



MEMORANDUM

TO: NFPA Technical Committee on Special Operations Protective Clothing and Equipment

FROM: Stacey Van Zandt

DATE: September 21, 2010

SUBJECT: NFPA 1951 ROP TC FINAL Ballot Results (F2011)

The Final Results of the NFPA 1951 ROP Letter Ballot are as follows:

19 Members Eligible to Vote
4 Not Returned (Byrne, Geraghty, Hess, and Reall)

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/comment to pass is 10.
(19 eligible to vote - 4 not returned - 0 abstentions = $15 \times 0.66 = 9.9$)
- (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:
[19 eligible $\div 2 = 9.5 = (10)$]

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.

1951-6 3.3.46, 6.1.3, 6.2.3, 7.1.3 (Log # CP24)

Affirmative with Comment

Allen, J. 3.3.46 Glove Body Definition should read: The part of the glove that extends from the tip of the fingers to 25 mm (1 in) beyond the wrist crease.

Davis, S. I agree with Mr. Allen's Affirmative with Comment.

1951-26 8.1, 8.1.1 (Log # CP11)

Negative

Allen, J. The manufacturer's helmet positioning index (HPI) is a reliable and repeatable means of positioning each model helmet on the test headform. However, some helmet brims have complex curves and it is unknown what part to level.

Davis, S. I agree with Mr. Allen's and Mr. Fithian's Negative comment.

Fithian, W. Comment: This should be rejected in its entirety.

The manufacturer's helmet positioning index (HPI) is a reliable and repeatable means of positioning each model helmet on the test headform. The manufacturer should be determining the HPI, not the testing facility. ASTM, ANSI, CPSC and other standards use the manufacturer's HPI for drawing the test line and positioning the helmet for testing. Many current structural fire fighting helmets do not have horizontal lines on the brim; there is a downward tilt to the rear. This may create a situation whereby the testing facility will be forced to make a subjective decision regarding positioning of the helmet, which is certainly not repeatable between testing facilities or even within each testing facility. The newer style helmets (¾ motorcycle type) may not have horizontal lines that can be used, so without an HPI it will be subjective from year to year. Using the proposed horizontal method will be design restrictive for the manufacturers. There may need to be different HPI values for the different headforms (ISO J and EN168) if the distance from the crown to the basic plane is different and the head sizes and/or shapes are different.

1951-44 8.32.4.1, (Log # CP15)

Negative

Davis, S. I agree with Mr. Fithian's Negative comment.

Fithian, W. Comments: This should be rejected in its entirety.

The use of an open pan containing an accelerant that is in an open, draft-free area of a testing facility, which is then lit to perform a test, does not seem to be a very safe way to conduct any type of performance test. A draft-free area as defined in the proposed method also indicates this test cannot be performed within or under a fume hood. This poses a significant safety hazard. Furthermore, insufficient test data is available to evaluate the proposed method and inter-laboratory testing has not been conducted to validate the reproducibility of this test method.