

13-251 8.15.5.3 (Log # 371)

Negative

Dornbos, D. The proposal should be rejected. Such spaces are likely to accumulate stored materials over time. The standard should not mandate elimination of sprinklers from such spaces.

Ketner, C. Buildings tend to use any available space for storage, the elevator machine room is no exception. We should not be removing sprinklers from these spaces.

Miller, T. While the proposal has merit for traction elevators, it should not apply to rooms with hydraulic elevators where hazardous volumes of combustible fluids are present.

Victor, T. I disagree with the concept of deleting sprinkler protection in elevator machine rooms and elevator machine spaces. Although the submitter states that four conditions need to be met to do so, the ability to enforce the fourth one is next to impossible. These rooms and spaces are typically used by the building occupants for storage of combustible materials and therefore should have sprinkler protection.

13-253 8.15.5.6 (Log # 378)

Negative

Keeping, L. I believe that the committee should reconsider and accept this proposal. The proponent is correct, during the last cycle the requirement was added, based on only the shakiest of substantiations, with no data presented to quantify this amount of combustible loading, so the requirement should never have been added in the first place.

Affirmative with Comment

Miller, T. The hazard is from the combustibles and fire on the stage. Therefore, the deluge sprinklers should be on the stage side and not the auditorium side. This will apply water to the side of the curtain that is receiving the heat load.

13-254 8.15.5.6 (Log # 401)

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. See my comments concerning Proposal 13-253 (Log #378).

13-257 8.15.8.1.1, 8.15.8.1.2, and 8.15.8.1.3 (Log # 57)

Negative

Gerdes, R. Acceptance of this proposal will set up conflict within NFPA standards. Committee rules establish that occupancy standards overrule installation standards. This exception has been in NFPA 101 - Life Safety Code for years without negative affect. The NFPA membership spoke last cycle to retain the existing allowance.

Keeping, L. I believe that the committee should reconsider and reject this proposal. Prior to the 1991 edition of NFPA 13, sprinklers were only allowed to be omitted from the washrooms in hotels, but for that edition, the allowance was opened up to all dwelling units as long as they were no larger than 55 sq. ft. and enclosed within a 15 minute thermal barrier. At that time adequate technical substantiation was offered to validate the change. Since that time, no adverse fire losses have been brought to the Committee's attention that would support this backward step. Further the conditions inside the 55 sq.ft. bathrooms of today are no different from those that were found in 1991, so the current submitter's substantiation is not correct. Also, as the proponent himself noted, a very similar proposal was overturned on the floor by the during the last cycle, and the wishes of the membership should be respected now, since no new data has been presented.

Miller, T. While the submitter is correct about some small bathrooms having dangerous amounts of combustible material, bathrooms of other than hotels and motels should also be considered. Most health care facilities typically do not contain hazardous amounts of combustible material. These would now require sprinklers.

13-258 8.15.8.4 (New) (Log # 35)

Negative

Brown, P. In light of the recent TIA limiting antifreeze solutions based upon life safety concerns, it seems more important now to provide guidance for freeze protection options which, as noted in the submitters substantiation, is already provided in NFPA 13R and 13D. I agree this is already permitted, the standard needs to provide guidance on "how to" so it will be useful and acceptable to AHJ's.

Caputo, R. In light of the recent TIA limiting antifreeze solutions based upon life safety concerns, it seems more important now to provide guidance for freeze protection options which, as noted in the submitters substantiation, is already provided in NFPA 13R and 13D. I agree this is already permitted, the standard needs to provide guidance on "how to" so it will be useful and acceptable to AHJ's.

Affirmative with Comment

Meehan, M. In light of the recent TIA limiting antifreeze solutions based upon life safety concerns, it seems more important now to provide guidance for freeze protection options which, as noted in the submitters substantiation, is already provided in NFPA 13R and 13D. I agree this is already permitted, the standard needs to provide guidance on "how to" so it will be useful and acceptable to AHJ's.

13-275 8.16.1.1.1.6 (New) (Log # 87)

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. While I agree with this action, I would offer an editorial comment that, rather than the term "heat trace", the proper phrase should be "heat tracing".

13-276 8.16.1.1.2 (New) (Log # 529)

Negative

Gerdes, R. There should be a provision that a owner / tenant should be able to shut off the water to avoid further damage.

13-279 8.16.1.5.1 and 8.16.1.5.2 (Log # 60)

Negative

Joyce, II, E. I disagree with the committee action on this as these sections are part of a group that is covering valves which includes valve pits and P.I.V's which can relate to undergrounds. Also sectional valves can be in the above ground mains.

13-280 8.16.1.5.3, 8.16.1.5.4, and A.8.16.1.5.3 (New) (Log # 197)

Negative

Brown, P. This proposal which provides an opportunity to require control valves for non-high-rise multi-story buildings, where we currently accept taking as much as 156,000 ft² of area out of service just to perform a tenant improvement or replace a single sprinkler in a three story building. This proposal should be accepted.

Caputo, R. I believe there is a typo in the committee statement with regard to sending this proposal to NFPA 24 (should read NFPA 14). However, in light of the committee's continued support of limiting system sizes to 52,000 ft² (and 40,000 ft²) it seems incongruent that we reject a proposal which provides an opportunity to require control valves for non-high-rise multi-story buildings, where we currently accept taking as much as 156,000 ft² of area out of service just to perform a tenant improvement or replace a single sprinkler in a three story building. This proposal should be accepted and added to both NFPA 13 and NFPA 14.

Dornbos, D. I agree with submitters' proposal and substantiation.

Joyce, II, E. To start with what the submitter is discussing has nothing to do with underground piping and is not related to NFPA 24. He is talking about above ground piping systems not underground or private mains. Additionally it appears he is addressing issues of a non-standpipe offshoot of 8.17.5.2.

Linder, K. This proposal should be accepted as any modifications/maintenance in these buildings results in a larger impairment than needed.

Victor, T. I agree with the submitters proposal and substantiation. These devices are necessary to isolate and alarm or annunciate individual floors in a multi-story building. Water conservation, and in some areas drainage control, is becoming a big problem. Subdividing buildings by floor as proposed will conserve water and provide better fire protection in the buildings when performing maintenance and repairs.

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. While I agree with the Committee Action, there is a typographical error in the Committee Statement. Since the subject matter for this proposal is floor control valves, the reference to sending the matter to NFPA 24 is inappropriate.

13-281 8.16.1.6.3 (Log # 394)

Affirmative with Comment

Victor, T. While I agree with the committee action, I don't agree with the change from 50% to 10%. Most authorities having jurisdiction are allowing 20% or more rack area on a sectional control valve.

13-282 8.16.2.4.3 (Log # 212)

Negative

Brown, P. The committee statement indicates that they did not follow where the check valve was to be used. It is to be used with the Floor Control valve.

13-284 8.16.2.5.3.8 (Log # 391)

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. While I agree with the Committee Action to reject the proposal, I disagree with the Committee Statement that a reworded sign might be more acceptable. This matter should be left with NFPA 25 due to differences in dry pipe system operations. Some systems with quick opening devices are very sensitive to minor air pressure changes and if directions similar to those suggested in this proposal were to be followed, the systems could inadvertently trip.

13-288 8.16.4.1.1 (Log # 536)

Negative

Keeping, L. I believe that the committee should reconsider and accept this proposal, the same as was done for Proposal 13-148, (Log #534). If a 25% by volume solution is okay for ESFR (ie suppression type) systems, it should be equally acceptable for other (control mode) types of system.

13-290 8.16.4.1.3 (Log # 90)

Negative

Keeping, L. I believe that the committee should reconsider and accept this proposal. Areas such as cold rooms and unheated passageways often need to be sprinklered, so adding "branch lines" to the 8.16.4.1.3 is an entirely appropriate suggestion.

13-291 8.16.4.1.6 (New) (Log # 62)

Negative

Baker, Jr., W. It is unclear to this submitter what data is needed to substantiate the proposal. Is the committee asking whether a 25% solution of propylene glycol will actually freeze at temperatures above freezing?

Dornbos, D. The proposal erodes the safety margin provided by the standard where it presently calls for the use of technical methods to prevent water filled pipe from exposure to temperatures where freezing can occur.

13-293 8.16.4.2.5 (Log # 38)

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. While I agree with the Committee Action, I must point out that the referenced supporting material was not distributed to all of the members of the TC. This omission needs to be rectified prior to the Comment Closing date.

13-297 8.17.2.2 (Log # 207)

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. While I agree with the Committee Action to reject the proposal, I disagree with the Committee Statement that the FDP is meant to supplement both the flow and the pressure. That statement is contrary to the information provided in Proposal 13-46, (Log #215), which clarifies that FDC's are intended to supplement the water supply and not necessarily the water pressure.

13-298 8.17.2.5.1 (Log # 99)

Negative

Keeping, L. I believe that the committee should reconsider and accept this proposal. Just as NFPA 13 requires control valves, system valves, gauges, alarm apparatus, drain valves and test valves to be accessible, it should also require major system components, such as check valves, to be similarly accessible. This is not a matter that should have to be determined to the AHJ.

13-503 Figure 24.1 (Log # 357)

Negative

Dornbos, D. The proponent provided an attachment providing information to be added to figure 24.1.

Lake, J. The committee statement is incorrect. There is an attachment provided showing the line as it would appear in the figure.

13-506 24.2.1.6 and A.24.2.1.6 (Log # 165)

Negative

Brown, P. Action should be Accept in Part and move example to annex as per Manual of Style. TC should consider adding the rejection substantiation text to annex.

Caputo, R. Action should be Accept in Part and move example to annex as per Manual of Style. TC should consider adding the rejection substantiation text to annex.

13-507 24.2.1.11 (Log # 303)

Negative

Victor, T. I disagree that plugs should be allowed for any type of sprinkler in a system when performing a hydrostatic test. Using plugs for pendent sprinklers is necessary in many cases because of the use of antifreeze that needs to be drained when testing in the winter time, and to prevent damage to sprinklers being installed in areas with drywall ceilings, as well as in some other situations. Visually observing that the plugs have been removed and the pendent sprinklers have been installed is easy to do. However, I can't think of a situation when it would be necessary to test against plugs instead of upright sprinklers. To verify that the plugs have been removed and replaced with upright sprinklers may be difficult without lifts and ladders, and the potential exists that some plugs would be missed.

13-508 24.2.1.11 (Log # 501)

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. While I agree with this action, I would offer an editorial comment that, in the last sentence instead of "without performing an addition hydrostatic test" the wording should say "and an additional hydrostatic test shall not be required".

13-517 24.6.1.3 (Log # 431)

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. I agree with this action, but I also believe that Figure A.24.6 also needs to be revised, so as to reflect this new requirement for the illustration of a General Information Sign.

13-520 A.3.3.18 (Log # 166)

Negative

Keeping, L. I believe that the committee should reconsider and reject this proposal. The proponents substantiation and the Committee Statement are both contrary to the substantiation and the Acceptance for Proposal 13-521, (Log #440). We cannot have it both ways, and since the definition of a sprinkler system does indeed describe the configuration of a floor control valve station, then Proposal 13-521(Log #440) must take precedence over this Proposal 13-520 (Log #166).

13-521 A.3.3.18 (Log # 440)

Negative

Miller, T. There is no reason to classify each floor of a multi-story building as a separate sprinkler system. The standard has historically allowed one riser control valve for a multi-story building. This definition will impose considerable expense for the life of the sprinkler system without supporting data for such expense.

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. See my comments for Proposal 13-520, (Log #166).

13-522 A.3.7.1(6) (Log # 265)

Negative

Brown, P. The substantiation statement assumes sprinklers are only installed in new construction projects. Without adding this language, the standard provides no guidance when joists are deeper than 14 in.

Caputo, R. The substantiation statement assumes sprinklers are only installed in new construction projects. Without adding this language, the standard provides no guidance when joists are deeper than 14".

Keeping, L. This matter should not be shown as a Rejection. According to my notes, the Committee voted to Accept this proposal.

McPhee, R. Solid wood joists manufactured using structural composite lumber can be more than 14" in depth. This proposal should be accepted.

13-524 A.3.7.2(3)(a) (Log # 168)

Negative

Brown, P. Pan-type reinforced concrete is flat on top but the bottom has deep cavities typically created by pans which leave voids - also called waffle slab construction.

Caputo, R. Pan-type reinforced concrete is flat on top but the bottom has deep cavities typically created by pans which leave voids - also called waffle slab construction.

13-532 A.6.2.7.1 (New) (Log # 383)

Negative

Keeping, L. I believe that the committee should reconsider and accept this proposal. Concealed and recessed sprinklers rely on the flow of hot gases through their escutcheons and past their fusible elements and up into the ceiling spaces, to enable them to operate properly. If the holes in the ceilings that they are mounted in are too large, those hot gases could vent up into the ceiling spaces beside the sprinkler assemblies instead of up through them, and thereby retard sprinkler activations. Contrary to the Committee Statement, this is not obvious to everyone, hence the tendency for some parties to want to caulk around the cover plates to hide the vent/gaps, which keep the plate from fitting tight to the ceilings.

13-535 A.8.4.5.1 (Log # 340)

Negative

Dornbos, D. The proposal should be accepted. The proposal effectively clears up confusion concerning the issue.

13-544 A.8.15.1.2.18 (New) (Log # 75)

Negative

Victor, T. This new annex text will cause confusion when applying this section. By showing a sprinkler in the small awning in the figure provided, the user will get the impression that one is required, when it may not be. It is also confusing when considering sprinkler protection for the eave of an attic. If the eave is large enough with sufficient inside clearances it may require sprinklers.

13-597 Figure A.24.6 (Log # 557)

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. While I certainly agree with this action, I would offer an editorial comment that the question marks (?) adjacent to the "Yes" and the "No" are intended to be check boxes instead.

13-599 D.2 (Log # 382)

Negative

Gerdes, R. The proponent makes a sound reason to have the material on atrium glass protection in the body of the standard.

13-605 Chapter X (New) (Log # 16)

Affirmative with Comment

Gerdes, R. The proposal attempts to require sprinklers for saunas whether the building is sprinklered or not. NFPA 13 deals with fully sprinklered buildings. This proposal is more suited for a building code that addresses special hazards.