

# **UNWANTED FIRE ALARMS**

**April 2011**



**National Fire Protection Association, 1 Batterymarch Park, Quincy, MA 02169-7471  
[www.nfpa.org](http://www.nfpa.org)**

## **Abstract**

Unwanted fire alarms are a problem for the fire service, businesses, and the public. In 2009, fire departments went to 16 false alarms for every 10 fires, and 45 false alarms for every 10 structure fires. In 2009, almost half (45%) of false alarm responses were to unintentional activations, one-third (32%) were due to system malfunctions, 8% resulted from malicious or mischievous false alarms, and 15% were due to other false alarms. The ratio of smoke alarm activations to actual fires is even higher in surveys of the public than it is in fire department responses.

This report contains two sections. The first, by Marty Ahrens, summarizes NFPA estimates of fire department responses to false alarms some findings from other studies about causes of fire alarm activations and false alarms, and policies to address them. The second, by Ben Evarts, provides a detailed overview of fire department responses to false alarms in 2003, the most recent year the detailed data were available.

Many unwanted fire alarms could be prevented by improving procedures, training, and enforcement throughout the process. An interdisciplinary approach is needed to address the problem.

Keywords: false alarm, fire alarm, alarm verification, nuisance alarm, alarm system, smoke alarm, smoke detector, fire department

## **Acknowledgements**

The National Fire Protection Association thanks all the fire departments and state fire authorities who participate in the National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS) and the annual NFPA fire experience survey. These firefighters are the original sources of the detailed data that make this analysis possible. Their contributions allow us to estimate the size of the fire problem.

We are also grateful to the U.S. Fire Administration for its work in developing, coordinating, and maintaining NFIRS.

For more information about the National Fire Protection Association, visit [www.nfpa.org](http://www.nfpa.org) or call 617-770-3000. To learn more about the One-Stop Data Shop go to [www.nfpa.org/osds](http://www.nfpa.org/osds) or call 617-984-7443.

You can also find us on...



Copies of this analysis are available from:

National Fire Protection Association  
One-Stop Data Shop  
1 Batterymarch Park  
Quincy, MA 02169-7471  
[www.nfpa.org](http://www.nfpa.org)  
e-mail: [osds@nfpa.org](mailto:osds@nfpa.org)  
phone: 617-984-7443

NFPA No. USS90

Copyright© 2011, National Fire Protection Association, Quincy, MA

## Table of Contents

	<b>Page</b>
Contents	i
Executive Summary	ii
Unwanted Fire Alarms: A Problem for the Fire Service and the Public	1
False Alarms by Incident Type and Occupancy	17
Appendix A.	25

## Executive Summary

Unwanted fire alarms are a problem for the fire service, businesses, and the public. NFPA estimates that in 2009, U.S. fire departments responded to an estimated total of 2,177,000 false alarms. These calls include false calls to 911 as well as automatic alarms and are not limited to false calls relating to structure fires. During 2009, false alarm responses included

- 979,500, (45% of false alarms) calls due to unintentional activations,
- 698,000 (32%) due to system malfunctions,
- 183,000 (8%) malicious or mischievous false alarms and;
- 316,500 (15%) other false alarms, including bomb scares and unclassified false alarms.

In 2009, fire departments went to 16 false alarms for every 10 fires, and 45 false alarms for every 10 structure fires.

Responses due to unintentional activations have generally been increasing since 1990. System malfunctions were generally increasing from 1990 to 1999 and have been trending downward since then. Malicious or mischievous false alarms have been falling over the past 20 years.

These unnecessary responses pose a severe burden for local fire departments in terms of personnel, fuel use, equipment wear and tear, risk of injury, and in extreme cases, even death. In their analysis of firefighter fatalities in 2009, Fahy, LeBlanc, and Molis report that 29 firefighter fatalities had resulted from false calls over the past 10 years.

This report contains two sections. The first, by Marty Ahrens, summarizes NFPA estimates of fire department responses to false alarms, some findings from other studies about causes of fire alarm activations and false alarms, and possible policies to address them. The second, by Ben Evarts, provides a detailed overview of fire department responses to false alarms in 2003.

The U.S. Fire Administration's National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS) now collects data on all types of fire department responses. Due to the size of the file, 2003 was the last year that the national file included non-fire responses such as false alarms. Evarts used the 2003 NFIRS data and NFPA survey results to provide more detailed estimates about the type of unwanted alarm and the occupancies in which they occurred. Note that NFIRS does not distinguish single-station smoke alarms from smoke detectors that are part of a system. The term "smoke detectors" in NFIRS is used to capture incidents with both technologies.

In 2003, false alarms due to malfunctions and false alarms due to unintentional activations together accounted for three-quarters of all false alarm responses. Unintentional smoke detector activations caused one in five (19%) alarms from these two categories.

When malfunctions and unintentional activations were grouped by the equipment involved, smoke detection activations accounted for almost one-third (31%) of these unwanted false alarms. Fire alarms system activations led to almost the same

percentage (30%). Carbon monoxide detection, heat detection, sprinklers, and other extinguishing equipment were involved in a much smaller share of the unwanted alarms.

While residential properties accounted for the largest share of false alarms of any single occupancy group, non-residential properties accounted for more than half of false alarm responses in all categories shown except unintentional smoke detector activations. Fifty-five percent of these activations occurred in residential properties, including

- one-quarter (27%) in one- or two-family homes,
- 18% in apartments or other multi-family dwellings, and
- 10% in other residential properties.

Smoke detector activations may include 911 calls about sounding smoke alarms as well as automatic alarms.

The requirements for smoke detection in residential dwelling units are very different from those in commercial properties. The purpose of fire-warning equipment for residential occupancies is to “provide a reliable means to notify the occupants ...”, according to Section 29.2 of the 2010 edition of NFPA 72, *National Fire Alarm and Signaling Code*. Fire department notification by household fire alarm systems is not a priority of the code. Common areas of multi-family housing, hotels, dormitories and similar residential properties would be protected by commercial fire alarm systems.

The ratio of smoke alarm activations to actual fires is even higher in surveys of the public than it is in fire department responses. Dubivsky’s and Bukowski’s 1989 study of Veterans Administration hospitals found 15.8 unwanted activations for every real

alarm, or one unwanted activation for every six devices per year. Among the causes cited for false alarms in these facilities were: smoking (in groups); dust; humidity; high air velocity; defective; transient (electrical); lack of maintenance; insects; steam; construction work; housekeeping that used aerosol, solvents, etc.; cooking and baking; fumes (inside or outside); water, malicious; or a combination of factors that together increased the systems’ sensitivity.

In a 2010 Harris poll done for the NFPA, 96% of surveyed households said they had at least one smoke alarm. In roughly half (52%) of all homes with at least one smoke alarm, a smoke alarm was installed in the kitchen, despite the fact that smoke alarms should generally not be installed in kitchens because of the potential for nuisance alarms.

Forty-three percent of those with smoke alarms said that at least one had sounded in the past year. Among those with activations, cooking was cited as a factor by roughly three out of four households. Eight percent with activations said the alarm chirped to indicate a low battery.

When respondents in the same survey had to select only one answer, none mentioned a real fire as a cause of the activation. When those with activations were asked a series of yes or no questions,

- 5% agreed that that the activation alerted them to a real fire,
- 15% said the alarm sounded in response to a fire they already knew about,
- *Twenty-two percent said it warned them of something that could have become a fire.*
- 43% said it sounded after they knew food was burning.
- Almost two-thirds (63%) agreed that the activations were due to normal

conditions associated with cooking, smoking, steam or other normal household conditions.

- Twelve percent said it went off for no apparent reason.

There is a continuum of fire alarm activations and response across five scenarios. The first, malfunctioning alarms with no hazards and no obvious trigger, are probably the most annoying to all parties. The second, nuisance activations in response to predictable environmental stimuli such as cooking fumes, shower steam, and construction activities, are also disruptive. However, the pattern is understood.

The third scenario, a warning of pre-fire conditions, is often overlooked in discussions of fire detection. Smoke detectors or other fire alarms can alert occupants to a situation that is on the verge of becoming a fire but is very easily remedied. These warnings are useful. It would be inappropriate to call them false or nuisance alarms, but they would generally not be considered fires either.

Malfunctioning alarms and nuisance activations are clearly undesirable. A warning of pre-fire conditions is very useful, but a fire department response is not needed.

In the fourth scenario, the alarm sounds when a fire is very small. With an early discovery, the occupant is often able to extinguish the fire prior to fire department arrival. However, there is a risk of fire spread if the occupants cannot quickly put the fire out.

Because not all spaces in a building are in the same proximity to the detection unit and some types of fires are detected earlier by some types of sensors than others, there is no obvious way to distinguish in advance

between this type of fire and the last category of a more serious fire. In these cases, a prompt fire department response is essential.

NFPA 72 currently allows supervising stations to verify alarm signals from household fire alarm systems before notifying the fire service if such verification will not delay reporting by more than 90 seconds and the authority having jurisdiction agrees. Proposals have been made to expand this verification practice to non-residential occupancies. Such verification can reduce the costs and risks associated with unnecessary response. When the automatic alarm is signaling a real fire, a delayed response can allow the fire to grow unchecked for a longer period of time.

Peter J Finley's 2001 paper for the USFA's Executive Fire Officer Program (EFOP), *Residential Fire Alarm Systems: the Verification and Response Dilemma*, surveyed departments protecting populations of 47,000 to 67,000 and residents of his community, Vineland, New Jersey, who had experienced fire department responses to false alarms in their homes. Among the departments that responded to his survey, on average, one in five (19%) fire-related responses was made because of automatic fire alarm activations.

Among these departments,

- 9% of automatic fire alarm activations were residential fire alarm system activations.
- System malfunctions caused almost one-third (31%) of the residential fire activations.
- Only 3% were actual fires.

Most of the fire departments did not consider unintentional activations to be false alarms. Three-quarters (78%) of the

departments did not permit verification of residential fire alarms prior to responding. However, almost nine out of ten (88%) would modify the response if dispatch is informed that the alarm may be false.

One-quarter of the departments issue citations or violation notices and almost one-third (31%) use fines or penalties when necessary. Eighty percent of the departments who issue fines permit at least three false alarms in a year before issuing the fines.

Of the Vineland, New Jersey residents who had experienced fire department responses to automatic false alarms:

- 84% of the surveyed residents said they tried to stop the fire department from responding.
- Half (52%) said they would still want the fire department to check.
- Two-thirds (69%) would still want the fire department to check if they came with just one engine and no lights or sirens.
- Three-quarters (76%) did not want children who were home alone to be able to cancel the fire department response.

Dell'Orfano reported that increased inspection activity in 2008 and 2009 by the South Metro Fire Rescue Authority at

properties with the most false alarms led to a decrease in the number of false alarms.

In his March 2007 *NFPA Journal* article, "Nuisance Alarms," Glen Kitteringham described the approach used by the Brookfield Properties management group in addressing the false alarm problem in three multi-towered commercial high-rise buildings in Calgary, Alberta, Canada. Seventy percent of the 244 total fire alarms in 2002-2006 were false. These alarms could be divided into four causes: 1) user error, 2) work done without notification, 3) system malfunction, and 4) damage to the system. Increased training, improved procedures and communication, investigation in to false alarm causes, and passing false alarm fines to tenants or contractors who caused them led to a 50% drop in fire alarms from 2003-2006.

Several studies provided details on the causes of unwanted false alarms, including improper placement, testing without communication, lack of maintenance, construction, etc. Many unwanted fire alarms could be prevented by improving procedures, training, and enforcement throughout the process. Unwanted fire alarms are a problem for both the fire service and the public. An interdisciplinary approach is needed to address this problem.