



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: Elena Carroll, Administrator, Technical Projects
DATE: November 9, 2011
SUBJECT: NFPA 13 ROC TC **FINAL** Ballot Results (A2012)

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

- 25 Members Eligible to Vote**
- 2 Not Returned** (Hogan and McNamara)
- 12 Affirmative on All**
- 9 Negatives** (Baker, Bauroth, Bellamy, Deegan, Denhardt, Hopkins, Huggins, LaFleur, and Pehrson) (on one or more comments as noted in the attached report)
- 2 Abstentions** (Javeri and Keeping) (on one or more comments 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 comment to pass is **14**.
(25 eligible to vote - 2 not returned - 2 abstentions = $21 \times 0.66 = 13.86$)
- (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 eligible \div 2 = 12.5 = **(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 with the exception of: 13-274, Log #128.

Document # 13

13-41 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**3.9.3.8 Solid Shelving** (Log # 364)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.**

13-42 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**3.9.3.8 Solid Shelving, 16.1.6.1, and 16.1.6.2** (Log # 136)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.**

13-48 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**5.6.4.4** (Log # 322)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.**

Affirmative with Comment**Bellamy, T.** The next to last sentence in the original comment was not included in the final Committee action and should be reinstated. The Committee action to Accept in Principle only included a change to the last sentence.

13-111 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 22 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**8.4.6.1.2.1 (New)** (Log # 115)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.**

Negative**Baker, Jr., W.** I agree that the definition of an open-top container is provided in Sections 3.9.1.19 and A3.9.1.19, however the proposed language, which I think everyone agrees with, is not enforceable and therefore does not address the guidelines provided in this proposal.

Affirmative with Comment**Bauroth, C.** The committee statement is not a reason to reject this comment and doesn't make sense. While putting a statement as the comment desires is not appropriate for either 8.4.6.1.2 or as part of the definition, it would be appropriate as part of the ESFR protection requirements as stated in 16.2.3.2; 16.2.3.2; 17.2.3.1.1 and 17.3.3.1.1 where open top containers under ESFR protection is addressed.**Denhardt, J.** The Committee Statement does not address why this comment was rejected and it does not make sense.**Huggins, R.** The Committee Statement does not address why this comment was rejected.

13-250 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**11.1.7 and A.11.1.7** (Log # 125)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.**

Document # 13

McNamara, T.

Affirmative with Comment

Baker, Jr., W. I agree with the concept but I think it is too limiting. This proposal mandates shutdown of the fans upon sprinkler waterflow, but doesn't allow for potential better detection options that could be in place at a facility. In addition, this requires shutdown of the fans regardless of any sprinkler arrangement; hence if a facility had in-rack sprinklers within their storage racks that left only 5 ft of storage above the top level of in-racks or had a Scheme A type of protection arrangement where the ceiling sprinklers are not expected to operate, this guideline mandates that the fans be shutdown for these types of arrangements. To me this is unwarranted and thus the proposed guideline should be further expanded to account for (1) other means of acceptable detection and shutdown when needed, and (2) have this apply only to ceiling-only sprinkler systems.

Koffel, W. The word "immediately" is problematic and should be deleted. In the Substantiation for 13-263 the proponent justifies deleting the reference to 90 seconds that was contained in the ROP language. While a reference to 90 seconds is potentially a problem, so is immediately. Does the use of the word "immediately" override the processing time included in NFPA 72?

13-251 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

11.2.3.1.1 (Log # 5)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-252 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

11.2.3.1.1 (Log # CC20)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-253 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

11.2.3.1.2 (Log # 269)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-254 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

11.2.3.1.4(3) (Log # 263)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-255 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

11.2.3.1.4(3) (Log # 323)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

Document # 13

McNamara, T.

13-256 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 22 Negative: 0 Abstain: 1 Not Returned: 2

11.2.3.1.4(4)(k) (Log # 324)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

Abstain

Keeping, L. I chose to abstain on this matter, because I do not properly understand the issues. My original understanding of the limited combustible insulation was that it would stay in place during a fire and would not propagate the fire to the point of flashover, due to limited flame spread ratings, etc. I thought that that was why the omission of sprinklers in concealed spaces with this type of construction was accepted in the 2010 edition of the standard. Now however, the Technical Committee seems to have accepted the idea that these materials could fall down from the affects of a fire, as described in the proponents substantiation. This leaves me unsure as to how to proceed.

Affirmative with Comment

Denhardt, J. The Committee Statement is not applicable for an action to Accept.

Huggins, R. The Committee Statement is not applicable for an action to Accept and should be deleted.

13-257 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

11.2.3.4.4 and 22.4.4.1.3 (Log # 276)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

Affirmative with Comment

Baker, Jr., W. I have noted Affirmative only because the Committee currently has no test data to work with. However, it would be appropriate for the Committee to provide some guidance to the NFPA 13 user as to how to design a sprinkler system that is to be installed under an open grid type ceiling. The issue raised in the submitter's Substantiation has not been addressed.

Bellamy, T. The intention of the Committee to direct the proper application of the design criteria for sprinklers beneath grated mezzanines and solid floors is contained in the Committee substantiation; however, this is not included anywhere within NFPA 13 and should have been incorporated as a Committee Comment.

Denhardt, J. I agree with the committee's action but concur that guidance is needed on how to design for open metal grading when they are acting as ceiling/floor assemblies such as in a mezzanines.

Huggins, R. I agree with the action but concur that guidance is needed on how to design for open metal grading when they are ceiling/floor assemblies such as mezzanines.

13-258 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

11.3.1.2.1 (Log # 325)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

Document # 13

13-259 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**12.1.3.4.1** (Log # 120)**Not Returned****Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.****Affirmative with Comment**

Baker, Jr., W. I think the Committee Statement meant to say that it was already addressed in Section 12.1.3.4.1.1, which I disagree with. The current wording references a measure of depth and does not take into consideration width of either the lower or upper channels of the roof decking. If my channel depth is greater than 3 in. then 12.1.3.4.1.1 mandates that I measure to the upper portion of the channel, even if the width of the channel were to be 1 in. and the lower width of the channel were 6 in., which would be inappropriate in my opinion. The guidelines for where to measure to should take into consideration both depth and width rather than just one or the other. This should apply to ceiling height measurements in 12.1.3.1 as well.

13-260 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 22 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**12.1.3.4.3 (New)** (Log # 127)**Not Returned****Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.****Negative**

Keeping, L. I believe that this matter should have been accepted as submitted. The Committee Action to Accept in Principle with reference to Log #37 (Comment 13-261) is not adequate. This matter was raised in response to Proposal 13-395 on clearances above wood pallets, whereas Log #37 was in response to Proposal 13-284 and does not address the wood pallet question.

Affirmative with Comment

Bell, K. The committee statement should reference action on Log 13-261 rather than Log 13-37.

Denhardt, J. I agree with Mr. Bell. The committee's statement should reference 13-261 (Log #37).

Huggins, R. I agree with Mr. Bell. The committee statement should reference 13-261 (Log #37) verses log 13-37.

13-261 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**12.1.3.4.4, 12.1.3.4.5, and 12.1.3.4.6** (Log # 37)**Not Returned****Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.**

13-262 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**12.1.4** (Log # 358)**Not Returned****Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.**

13-263 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**12.1.4(4)** (Log # 126)

Document # 13

Not Returned**Hogan, A.**

McNamara, T.

Affirmative with Comment**Baker, Jr., W.** See my comments from 13-250.

Keeping, L. While I vote to accept this comment, I still believe that the wording should have been revised somewhat, because this text seems to imply that, if HVLS fans are present in a sprinklered building, then a fire alarm system is also required. However NFPA 13 does not have any jurisdiction over when fire alarm systems are required.

Koffel, W. The proponent justifies deleting the reference to 90 seconds contained in the ROP language. While a reference to 90 seconds is potentially a problem, so is immediately. Does the use of the word "immediately" override the processing time included in NFPA 72?

13-264 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**12.6.7** (Log # 57)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.**

McNamara, T.

Affirmative with Comment

Baker, Jr., W. I have heartache with this one as I hate to see a better sprinkler replaced with one that would be considered less effective. I think the submitter was on the right track with this one, but the submittal needs to be able to address the potential concerns that an EH occupancy hazard may have in the presence of quick-response (QR) sprinklers. If the wording of a future proposal can be further clarified to identify those EH occupancies that are compatible with QR sprinklers and aim the guidelines of this proposal to them, then I think the Committee would be able to accept such a proposal.

13-265 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**12.6.7** (Log # 91)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.**

McNamara, T.

13-266 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**12.6.7.1 and 12.6.7.2 (New)** (Log # 147)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.**

McNamara, T.

13-267 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**Table 12.8.6** (Log # 100)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.**

McNamara, T.

Affirmative with Comment

Document # 13

Baker, Jr., W. I agree with the proposal as it current is written since the maximum linear spacing is 12 ft. However, if by chance the maximum linear spacing were to change to 14 ft, then the current wording would need to be modified to indicate a maximum linear spacing of 12 ft, unless testing at the 14 linear spacing demonstrates that the sprinkler warrants a 250 gpm and 1 hour duration (in other words I believe that linear spacing is the more important factor than area spacing).

13-268 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

Table 12.8.6 (Log # 357)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-269 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

12.12.1.2 and 12.12.2 (Log # 264)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-270 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 20 Negative: 2 Abstain: 1 Not Returned: 2

Table 12.12.1.2(c), 12.12.2.1, 14.4.1, 15.4.1, 16.2.3.1, 17.2.3.1, 17.3.3.1, 18.4(d), 19.1.2.3 (Log # 122)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

Negative

Baker, Jr., W. I believe the Committee has removed too many protection options based on the results of two tests. For both tests the commodity hazard was cartoned unexpanded plastics in open-frame racks to 20 ft high under a 40 ft high ceiling. The two test results opened up in excessive of 12 sprinklers at both 75 psi as well as 90 psi. So for this specific commodity hazard, storage ceiling height arrangement, the Committee has removed 40 ft high ceiling options for the K14.0 sprinkler for Class 1 through 4 that are either in an on-floor or open-frame rack arrangement; I do not see the substantiation for that. The Committee has removed 40 ft high ceiling options for cartoned plastics maintained in an on-floor arrangement; I do not see the substantiation for that. They have also removed 40 ft high ceiling options for the K14.0 sprinkler for wood pallets from Table 12.12.1.2(c), plastic pallets from Table 12.12.2.1, rubber tires from Table 18.4(d) and roll paper from Table 19.1.2.3 without any apparent substantiation. Lastly, the 40 ft ceiling designs that the K14.0 were initially based on from test data was included in Table 17.3.3.1, yet those protection options which were proven via full-scale fire tests have now been removed, again without any apparent substantiation. It appears that the main issue for the unacceptable test results is excessive clearance, therefore I still think that the Committee should allow for the higher storage heights, but for rack storage heights of 20 ft or less, a condition that I would think would be very rare, the ceiling design of 12 AS @ 75 psi needs to be supplemented as outlined in proposed Section 12.1.3.4.6.

Javeri, S. The committee statement is incorrect. The data presented supports the elimination of a 20 ft clearance to the sprinkler and not the elimination of a 40 ft building height.

Abstain

Keeping, L. I must abstain on this matter. I have not seen the test data that was part of the submission. Apparently it was available to the Storage Task Group, but not to the entire Committee.

13-271 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

12.12.1.4 (Log # 131)

Not Returned

Document # 13

Hogan, A.**McNamara, T.**

13-272 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**12.12.1.4** (Log # 265)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.**

13-273 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**12.12.3.3** (Log # 212)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.**

13-274 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 12 Negative: 11 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**Table 13.2.1** (Log # 128)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.****Negative**

Baker, Jr., W. According to my notes the Substantiation is wrong in that this issue had nothing to do with the inability of the user to use one 1 level of IRAS with OH2, but rather the argument was made that the user may not see that the guidelines for rack storage were actually two lines above the current one and therefore are redundant.

Bauroth, C. If you review Table 13.2.1 for Cartoned Group A Plastic Storage, the two lines in question are exactly the same except that the line to be eliminated is for rack storage only. The line that would remain is for palletized, bin box, shelf AND rack storage. Eliminating the line as done in the ROP would not remove any options for the user.

Bell, K. In regard to 13-274, I change my vote to negative since this is redundant text and is not needed.

Bellamy, T. The original action of the Committee on the Proposal was correct. The information is redundant. Elimination of the redundant information does not eliminate any currently available option.

Deegan, T. Table 13.2.1 in the 2010 Edition is not clear. Under Group A Plastic Storage Line five refers to "Palletized, bin box, shelf and rack and back-to-back shelf storage" and references that a level of in-racks is required. Except for a rack storage scenario, this is obviously not possible as written. By eliminating the line, as written, nothing is lost. Line seven maintains the option for OH2 in racks with 1 level of in rack sprinklers. The Committee's action at the ROP was correct.

The 1999 Edition did not include this option for palletized, bin box or shelf storage of Group A Plastics. The Committee's intent when this Table was modified in the 2002 Edition should be researched and the Table should be amended, if necessary, during the next cycle.

Denhardt, J. This material is redundant. The report on proposal action should stand.

Hopkins, Jr., D. The last row of the table for cartoned materials is redundant. Removal of the row does not eliminate any protection options.

Huggins, R. This is redundant material and serves no purpose.

Document # 13

Javeri, S. The comment is incorrect and the original proposal is correct. In Table 13.2.1, the 5th line should be eliminated as it is already in the 1st portion of the 6th line.

Keeping, L. I vote negative on this matter, because I believe that the 5th row of Table is redundant, because that same information is shown in the last row.

LaFleur, A. Table 13.2.1 for Cartoned Group A Plastic Storage - In line with C. Bauroth's comment, the line that is redundant and should be deleted is the last row in that section pertaining to Racks only. The line that would remain is for palletized, bin box, shelf AND rack storage - two rows up.

13-275 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

Figure 13.2.1, 14.2.4.1, 14.2.4.2, 16.2.1.3.2(a) through (g) (Log # 105)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-276 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

13.2.3 (New) (Log # 281)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-277 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

Table 13.3.3.4.2 (Log # 93)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-278 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

Table 13.3.3.4.2 (Log # 129)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-279 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

13.3.3.4.3 (Log # 361)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

Document # 13

13-280 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**14.2.4.6** (Log # 38)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.**

13-281 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**14.2.4.6** (Log # 138)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.**

13-282 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 21 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**15.2.2.1, 17.2.1.2.1, and 17.3.1.1** (Log # 39)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.**

Negative**Denhardt, J.** There is no guidance in chapter 15 or chapter 17 that defines the allowed temperature rating classification and the Committee Statement does not indicate the intent of the technical committee regarding this issue. Suggest modifying the Committee Statement to "The temperature limit being proposed is too restrictive since either an Ordinary or High temperature rating classification can be used."**Huggins, R.** There is no guidance in chap 15 or 17 that defines the allowed temperature rating and the Committee Statement does not indicate the intent of the technical committee regarding this issue.**Affirmative with Comment****Bellamy, T.** A reference should have been made to the new A.17.3.1.3 that indicates that temperature is not a factor in determination of protection criteria for Group A Plastics.

13-283 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 22 Negative: 0 Abstain: 1 Not Returned: 2**16.1.6.5** (Log # 139)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.**

Abstain**Keeping, L.** I vote to Accept this matter, but I believe the text needs an editorial correction to delete the duplicate wording. The text should read in part "... the water demand for in-rack sprinklers shall be based ..." and the extra words "for the in-rack sprinklers" need to be eliminated.

13-284 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**16.1.6.5, 16.1.8.1, and 17.1.7.1** (Log # 59)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.**

Document # 13

McNamara, T.

13-285 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

16.1.6.5 and 16.1.6.6 (Log # 359)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-286 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

16.1.6.5 and 16.1.6.6 (New) (Log # 356)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-287 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

16.1.6.6 (Log # 360)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-288 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

16.2 (Log # 143)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-289 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

16.2.3.2 (Log # 94)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-290 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

Table 16.2.4.2.1 (Log # 355)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-291 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 22 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

16.2.4.2.7 (Log # 40)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

Negative

Huggins, R. The action should have been HOLD since this is new material as identified in the Committee Statement.

Affirmative with Comment

Keeping, L. While I felt that it was necessary to reject this comment, because it is new material that was not referenced in the ROP, I disagree with the 2nd part of the Committee Statement that the section is needed, to provide additional clarity. I believe that the proponent is correct and that 16.2.4.2.7 is in conflict with 16.2.4.2.3.

13-292 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

16.3 (Log # 144)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-293 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

17.1.5.5 (Log # CC21)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-294 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 22 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

17.2.1.2.1 and 17.3.1.1 (Log # 279)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

Negative

Bellamy, T. The Comment substantiation speaks for itself.

13-295 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

Figure 17.2.1.2.1(c) and (d) (Log # 268)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

Document # 13

13-296 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 22 Negative: 0 Abstain: 1 Not Returned: 2**17.2.1.5** (Log # 116)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.****Abstain**

Javeri, S. I am abstaining from this vote. As a member of the Correlating Committee I feel the TC has gone beyond its scope in accepting a proposal without ANY scientific or engineering data. This goes against the principles of an NFPA standard. As an fire protection engineer, I too would like to see protection schemes for this commodity in the standard, but not at the cost of the reputation of the document.

13-297 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 22 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**17.2.1.5** (Log # 145)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.****Negative**

Pehrson, R. Recommend Hold: Protection criteria is being added to the standard without technical justification or test results which should be provided based on the committee's past practice for new material of this nature. This incomplete extraction of protection criteria represents figures pulled in isolation from the FM standard and fails to incorporate the other guidance or requirements found in the FM standard.

13-298 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**17.2.5.1.2** (Log # 277)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.****13-299** Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**17.2.5.1.2** (Log # 326)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.****13-300** Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**17.3.3.1.1 and 17.3.3.1.2** (Log # 95)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.**

Document # 13

13-301 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

20.8 (Log # 137)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.**

McNamara, T.

13-302 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 22 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

Chapter 21 (Log # 102)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.**

McNamara, T.

Negative

Pehrson, R. Recommend Hold: The proposed tables of protection criteria represent new material submitted at the ROC stage in violation of the Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards and past practice of this committee. It appears no testing of intermediate temperature sprinklers has been submitted as required by new Chapter 21 (other testing of large K factor CMSA sprinklers has shown an increase in the number of sprinklers opening when changing to intermediate temperature sprinklers).

Affirmative with Comment

Bell, K. Editorial: The word "cartooned" in Tables 21.2 and 21.3 should be "cartoned." Also, the format of the new Tables related to the actions taken on Logs 13-302 and 13-305 were to be consistent.

Bellamy, T. The Tables must be corrected as directed during the ROC meeting.

13-303 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

21.1 (Log # 130)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.**

McNamara, T.

13-304 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

21.1.6 (Log # CC22)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.**

McNamara, T.

13-305 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 22 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

Table 21.2.1, Table 21.3.1, and 21.5.3.2.3 (Log # 291)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.**

McNamara, T.

Negative

Document # 13

Pehrson, R. Recommend Hold: The proposed tables of protection criteria represent new material submitted at the ROC stage in violation of the Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards and past practice of this committee. It appears no testing of intermediate temperature sprinklers has been submitted as required by new Chapter 21 (other testing of large K factor CMSA sprinklers has shown an increase in the number of sprinklers opening when changing to intermediate temperature sprinklers). This protection criteria is being added to the standard without technical justification or test results which should be provided based on the committee's past practice for new material of this nature.

Affirmative with Comment

Bellamy, T. The Tables must be corrected as directed during the ROC meeting.

Keeping, L. While I vote to accept the Committee's action on this comment, I would also offer an editorial suggestion that the term "CMDA" is not currently defined in NFPA 13, so instead of using that abbreviation the full term "Control Mode Density/Area" should be used instead.

13-306 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

Table 21.4.1 (Log # 101)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

Affirmative with Comment

Baker, Jr., W. I agree with the proposal as it current is written since the maximum linear spacing is 12 ft. However, if by chance the maximum linear spacing were to change to 14 ft, then the current wording would need to be modified to indicate a maximum linear spacing of 12 ft, unless testing at the 14 linear spacing demonstrates that the sprinkler warrants a 250 gpm and 1 hour duration (in other words I believe that linear spacing is the more important factor than area spacing).

Keeping, L. While I vote to Accept this comment, I would also offer an editorial suggestion that the term "CMDA" is not defined in NFPA 13, so instead of using that abbreviation, the full term "Control Mode Density/Area" should be used instead.

13-307 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

21.4.1.2.1 (New) (Log # 278)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-308 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

21.14.2.1 and 21.14.2.3 (Log # 239)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-309 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

22.4.2.5 (Log # 312)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

Document # 13

13-310 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**22.4.3.1.1** (Log # 123)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.**

13-311 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 21 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**22.4.4.1.1.4** (Log # 12)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.**

Negative

Hopkins, Jr., D. There is no technical basis provided for the proposed approach. Further, the approach does not account for overage associated with friction loss, does not account for friction losses within branch piping and does not comply with any of the approved calculation methods within the standard.

Keeping, L. I believe that this matter should have been rejected. In my opinion, when the actual area is less than the specified design area, with no separation from adjoining areas, the correct procedure should be to conduct a "straddle" calculation, as described in the substantiation for Comment 13-312, Log #280.

13-312 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 21 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**22.4.4.1.1.4 (New)** (Log # 280)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.**

Negative

Hopkins, Jr., D. See my Explanation of Negative on Comment 13-311 (Log #12).

Keeping, L. I believe that this matter should have been rejected. In my opinion, when the actual area is less than the specified design area, with no separation from adjoining areas, the correct procedure should be to conduct a "straddle" calculation, as described in the proponent's substantiation.

13-313 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**22.4.4.2.1** (Log # 41)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.**

13-314 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2**22.4.4.5.1** (Log # 124)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.**

Document # 13

McNamara, T.

13-315 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 21 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

Table 22.4.4.7 (Log # 141)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

Negative

Bellamy, T. No technical data was submitted to support a change in the C-factor for galvanized piping. Additionally, no guidance is provided as to the impact on existing systems.

Deegan, T. Based on discussions at the ROC meeting, it is understood that there have been observations in the field of problems with some installations of galvanized pipe on dry systems. However, there was no information/data provided to support the Comment. Galvanized pipe has been used for a long time based on the current application criteria. It is unclear if the issue is with all galvanized pipe on dry systems in all situations or if there are limiting factors (manufacturer, site conditions, fabrication techniques, etc.). I believe more investigation is necessary to adequately determine if there are other factors that can be addressed that will allow galvanized piping with a 120 C-factor to be continued as an option.

13-316 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

23.1.2 (Log # 270)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-317 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

23.1.5.1(5) (Log # 302)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-318 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

23.1.5.2 (Log # 301)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-319 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

23.2 (Log # 274)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-320 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2
23.2.2.3 and A.23.2.2.2 (Log # 58)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.**

13-366 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2
A.11.1.5.3 (Log # 42)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.**

13-367 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2
A.11.2.3.1.4(3), A.11.3.1.2.1, and A.12.9.1 (Log # 60)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.**

13-368 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2
Figure A.11.3.1.1(b) (Log # 43)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.**

13-369 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 22 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2
A.12.1.3.4.1.1 (Log # 2)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.****Negative****Baker, Jr., W.** See my comments in 13-258.

13-370 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2
A.12.9.1 (Log # 92)

Not Returned**Hogan, A.****McNamara, T.**

13-371 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

A.17.1.2.1 (Log # 121)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-372 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

A.20.6 (Log # 140)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-373 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 23 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

A.20.6.1 (Log # 327)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

13-374 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 20 Negative: 3 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

A.23.1.3.2 (Log # 30)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

Negative

Denhardt, J. I agree with Mr. Keeping's comment that no justification or data was provided to support this change. Domestic demand needs to be better defined.

Huggins, R. I agree with Mr. Keeping's comment that no justification or data was provided to support this change. Additionally, this new section is in conflict with 23.1.3.2 that allows pipe smaller than 6 in. when the main is supplying ONLY sprinklers.

Keeping, L. I believe that this matter should have been accepted. Without having a procedure or a formula to follow, the matter should be left in the Annex as guidance. Further, no technical justification was provided for revising the original "less than 6 in" from A.23.1.3.2 to the "less than 4 in" of Proposal 13-593.

13-375 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 22 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

A.23.1.3.2 (Log # 328)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

Negative

Document # 13

Huggins, R. In addition to the conflict this criterion creates with 23.1.3.2, the use of the term CONSIDERABLE is problematic and should be quantified in order for it to be consistently applied. If data had been submitted for this change, a value could have been identified.

Affirmative with Comment

Denhardt, J. Direction should be given on what is included and how to calculate the domestic demand. Does this include all water use both domestic and industrial?

13-376 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 20 Negative: 3 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

A.23.1.3.2 (Log # 331)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

Negative

Denhardt, J. See my Explanation of Negative on Comment 13-374 (Log #30).

Huggins, R. See 13-374 (Log #30).

Keeping, L. I believe that this matter should have been accepted. Without having a procedure or a formula to follow, the matter should be left in the Annex as guidance. Further, no technical justification was provided for revising the original "less than 6 in" from A.23.1.3.2 to the "less than 4 in" of Proposal 13-593.

13-377 Eligible To Vote:25 Affirmative: 20 Negative: 3 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 2

A.23.1.3.2 (Log # 349)

Not Returned

Hogan, A.

McNamara, T.

Negative

Denhardt, J. See my Explanation of Negative on Comment 13-374 (Log #30).

Huggins, R. See my Explanation of Negative on Comment 13-376 (Log #331).

Keeping, L. I believe that this matter should have been accepted. Without having a procedure or a formula to follow, the matter should be left in the Annex as guidance. Further, no technical justification was provided for revising the original "less than 6 in" from A.23.1.3.2 to the "less than 4 in" of Proposal 13-593.