



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 Correlating Committee on Fire and Emergency Services Protective Clothing and Equipment

FROM: Stacey Van Zandt

DATE: July 18, 2011

SUBJECT: NFPA 1971 ROC TCC FINAL Ballot Results (F2011)

The Final Results of the NFPA 1971 ROC TCC Letter Ballot are as follows:

20 Members Eligible to Vote
2 Not Returned (Bain and Neilson)

PART 1 (TCC Comment Log #137)

18 Affirmative
0 Negatives
0 Abstentions

PART 2 (TCC Notes)

15 Affirmative
3 Negatives (Duffy, Sanders, and Stull)
0 Abstentions

PART 3 (Release of ROC)

15 Affirmative
3 Negatives (Duffy, Sanders, and Stull)
0 Abstentions

There are two criteria necessary to pass ballot [(1) affirmative $\frac{3}{4}$ vote and (2) simple majority].

- (1) The number of affirmative votes needed for the comment to pass is 14.
(20 eligible to vote - 2 not returned - 0 abstentions = $18 \times 0.75 = 13.5$)
- (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:
[20 eligible \div 2 = 10 + 1 = (11)]

Reasons for negative votes, etc. are attached for your review. Ballots received 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 $\frac{3}{4}$ required affirmative votes to pass ballot.

Technical Correlating Committee on
Fire and Emergency Services Protective Clothing and Equipment

Ballot on the NFPA 1971 Report on Comments (F2011)

Part 1: Letter Ballot on the Technical Correlating Committee Comment (Log #137) please record me as voting:

AFFIRMATIVE NEGATIVE* ABSTAINING*

EXPLANATION OF VOTE - Please type or print your comments:

*An explanation must accompany a negative or abstaining vote.

Part 2: Letter Ballot on the Technical Correlating Committee Amendments to the ROC (TCC Notes), please record me as voting:

AFFIRMATIVE NEGATIVE* ABSTAINING*

EXPLANATION OF VOTE - Please type or print your comments:

*An explanation must accompany a negative or abstaining vote.

SEE ATTACHED

Part 3: Letter Ballot Authorizing the Release of the ROC (This is an Informational Letter Ballot only), please record me as voting:

AFFIRMATIVE NEGATIVE* ABSTAINING*

EXPLANATION OF VOTE - Please type or print your comments:

*An explanation must accompany a negative or abstaining vote.

SEE ATTACHED - SAME AS REASON AS PART 2.

If you have correlating issues on any of these parts, please describe below (include section/paragraph and the issue):

Signature

Name (Please Print)

Date

Please return the ballot as soon as possible but not later than July 7, 2011.

PLEASE RETURN TO: Stacey Van Zandt, NFPA, 1 Batterymarch Park, Quincy, MA 02169

FAX: 617-984-7056 /Email: svanzandt@nfpa.org

**TCC Ballot on NFPA 1971 Report on Comments (F2011)
Explanation of Negative Vote for Parts 2 and 3**

**Richard M. Duffy
International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF)**

The IAFF believes that the TCC's rejection for establishing an "all hazards" designation in place of "CBRN" as a reversal its previous October 2010 decision is short sighted and detrimental to the future of fire service's ability to secure Federal funding for PPE. Further, I believe this reversal will put fire fighters at risk, especially in view of reduced federal funding. The TCC should reverse the actions on Comments 1971-1 and 1971-10. The IAFF had proposed the following definition of All Hazards to be substituted for CBRN terminology:

3.3.X All Hazards. *Hazards to emergency response personnel that potentially include thermal, chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, explosive and physical which are caused by an unintentional act or omission, or are the result of deliberate, malicious actions with the intention to kill, sicken and/or disrupt society, and can include the psychological effect of an incident that has a major impact on the population not exposed to the hazard itself.*

A.3.3.X All Hazards. *The all-hazard environment that emergency response personnel must consider include a broad spectrum of threats and hazards that are caused by natural conditions or human actions. These situations include: fires (structural, transportation, and wildland), emergency medical incidents (single, multiple, or mass casualty), hazardous material incidents (spills or active releases), natural events (flooding, earthquakes, tornadoes, hurricanes, tsunamis), transportation incidents (truck, rail, waterway, pipeline), loss of vital services (electrical, water, sanitary sewer), and disruption to the information technology infrastructure. The situations may occur individually, or there may be a combination of them during an incident, creating a synergistic effect.*

The actual hazards to emergency response personnel include thermal, chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, explosive and physical. These may be caused by an unintentional act or omission, or they may be the result of deliberate, malicious actions with the intention to kill, sicken and/or disrupt society. In addition, the psychological effect of an incident may have a major impact on the population not exposed to the hazard itself.

An important feature of all hazards protection is the testing and certification of the entire ensemble for protective performance. A systems approach is employed to establish broad protection of the individual responder for the threats and hazards in the all-hazard environment.

The all-hazard environments are not limited to the large, high-profile national incidents, but can occur on a smaller scale. They include any situation in which emergency responders encounter hazards that present an imminent threat to the lives of all present and property.

Emergency response system capability must also be comprehensive, risk-based, all hazard. The onset of an emergency creates a need for time-sensitive actions to save lives and property, as well as for action to stop the event and begin stabilizing the situation. Such response actions

include fire suppression, hazardous material containment and other immediate measures necessary to stop or minimize the escalation of the event. Additional interventions will include warning and evacuating the population in the threat area, rescuing individuals and providing medical treatment and transport.

In addition, the IAFF does not support the implementation of new tests in the standard that have not been fully investigated for the precision and impact on fire fighter health and safety. As I discussed during the last TCC meeting, although I had to "attend" via conference call due to numerous plane cancelations, I was very concerned about the addition of new tests that didn't achieve a higher level of safety of the products, namely in this case boots and gloves. Tests should not be added for the evaluation of fire fighter PPE elements unless the tests have been demonstrated to provide reproducible results and the criteria have been based on properly decided field evaluations and studies. These include all the test methods that are the subject of comments 1971-60, 1971-64, 1971-65, 1971-66, 1971-67, 1971-69, 1971-70, 1971-75, 1971-108, 1971-109, 1971-136, and 1971-160.

Van Zandt, Stacey

From: Steve Sanders [SSanders@seinet.org]
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2011 3:29 PM
To: Van Zandt, Stacey
Cc: Walker, Nancy; Baio, Debbie; Trebisacci, Dave; Grant, Louise; 'Pat Gleason'
Subject: RE: TCC ROC Ballot Circulation on NFPA 1951, NFPA 1971, NFPA 1991, and NFPA 1994

Dear Stacey,

Based upon the comments submitted by Messrs. Duffy and Stull, SEI would like to change its vote to "negative" on Parts 2 & 3 for both the NFPA 1951 and NFPA 1971 TCC ROC ballots. Additionally, we would use the same substantiation for our negative votes as articulated in the comments by Messrs. Duffy and Stull.

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Stephen Sanders
Technical Director
Safety Equipment Institute

From: Van Zandt, Stacey [mailto:svanzandt@NFPA.org]
Sent: Friday, July 08, 2011 1:06 PM
To: Van Zandt, Stacey
Cc: Walker, Nancy; Baio, Debbie; Trebisacci, Dave; Grant, Louise
Subject: TCC ROC Ballot Circulation on NFPA 1951, NFPA 1971, NFPA 1991, and NFPA 1994

To TCC on Fire and Emergency Services Protective Clothing and Equipment:

Attached are the TCC ROC Ballot Circulations on NFPA 1951, NFPA 1971, NFPA 1991, and NFPA 1994. They have also been posted onto the Document Information page which you may view by going to www.nfpa.org/1951, www.nfpa.org/1971, www.nfpa.org/1991, or www.nfpa.org/1994, and clicking the "Next Edition" tab.

If you have not voted or wish to change your vote, you must do so by the close of business on July 15, 2011. If you have already voted and don't wish to change your vote, no action is required.

Thank you.

Stacey Van Zandt
Project Administrative Supervisor
phone - 617-984-7481
fax - 617-984-7056

Technical Correlating Committee on
Fire and Emergency Services Protective Clothing and Equipment

Ballot on the NFPA 1971 Report on Comments (F2011)

Part 1: Letter Ballot on the Technical Correlating Committee Comment (Log #137) please record me as voting:

AFFIRMATIVE NEGATIVE* ABSTAINING*

EXPLANATION OF VOTE - Please type or print your comments:

*An explanation must accompany a negative or abstaining vote.

Part 2: Letter Ballot on the Technical Correlating Committee Amendments to the ROC (TCC Notes), please record me as voting:

AFFIRMATIVE NEGATIVE* ABSTAINING*

EXPLANATION OF VOTE - Please type or print your comments:

*An explanation must accompany a negative or abstaining vote.

Part 3: Letter Ballot Authorizing the Release of the ROC (This is an Informational Letter Ballot only), please record me as voting:

AFFIRMATIVE NEGATIVE* ABSTAINING*

EXPLANATION OF VOTE - Please type or print your comments:

*An explanation must accompany a negative or abstaining vote.

If you have correlating issues on any of these parts, please describe below (include section/paragraph and the issue):

Signature

Jeffrey O. Stull
Name (Please Print)

7/7/2011
Date

Please return the ballot as soon as possible but not later than July 7, 2011.

PLEASE RETURN TO: Stacey Van Zandt, NFPA, 1 Batterymarch Park, Quincy, MA 02169

FAX: 617-984-7056 /Email: svanzandt@nfpa.org

Stull Vote on TCC Ballot on NFPA 1971 Report on Comments (F2011)***Part 2***

The TCC should have acted to provide language in NFPA 1971 to accommodate the transition from CBRN to "All Hazards." While the current criteria have been designed for some parts of the CBRN mission, they by no means are all inclusive. The overall industry is shifting to a vernacular of "all hazards" and it is a serious mistake for the TCC not to act now for making this change since the standard will not come up for revision for another 5 years. During this time, it is expected that Federal funds provided through the Fire Act and other sources will continue to diminish along with municipal budgets for procuring PPE. The nomenclature used in describing PPE will be important in how first responder organizations will be able to justify expenditures for PPE. PPE that can be used in a multitude of missions, as that designed for CBRN capabilities, will stand a greater chance of being funded than the narrow interpretation currently provided for CBRN. CBRN requirements are the only requirements in the project that dictate complete ensembles.

I do not agree with the criticisms that the implementation of an "all hazards" approach conveys any false sense of protection or increases the product liability of the manufacturers. The standards clearly define the levels of performance and manufacturers through user information guides are able to describe in detail the limitations of their clothing ensembles.

I am also dismayed that TCC is willing to permit the inclusion of new tests that have not been subject to interlaboratory validation by the certification organizations. Further, performance criteria have been set for these new tests, which are innocuous and thus provide no benefit to the end user but ultimately add cost to the product without a commensurate increase in safety. Even more surprising is to allow a new flame resistance test, displayed as a video to the TCC at the ROC meeting, that is not only dangerous but considerably undeveloped. For those TCC members present at the TCC, recall that there are no specifications, no calibration, and no assurance that this test will even properly work.

Part 3

The response provided above is also the basis for my vote on this part.