ANNUAL 2012
NATIONAL FIRE PROTECTION ASSOCIATION
CONFERENCE AND EXPO

NFPA ASSOCIATION TECHNICAL MEETING
CERTIFIED AMENDING MOTIONS
59A, 61, 499,20, 13R and 13

Wednesday, June 13, 2012
Mandalay Bay Convention Center
Las Vegas, Nevada

Reported by:
Christy I. Phelps,
CCR #683
Job No. 139527

Pages 1 - 174

1

DANNY McDANIEL: I have the distinct pleasure of being a member of your standards committee. I now declare that a forum exists and convene the 2012 Association Technical Meeting.

To assist me is Linda Fuller, the NFPA staff, who is serving as staff coordinator.

I'd also like to introduce Amy Cronin, secretary of the standards council and Jim Pauly, chair of the standards.

This session is being recorded by Sarnoff Court Reporters of Las Vegas, Nevada.

First let me address our safety issues. Take a minute to note the exits from this room. Now that you've noted the closest exit to you, I would like to inform you of the fire alarm system at the Mandalay Bay Convention Center, flashing strobe lights followed by a voice announcement. Do not use the elevators.

If you are a person with a disability who has not already made arrangements with NFPA for emergency evacuation, please see someone at registration just outside of this hallway.

As with any organization, we have certain rules and protocols. First, use of video and/or audio recording devices of any type is not allowed in the Association Technical Meeting.

2

I'd like to call your attention to the guide for conduct for the participants in the NFPA codes and standards process. As a participant in the process, you should be familiar with this guide.

I'd also like to call your attention to the NFPA convention rules which set the process to be followed today. Copies of both documents are contained in the NFPA standards directory which is posted on the NFPA website with copies also available in NFPA registration desk.

The certified amending motions that comprise the agenda for today's session will be taken in order as printed in the salmon colored handout entitled Annual 2011 NFPA Association Technical Meeting Certified Amending Motions.

The primary regulations governing the NFPA codes and standards development process includes processing the amending motion at the Association Technical Committee -- at the Association Technical Meetings are the regulations governing committee projects and regs. Regs are also posted in the NFPA website and published in the NFPA standards directory.

I'd like to say a few words about the actions that can be taken today in the voting procedures. At this session you are being asked to act

3

on certain motions pertaining to technical committee reports. The technical committee reports on eight of these documents, NFPA 59A, 75, 150, 275, 499, 1951, 1971 and 1991 are contained in the 2011 NFPA Fall Revision Cycle Report on proposal and reporting comments.

12 documents, NFPA 13, 13R, 20, 61, 72, 105, 1124, 1127, 1144, 1500, 1582, and 1917 can be found in the 2012 NFPA Annual Revision Cycle Report, Volume 1 and 2 and Report on Comments in the blue books.

Under convention rules, before a motion can be considered for action at the association technical meeting, the intended maker of the motion must have filed a notice of intent to make a motion, NITMAN, prior to the published deadline of April 6th.

These NITMANs were reviewed by the motions committee appointed by the standards council chair. The motions committee certified these NITMANs in accordance with the NFPA rules as certified amending motions and published with the final motion committee report on May 7, 2012.

Motions committee approved posting a revised report on May 30, 2012, due to several submitters requesting the motions committee approve the certified amending motions.

Table A of this salmon colored handout

4

identifies the certified amending motions for consideration today. Only certified amending motions, together with certain allowable followup amending motions, that is a motion that become necessary as a result o successful certified amending motions, will be allowed at this meeting.

There is a further requirement that a person must sign in to indicate they are, in fact, here to pursue their motion.

As part of these procedures, the statements for the record, that is statements containing technical committee actions for which no certified amending motions or allowable followup motion is available, are not permitted.

In accordance with 4.610 of the regs, if a quorum is challenged and found to be no longer present, 100 members, the session will be terminated without further action on the reports.

In a report on documents that have not been acted on should be forwarded directly to the council

21 without the recommendation of this meeting for action in
22 accordance with 4.8 of the regs.
23 If a quorum is lost during the consideration
24 of report, any motion to amend or return that report
25 that had been passed prior to the loss of the quorum

5

♀

1 will be processed with the council in accordance with
2 4.6 and 4.7 of the regs.
3 Any appeal based on actions by the
4 association at this meeting must be filed with the
5 standards council within 20 days of this meeting; that
6 is by July 4, 2012.
7 Any amendment accepted at this meeting that
8 fails to pass subsequent committee ballot will
9 automatically be documented as an appeal on the
10 standards council agenda in accordance with Section
11 1.6.2B of the regs. Note, however, that if an
12 automatically documented appeal is not pursued by a
13 party, the council need not consider it.
14 Votes cast at this association technical
15 meeting today and the discussions that lead up to that
16 voting are an integral and important part of the NFPA
17 consensus process.
18 The association technical meeting is the
19 forum where the membership considers changes to the
20 reports prepared by NFPA technical committee concerning
21 proposed or revised NFPA codes and standards when such
22 changes are pursued via certified amending motions.
23 Through the motions, debate and voting on
24 this at this meeting, membership makes recommendations
25 to the standards council. The standards council under

6

♀

1 the NFPA rules is the official issuer of the NFPA codes
2 and standards. The majority vote of the persons present
3 here today is for the sole purpose of making a
4 recommendation to the standards council on the
5 disposition of the report.
6 Standards council will meet on August 6
7 through 9 on 2012 to make a judgment on whether or not
8 to issue a document. Council's decision on document
9 issuance is based on the entire record before it,
10 including the discussion and vote taken at the NFPA
11 association meeting.
12 Limited review following action by the
13 standards council may also be available through a
14 petition to the board of directors. Any such petition
15 must be filed within 15 days of council action in
16 accordance with the regulation governing petition to the
17 board of directors from decisions of the standards
18 council. The deadline for notice of such petition is
19 August 24, 2012.
20 With respect to voting procedures, the regs
21 state that voting at the NFPA association meeting shall
22 be limited to the following:
23 One, those present who are voting members of
24 the association, that is those with red badges with
25 voting at the top. If you are not a voting member of

7

♀

1 record of the association registered at this meeting, I
2 ask you refrain from voting. You need not be a member
3 of an NFPA section in order to vote. You must, however,

be a voting member. Only voting members of record should be seated in the front area. Those seated in the back areas will not be counted.

Voting will be undertaken in the following manner. There will no voice votes. The votes will be taken by using electronic voting devices for regular voting members.

I want to say at the outset that I will not cast a vote. Therefore, in the event of a tie vote, the issue automatically fails.

Once a report and certified amending motion is presented, it is open for discussion and anyone in the room has the privilege of participating. The chair asks that you reference your remarks with your name and company and organization affiliation. Let me repeat that, your name and company or organization affiliation should preface your remarks even if you have been to the microphone many times since we're having the meeting transcribed for the record.

As you can see, we have red and green signs on the mikes in the room. Red signs indicate opposition to a motion on the floor and green signs indicate

8

support for a motion on the floor.

I would ask that you stand at the appropriate mike and state at the beginning of your remarks whether you are in support or opposition to the motion being stated.

Couple of things of note during the floor debate today. First, please be aware that no one participating in the floor motions and debate at this meeting is authorized to act as an agent of or speak on behalf of the NFPA. And views expressed during motions and debates, including those expressed on behalf of NFPA technical committee or other entities operating within the NFPA system, do not necessarily reflect the views of the NFPA.

Second, a note about NFPA sections. From time to time the chair or other representatives of NFPA section may rise during the debate and state the position of the NFPA section on a motion that is under consideration. NFPA sections are groups of NFPA members organized around particular subjects, such as electrical, fire service and health care sections.

Under the regulations governing NFPA sections, a section may take a position on an issue on the floor of an association technical meeting. The position of a section does not necessarily reflect views

9

of all section members; rather a section may state a position on a motion if the majority of section members attending a section meeting have approved that position and there were at least 25 votes cast at the section meeting.

The position of a section is accounted no special statute in the NFPA codes and standards development process and just as you would with any other position expressed during the debates today, you as voting members of the association may weigh and assess such positions as you deem appropriate.

Given the size of the agenda and the amount of material we have to get through, we'll start out with

14 three minutes per speaker. But it is my plan to limit
15 the time as appropriate in the event that becomes
16 necessary.
17 There will be a time limit that will appear
18 on the middle green screen to indicate you have one
19 minute remaining on your allotted time. The chair
20 reserves the right to hear any new speaker before
21 yielding the floor to anyone wishing to address the same
22 issue a second time.
23 Motions that are in order, certified
24 amending motions, are contained in the salmon colored
25 handout entitled Annual 2012 NFPA Association Technical

10

♀

1 Meeting Certified Amending Motions which are available
2 at the registration desk at the back of the room today.
3 The motions pertain to the documents
4 contained on Pages 79 through 80 of the annual meeting
5 program.
6 As previously stated, this meeting is
7 conducted in accordance with NFPA convention rules that
8 are available on the NFPA website and there are copies
9 at the NFPA registration desk.
10 Upon completion of action on all certified
11 amending motions relating to an NFPA document, the
12 presiding officer shall undertake any followup motions.
13 A followup motion is a motion that becomes necessary as
14 a result of a previous successful amending motion.
15 A motion to return the document or return a
16 portion of a document affected by a previous successful
17 amending motion is always in order as a followup motion
18 as long as it is not repetitious.
19 The presiding officer shall make a
20 determination on whether a motion is a proper followup
21 motion. The maker of the motion shall be required to
22 explain why it is a proper followup motion. A followup
23 motion shall require two seconders.
24 Before we begin today, I would like to
25 address the electronic voting devices that we will be

11

♀

1 using today. The devices will record your support or
2 lack of support of the motion on the floor. There are a
3 few rules that I need to make you aware of.
4 One, all voting members that were issued an
5 electronic voting device are responsible for the device.
6 Each device has been linked to the voting member name
7 and if the device is lost or broken, they will be held
8 responsible for placement of the device.
9 Two, at no time can you hand off your device
10 to anyone to input your vote. Anyone found with
11 multiple units will be asked to leave the association
12 technical session.
13 Three, you must return your device to the
14 NFPA staff manning the table at the back of the room as
15 you leave the association technical session at the end
16 of the day.
17 We're going to test this system and I'm
18 going to ask you for a vote on a motion and I want
19 everyone one to either one in favor of the motion accept
20 or two opposed to the motion reject.
21 I will give you ten seconds to vote. Then I
22 will give you a five second warning indicating that
23 balloting will be closing.

24 I will then announce the balloting is closed
25 and the results will be displayed on the middle screen
12
♀
1 behind me. Ready?
2 Motion on the floor is to accept Section
3 101-20. Please record your vote; one in favor of the
4 motion accept, two opposed to the, motion reject.
5 Balloting will be closed in five seconds.
6 Balloting is closed. Results will be displayed on the
7 middle screen for everyone to see. And the motion is
8 accepted.
9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How do we know if
10 what we put in actually happened? How do we know it
11 worked?
12 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: It's the way
13 the system is designed and if you think you have a
14 problem with your device, you can see a staff member in
15 the back of the room.
16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Would it be possible
17 to compare the total to the total number of voting
18 members to the total number of devices issued?
19 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: No. Because we
20 do not count abstention. It's only yes or no votes.
21 Now, we know how the devices work, let's
22 proceed.
23 Finally, I would like to stress that the
24 rules we are operating under today are designed to
25 approve the efficiency and the quality of the
13
♀
1 association technical meeting by eliminating the need to
2 present uncontested documents by giving you, the NFPA
3 membership, advance notice of the amending motions that
4 were presented and giving the presiding officer greater
5 discretion in managing debates to ensure that the issues
6 are as fully debated as possible in the available time.
7 It is my hope and expectation that together
8 we'll make this association technical meeting a success
9 and I thank you in advance for your cooperation,
10 patience, and when we're done, your comments and
11 suggestions for the future. Also, we'll be taking
12 comfort breaks as necessary.
13 At this point before we begin the documents,
14 I would like to introduce Jim Pauly, chair of the
15 standards council and Amy Cronin, who will present a
16 special achievement award and the committee service
17 award.
18 JIM PAULY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The
19 special achievement award is presented to recognize the
20 significant contribution of a committee member to a
21 single project that has enhanced the NFPA codes and
22 standards making process.
23 We have one special achievement award that I
24 will be presenting today. This award goes to Maurice
25 Pilette and I would like to ask Maurice to please join
14
♀
1 me here at the podium.
2 (Applause.)
3 AMY CRONIN: Maurice Pilette of Mechanical
4 Designs Limited in Massachusetts serves on several NFPA
5 technical committees including standardize committee
6 since 1990 and also chair from '96 to 2006, Roads and

7 Highway Fire Protection Committee since 1991, Fire
8 Inspector Road Wall Committee since 1991, Airport
9 Facilities Committee since 1993, Signaling Systems for
10 the Protection of Life and Property and the Technical
11 Committee on Notification for Fire Alarm and Signaling
12 System since 1993, Single and Multiple Station Alarms
13 and Household Systems since 2009 and Automatic Sprinkler
14 System Correlating Committee since 2006 and some of its
15 technical committees, including home water sprinklers
16 since '93, residential sprinkler system since '98 which
17 he was appointed chair in 2006.
18 And lastly, Maurice serves on the technical
19 committee on Commissioning Integrated Systems Committee
20 since 2007.
21 Maurice's dedication to the NFPA and the
22 NFPA standards development process is illustrated by his
23 contributions on a wide range of topics from sprinkler
24 systems to fire alarm systems and systems commissioning.
25 As a technical committee chair on

♀
1 commissioning and fire protection and life safety
2 systems, Maurice was a driving force behind NFPA's
3 inaugural commissioning document, NFPA 3.
4 Maurice has actively promoted commissioning
5 of fire protection systems to increase the reliability
6 of all types of fire protection systems.
7 Maurice is also a key in the approval of a
8 new project, NFPA 4, which will address integrated
9 system testing.
10 JIM PAULY: This award addresses not only
11 Maurice's leadership and personal contributions to the
12 commissioning projects, but also all the efforts
13 involved with his many committee projects that he's been
14 participating with over the years.
15 Please join me in congratulating Maurice on
16 this special achievement award. And on behalf of the
17 standards, we thank you for your continued dedication
18 and service to the NFPA codes and standards making
19 process.
20 (Applause.)
21 JIM PAULY: This concludes the special
22 achievement awards and now we'll move on the committee
23 service awards.
24 Committee service award is given to a
25 technical committee member for continuous and exemplary

♀
1 service on one or more committees over a substantial
2 period of time and in recognition and appreciation of
3 distinguished service to the NFPA and the development of
4 NFPA codes and standards.
5 I am pleased to present this award today to
6 the following deserving individuals:
7 Our first recipient of the committee service
8 award is Kerry Bell. Kerry, could you please join me at
9 the podium?
10 AMY CRONIN: Kerry Belle of UL, LLC in
11 Northbrook, Illinois serves on many technical
12 committees, including Automatic Sprinkler Systems
13 Correlating Committee 1990 to present, Automatic
14 Sprinkler System Technical Committees on Sprinkler
15 System Discharge Criteria, Residential Sprinkler System,
16 Sprinkler System Installation Criteria and Private Water

17 Supply Typing Systems, the Technical Committee on ire
18 Pumps and the Technical Committee on Inspection, Testing
19 and Maintenance of Water Based Systems, Technical
20 Committee on Electronic Computer Systems, Life Safety
21 Building Code, Technical Committee on Ward and Care
22 Facilities, the Technical Committee on Merchant Vessels,
23 the Technical Committee on Water Mist Fire Suppression
24 Systems, the Technical Committee on Water Spray Fix
25 Systems, NFPA Standards Council 2005 to present.

♀

1 In the past, Carey has served on the
2 Technical Committee on Carbon Dioxide, the Technical
3 Committee on Halogenated Fire Extinguishing Systems, the
4 Technical Committee on Alternative Protection Options,
5 the Technical Committee on General Storage and the
6 Technical Committee on Forest and Rural Fire Protection.
7 JIM PAULY: You guys are ahead of me. I was
8 going to say please join me on congratulating Kerry on
9 his service, but clearly you've done that. Thank you.
10 The next recipient of the committee service
11 award problem is Robert Friberg. Robert, could you join
12 me here at the podium?
13 AMY CRONIN: Rob Friberg, of Liberty Mutual
14 Property, in Statesville, Wisconsin, serves on the
15 Technical Committee on Finishing Prospectors from 2001
16 to present. And the Technical Committee on Aerosol
17 Products from 2010 to present.
18 JIM PAULY: Eventually you'll be able to cut
19 me out of this altogether. That's probably not a bad
20 thing.
21 The next recipient of the committee service
22 award is James Golinveaux. James, could you please join
23 me here at the podium?
24 AMY CRONIN: James Golinveaux of Tico Fire
25 Suppression and Building Products, in Cranston, Rhode

♀

1 Island, serves on the Automatic Sprinkler System,
2 Technical Committee on Sprinkler System Discharge
3 Criteria from '97 to the present, Sprinkler System
4 Installation Criteria, 1997 to present, the Technical
5 Committee on Garages and Parking Structures 1992 to
6 present, and the Life Safety Building Code, Technical
7 Committee on Industrial Storage and Miscellaneous
8 Occupancies 2000 to present.
9 In the past James served on the Technical
10 Committee on General Storage, the Technical Committee on
11 Airport Facilities, and the Technical Committee on
12 Automatic Sprinklers.
13 JIM PAULY: Please join me in congratulating
14 James on his service.
15 The next recipient of the committee service
16 award is Paul Hamer. Paul, could you please join me at
17 the podium?
18 AMY CRONIN: Paul Hamer of Chevron Energy
19 Research and Technology in Richmond, California, served
20 on the Technical Committee on Lightning Protection, 1995
21 to 1999, the National Electrical Code Panel 11 from '96
22 to 2011 and the Technical Committee on Electrical Safety
23 in the Workplace 1997 to 2010.
24 JIM PAULY: Please congratulate Paul on his
25 service.

♀
1 The next recipient of the committee service
2 award is Kenneth W. Linder. Ken, could you please join
3 me here at the podium?
4 AMY CRONIN: Ken Linder of Swiss, RE, in
5 Windsor, Connecticut, serves on the Technical
6 Correlating Committee on Automatic Sprinkler System 1984
7 to present, chair since 2012, Automatic Sprinkler
8 System, Technical Committees on the Sprinkler System
9 Installation Criteria, the Sprinkler System Discharge
10 Criteria, the Technical Committee on Water Spray Thick
11 Systems, and the Technical Committee on Inspection,
12 Testing and Maintenance of Water Based Systems.
13 In the past, Ken served on the Technical
14 Committee on Stand Pipes, the Technical Committee on
15 Fire Risk Assessment Methods.
16 JIM PAULY: Please join me in congratulating
17 Ken on his service.
18 The next recipient of the committee service
19 award is Bruce H. Varner. Bruce, could you join me here
20 at the podium, please?
21 AMY CRONIN: Bruce Varner, from Goodyear,
22 Atlanta, serves on the Technical Committee on Fire and
23 Emergency Services Protected Clothing and Equipment 1994
24 to present, and a few of its technical committees,
25 including Protective Equipment for Firefighters 1984 to
20
♀
1 1993, Proximity Protective Clothing 1988 as acting
2 chair, chair in 1993, and the Electronic Safety
3 Equipment 2002 as chair to present.
4 JIM PAULY: I know it's you guys in the back
5 that are doing that. Thanks, Bruce, for your service.
6 The last three recipients of the committee
7 service awards could not be with us today, but we want
8 to acknowledge and thank them for their service.
9 AMY CRONIN: Those who could not be with us
10 today are H. Lander Floyd of the Dupont Company,
11 Wilmington, Delaware on the National Electrical Panel
12 One 1990 to present.
13 Walt Frank, Frank Risk Solutions,
14 Incorporated of Wilmington -- excuse me -- Wilmington,
15 Delaware.
16 And Michael St. Claire of Austraner, Ohio.
17 JIM PAULY: On behalf of the Standards
18 Council, I would like to again say thank you to all of
19 these individuals. This concludes our awards ceremony
20 for this afternoon.
21 We will now move on to the Association
22 Technical Meeting. Thank you.
23 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you, Jim
24 and Amy. The fourth report under consideration this
25 afternoon is that of the technical committee on
21
♀
1 liquified natural gas. Here to present the committee
2 report is committee chair, Jay Jablonski, HSBPLC,
3 Hartford, Connecticut. Committee report can be found in
4 the white 2011 fall revision cycle ROP and ROC.
5 Certified amending motions are contained in
6 the motions committee report and behind me on the
7 screen.
8 We will proceed in the order of the motion
9 sequence number presented.

Mr. Jablonski.
COMMITTEE CHAIR JABLONSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ladies and gentlemen, the technical committee on liquefied natural gas is presented for adoption. It can be found on the report of proposals and the report on comments for the 2011 fall meeting revision cycle.
The technical committee has published a report consisting of a partial revision of NFPA 59A, standard for the production, storage and handling of liquefied natural gas LMG.
The report was submitted to the committee that consisted of 31 voting members. The ballot results can be found on Pages 59A-2 to 59A-66 of the report on proposals and 59A-2 to 59A-13 of the report on comments.
The presiding officer will now proceed with the certifying amending motions.

22

PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you, Mr. Jablonski.
Now let's proceed with the discussion of the certified amending motions on NFPA 59-A.
Microphone 5, please.
MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH International and I move acceptance of Comment 59A-5.
PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you. There is now a motion on the floor to accept Comment 59A-5. Is there a second? There is a second.
Please proceed with the discussion on the motion.
MARCELO HIRSCHLER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is a very simple issue. As some of you may know, Standards Council appointed a few years ago an advisory committee on the glossary o terminology and I happen to be chosen as chair. I am not here representing that committee, I want to make it very clear, but I still serve on that committee and I want to recognize the great contribution from our staff. As a result of that we now have a have new glossary of terminology that has been published.
With that, I want to come to the exact material that we're dealing with here. What we're dealing with here is that the NFPA rules state that the

23

definitions shall not contain requirements. The definition of noncombustible material contained in 59A does contain a requirement. You will hear more than one of these motions today and tomorrow.
What has happened at the last year was that all the major NFPA documents, NFPA 101, 5001 and various others took this type of action. What the action is is taking out the wording of the -- with the requirement in the section definition and just put a note that says see a certain section in the body of the standard and then put all the requirements in the body of the standard.
All that happened last year as I say 101, 5001, 703 several documents. All this is doing is doing exactly that. So since this definition in 59A was extracted from 101, it will be basically by doing this it automatically falls in line with all the other documents. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
Mr. Jablonski?

20 COMMITTEE CHAIR JABLONSKI: Thank you.
21 Brief statement. The definition for the noncombustible
22 material and the related new requirements were presented
23 to the NFPA 59 committee during the comment phase to
24 seek to introduce new requirements, specifically a test
25 method that was referenced in the motion.

24

♀

1 That was not previously presented to or
2 reviewed by the technical committee on LNG prior to that
3 point. The concepts incorporated in Comment 59A-5 were
4 not present at the technical committee ROP action.
5 Paragraph 4.4.6.2.2A of the NFPA regulations
6 governing committee projects states that a technical
7 committee shall hold for processing as a proposal for
8 the next revision cycle a comment that would introduce a
9 concept that has not had a public review by being
10 included in a related proposal as published in the
11 report on proposals.
12 Therefore, the committee acted in accordance
13 with the NFPA regulations by holding this comment until
14 such time the LNG technical committee and members of the
15 public familiar with NFPA 59A would have a chance to
16 fully review and comment on the inclusion of these new
17 concepts.
18 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you, Mr.
19 Jablonski.
20 We'll open the debate for any discussion on
21 this.
22 Microphone 5.
23 MARCELO HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH
24 International in support of the motion.
25 Just to clarify, if this document will

25

♀

1 remain with the reference as an extract, it will have a
2 confusing extracting, it will be extract from an
3 addition that is incomplete. This doesn't do anything
4 new, doesn't add any information. It will just simply
5 bring it in line with the NFPA 101 and 5001 and the
6 other codes.
7 And this couldn't be brought before the
8 comment stage because that was when it had been approved
9 at all the other NFPA major codes and that's why it was
10 put in place.
11 And again, if this stays the way it is, then
12 we would have something that contravenes the regulation
13 requirements that are in the definition. Thank you.
14 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
15 Any other discussion? Any other comments?
16 COMMITTEE CHAIR JABLONSKI: Really the only
17 other comment I have is we understood that there was the
18 new definition coming in, but at the point in time that
19 it was introduced it was already at the comment stage
20 and that's why the committee acted the way they did.
21 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you, Mr.
22 Chair.
23 Before we vote, let me restate the motion.
24 The motion on the floor is to accept Comment 59A-5.
25 Please record your vote, one in favor of the

26

♀

1 motion accept or two opposed to the motion reject.
2 Balloting will close in five seconds.

Balloting is closed. Thank you. Result of the votes are accept.

Are there any other discussion of the NFPA 59A? Motion passes.

Seeing none, let's move on to the next document.

The next report under consideration this afternoon is that of the technical committee on agricultural dust. Here to present the committee report is Committee Chair Matthew Bujewski of MKB Risk Consulting, St. Louis, Missouri.

Committee reports can be found in the blue 2012 annual revision cycle ROP and ROC. The certified amending motions are contained in the motions committee report and behind me on the screen.

We will proceed in the order of the motion presented.

Mr. Bujewski.

COMMITTEE CHAIR BUJEWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chair, ladies and gentleman, the report on the technical committee on agricultural dust is presented for adoption and can be found in the report on

proposals and reports on comments the 2012 annual meetings revision cycle.

The technical committee has published a report consisting of partial revision of NFPA 61, standards for the prevention of fires and dust explosions in agricultural and food processing facilities.

The report was submitted to letter ballot to the technical committee that consisted of 28 voting members. The ballot results can be found on Pages 61-2 to 61-24 of the report on proposals and Pages 61-2 to 61-10 of the report on comments.

That presiding officer will now proceed with the certified amending motions.

PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you, Mr. Bujewski.

Let's proceed with the discussion on the certified amending motions on NFPA 61.

Microphone 5, please.

ERDEM URAL: My name is Erdem Ural. I make a motion to accept Comment 61-4.

PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you. There's a motion on the floor to accept Comment 61-4. Is there a second? We do have a second.

Please proceed with the motion.

ERDEM URAL: Good afternoon, everybody. I am member of NFPA 61. I'm a proud member of NFPA 61 committee and I serve on the committee as a special expert. I also serve on practically all the dust, other dust committees as a special expert.

So this is a really important issue that we are discussing. Why is this agricultural dust definition important? A lot of people misuse the standard thinking flash fire and explosion hazards do not exist if the material does not fit the NFPA 61 definition of agricultural dust.

Why the definition and NFPA 61 is wrong?

13 Because NFPA 61 says if a dust contains any particles
14 greater 420 microns, it doesn't present an explosion or
15 a fire hazard.
16 This motion wants to change it to for dust
17 regardless of the particle size. 420 microns is
18 historical value. It's an old school value. It was
19 developed and used for gold dust, which is a more or
20 less compact historical type particles.
21 We have done a research study demonstrating
22 that agricultural dust, which is in the form of flakes,
23 can present a serious fire explosion hazard when the
24 particle size of 2,000 microns or 4,000 microns.
25 The committee also actually agrees with my

29

♀
1 statement because if you look at the ROC document, ROC
2 61-24, the committee ruled committee proposal it says it
3 put it in the annex, but in some case some 420 microns
4 may not be explosible.
5 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: You have one
6 minute.
7 ERDEM URAL: In other cases larger particles
8 it may be explosible and that passed unanimously. So
9 the committee also agrees 420 microns is inappropriate.
10 And the other standard did use 420, but
11 moved away from it such as standard such as NFPA 68, 69,
12 654, 655, 484 and 499.
13 So I sincerely hope that you will vote for
14 the motion and make the agricultural business safer and
15 protect NFPA from unnecessary liability.
16 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
17 Mr. Bujewski?
18 COMMITTEE CHAIR BUJEWSKI: The committee
19 voted during the ROP stage to retain the definition that
20 has been in the standard for many, many years. The vote
21 was 25 to 2. We do have a balanced committee. It is a
22 consensus document. All of the proposals were
23 thoroughly discussed in the ROP stage and in the ROC
24 stage.
25 All of the data that the agricultural dust

30

♀
1 standard is based upon 420 microns. It's been used for
2 decades. Some of the other committees have adopted
3 higher micron particle sizes, but those don't
4 necessarily concern agricultural dust. All the other
5 standards that were mentioned by Mr. Ural do not have
6 anything to do with agricultural dust. We are the
7 agricultural dust standard. And so we feel it's our
8 right to define what an agricultural dust should be.
9 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you, Mr.
10 Bujewski.
11 With that, we'll open debate on the motion.
12 Please provide your name and affiliation, whether you're
13 speaking in support of or against the motion.
14 Microphone 5, please.
15 BILL STEVENSON: My name is Bill Stevenson.
16 My company is CV Technology. I'm a member of NFPA
17 technical committee that deal with dust, not a member of
18 61.
19 The definition that Dr. Ural has submitted
20 for consideration today is very close to the same
21 definitions that are used in 654, 655, 68, 69.
22 And I think it's important that we realize

23 that from an enforcement point of view, if we can
24 harmonize these standards, bring them into closer
25 agreement, it's going to be much easier for companies

31

♀

1 that are trying to use the documents to determine what
2 to do. Thank you very much.
3 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
4 Microphone 8.
5 JIM MANESS: My name is Jim Maness. I'm
6 with the Grain Elevator and Processing Society and
7 National Grain and Feed Association. And I'm speaking
8 against the motion.
9 I've been on the NFPA committee for 28 years
10 now and 61 committee and several of the other committees
11 as well.
12 But just to correct one thing that Mr. Ural
13 said, we do not say that particles larger than 420
14 microns cannot explode. We say -- in fact, he repeats
15 what we say in the appendix. We said that might happen
16 with larger particles or smaller particles. So we do
17 not -- representing that we had something that we didn't
18 say.
19 I think that the -- we voted to reject the
20 proposal, one, because it does not give guidance to the
21 standard users out there of the type and size of dust of
22 the greatest concern.
23 The standards are with small facilities that
24 have less than ten workers and little technical
25 expertise. We understand that a lot of technical people

32

♀

1 that understand these things like dust testing groups
2 and so forth would understand more complex standard. We
3 believe that the standard needs to have this guidance in
4 there for the user of this standard in terms of the
5 industry.
6 The existing standards define agricultural
7 dust as that that's less than 420 microns, which has
8 been used historically in our industry since the dust is
9 great concern and use the definition which has been used
10 in the U.S. and Europe to characterize our dust
11 particles. So we -- it is common term that's been used
12 for many years. It is accepted around the world. It
13 only recently has this new standard came in.
14 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: You have one
15 minute.
16 JIM MANESS: In essence, dust is any
17 material that is released from the material that is
18 being handled and it's all treated as potential dust
19 hazard and is cleaned up as a potential hazard.
20 All existing material hazard information
21 based on 420 microns criteria would not change
22 significantly as a result of including the larger size
23 particles. The data that's being quoted that says the
24 large particles are a problem, we have not seen that
25 data although we do recognize in the appendix a

33

♀

1 possibility that that could occur. Thank you.
2 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
3 Microphone 5.
4 ERDEM URAL: Erdem Ural speaking for the
5 motion again. I just wanted to correct the statement

6 before. First, Mr. Bujewski said that the 420 is
7 appropriate for agricultural dust and the others may be,
8 regardless of particle size and shape, may be
9 appropriate for the other dust which is incorrect.
10 Because as I pointed out, we have traced the
11 origin of 420 microns and it came from the mines and the
12 gold dust and propagation in mine galleries.
13 So we actually have test data, published
14 test data, that shows agricultural dust greater than 500
15 microns, 2,000 microns, 4,000 microns is explosible. It
16 does present fire hazard. It does present explosion
17 hazard.
18 Regarding the statement by Mr. Maness, let's
19 look at the existing definition if the standard passes,
20 this is how it will read as before.
21 Any finding defining agricultural material
22 420 microns or smaller in diameter, in parenthesis
23 material passing a U.S. number 40 standard sive that
24 presents a fire explosion hazards when dispersed and
25 igniting in air.

34

♀
1 So this is saying that it has to pass
2 through number 40 mesh sive which says it has to be
3 smaller than 420 microns.
4 And lastly, I bring to your attention that
5 the committee, in committee proposal number CC1, ROC
6 61-24 --
7 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: You have one
8 minute.
9 ERDEM URAL: Quote: In some cases 420
10 micron particles may not be explosible. In other cases
11 the particle larger than 420 microns may be explosible.
12 So that passed unanimously. Just saying that 420
13 microns is appropriate is just double talk.
14 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
15 Microphone 8.
16 MARK BLISHAKER: Hello. My name is Mark
17 Blishaker and I'm an individual voting member of the
18 NFPA here today representing the National Grain and Feed
19 Association, the National Oil Seed Processors
20 Association, Corn and Farmer Associations and Renewable
21 Fuels Association speaking against the motion.
22 I just want to make three basic points.
23 First, when you have an overwhelming committee vote, in
24 this case I believe it was 25 to 2, it undermines the
25 consensus philosophy of this organization that has been

35

♀
1 so successful over many years to overturn that vote with
2 a proposal that was never even vetted from the committee
3 except in the appeals process, review process.
4 Secondly, I just want to emphasize in this
5 industry there is tremendous concern about safety. That
6 concern has been reflected in the improvement in the
7 safety records in the industry in the last 30 years, a
8 tremendous improvement, unprecedented I would say in any
9 industry in the United States. And that improved safety
10 record is threatened with confusion that would be
11 engendered by the proposal.
12 So I urge the voting members to vote against
13 this proposal.
14 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
15 Microphone 2.

16 WILLIAM FISKE: Thank you, Chairman. I'm
17 William Fisk and I am speaking against this motion.
18 I just want to address one statement that
19 was made during Mr. Ural's remarks in which he said that
20 any particle that will pass through 420 microns sive,
21 any particle that will pass through a sive of that size
22 is automatically under 420 microns in diameter, and
23 therefore, is to be deemed combustible.
24 It's not correct. Because as we all know,
25 agricultural dusts are irregular in shape and a number

36

♀
1 of them being irregular will pass through the sive even
2 though their average diameter is greater than 420
3 microns.
4 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
5 Microphone 5.
6 ERDEM URAL: Erdem Ural again speaking for
7 the motion. Actually, Mr. Fiske is arguing to my point
8 saying that it's really not related to what passes
9 through the sive, it's regardless of size and shape
10 because size as well as the shape matters.
11 The gentleman before Mr. Fiske spoke, I'm
12 sorry I missed his name, he said that this proposal was
13 not vetted by the committee. That's not true. It's
14 properly argued. It was submitted through the ROP. It
15 was submitted through the ROC.
16 And he also made a comment saying -- what
17 was the other comment?
18 But the issue is self-explanatory. It's not
19 rocket science. The committee already acknowledges that
20 the 420, the line in the sand doesn't apply to -- it's
21 not written in stone because dust smaller than 420
22 microns could be -- sometimes they are not explosible
23 and dusts that are larger than 420 microns can be
24 explosible.
25 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.

37

♀
1 Microphone 8.
2 NICK THIELEN: Nick Thielen, General Mills,
3 committee member on NFPA 61. I'm speaking against the
4 motion.
5 The prime concern here is one that says that
6 we will drop any threshold value. Not that 420 is the
7 magic number or not a magic number, but there should be
8 no threshold number.
9 And yet if you look across the world,
10 internationally there are numbers of international
11 bodies that got threshold numbers. They may be slightly
12 I different than this 420 number, but they all are
13 universally applying the threshold. Also insurance
14 companies almost universally apply a threshold value.
15 So if the concept of a threshold is so
16 wrong, if it should not be included, which is what the
17 actual motion is saying, then how come so many folks
18 believe that it is an appropriate thing?
19 And the value for a company like General
20 Mills when we're trying to apply a standard of having a
21 threshold, is pretty clear. It give us a clear focus,
22 an area we can focus on getting the most bang for our
23 buck by protecting the most people in the most
24 situations. Thank you.
25 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.

Microphone 5.
BILL STEVENSON: My name is Bill Stevenson. My company is CV Technology. I'm speaking in favor of the motion.
Two points. First, this whole process is a consensus process. Part of that consensus should be that this Standard 61 deals with dust should be in harmony with the other standards published by the NFPA that deal with dust. It is not. Not with regard to the definition for dust or in any of the other measures that we're going to consider this afternoon.
Dr. Ural's efforts on behalf of all of us, all committees, have been to try and help harmonize 61 with the other standards.
And that is consensus, ladies and gentlemen. All this denial that's coming from 61 is exactly that. It's denial. It's not consensus. It's not consenting to agreement with all the other technical committees that deal with the subject.
Agricultural dusts are dusts. They are not different from wood dusts or metal dusts or plastics or any other kind of dust, pharmaceutical, you name it, in terms of the basic physics of chemistry and how they react, the consequences if we have rapid oxidation.
The other point I'd like to make is with

regard to the safety record for the industry. If any of you would like to do so, I direct your attention, go to the CSB website, CSB.gov, and look up the statistics and you will find that the agricultural and foods products industry has the worst safety record with respect to explosible dust of any industry segment in the United States or Canada. Thank you very much.
PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
Microphone 2.
ART BLACK: Mr. Chair, Art Black, Carmel Fire Protection. I call the question.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.
DANNY McDANIEL: I have a call the question and second. We will now vote on the call the question.
Please record your vote, one in favor of the motion or two opposed to the motion.
You have five seconds. Voting is closed. Motion passes. We'll move to -- sorry. Motion did not pass. We need two-thirds for a passage with closure. Debate continues.
Is there anyone else who wishes to speak? Okay.
COMMITTEE CHAIR BUJEWSKI: Mr. Chair, I have another comment on the last statement was patently false that the grain industry has the worst safety record of

any of the industries that handle the combustible dust. I'm not the expert on that, but there are other members of the grain industry here that can continue to speak to that. The data is there for everyone to see.
It is appropriate to have 420 microns for agricultural dust. It's been used for decades. All of the testing has been done at 420 microns. The OSHA regulation that covers grain handling also uses 420

9 microns.
10 It is entirely appropriate for other
11 combustible dusts standards to have a different number,
12 such as plastics and cellulosics and all the other types
13 of dust that you can have, they can certainly be larger
14 than 420 microns and they can certainly explode.
15 But for agricultural dust, 420 microns has
16 been the standard for a long, long time. And there is
17 no reason why it should be the same as the other
18 standards that cover combustible dust. It would give a
19 false impression of the users of NFPA 61 if we did that.
20 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
21 Microphone 5.
22 ERDEM URAL: I would just like to qualify --
23 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Would you state
24 your name and your affiliation?
25 ERDEM URAL: Erdem Ural. I speak for the

♀
1 motion. The issue here is -- it has been now pointed
2 out that this is a consensus process. The consensus
3 committee is agreeing with the -- decided this way,
4 there is a minority, so let's ignore the minority.
5 That's not right.
6 NFPA incurs liability because the NFPA
7 appoints the committee members, NFPA appoints the chair.
8 There are other committees, like NFPA 68, 69, explosion
9 protection systems committees, that I will assist on
10 people specializing in explosion protection. And those
11 people came up with certain requirements, certain
12 standards for protection of the structures, as well as
13 more importantly the people.
14 One of them is explosion venting. One of
15 them explosion isolation, explosion suppression,
16 inertting.
17 This committee, the majority, the current
18 majority of the committee just doesn't want to include
19 that in the mandatory section. They have been willing
20 to accommodate part of it in the annex as we will
21 discuss later on. Thank you.
22 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
23 Microphone 8.
24 COMMITTEE CHAIR BUJEWSKI: Can I speak
25 again?

♀
1 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: After mike 8,
2 yes.
3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. My name is
4 (inaudible). I'm a member of the committee voting or
5 speaking against the motion.
6 420 microns is simply a starting point. It
7 is not a line in the sand. It gives us the ability to
8 characterize our dust, provides us with some priority as
9 to how we're going to go about attacking or mitigating
10 risk I should say.
11 The term finely divided agricultural solid
12 material which is what's being proposed today, it's a
13 broad non-definable term. There's no quantifiable
14 explanation as to what dust it and we know it.
15 From a regulatory standpoint, it's been said
16 OSHA set the definition for 420. Typically historically
17 our data is based on 420 micron size. Existing test
18 data on dust explosion properties is based on 420. Most

19 experts have indicated while some dust may combust, it
20 is the smaller dust, generally less than 100 microns
21 that is our greatest concern. The percentage of dust
22 greater than 420 microns is very, very small, typically
23 less than one percent.
24 In essence, by adopting the terminology, in
25 essence, we're going backward. We're not giving the

43

♀
1 industry something that we can use to quantify our dust.
2 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
3 Mr. Bujewski?
4 COMMITTEE CHAIR BUJEWSKI: Yes. I just
5 wanted to again state for the record that the vote, it
6 was not a small majority or a small minority on the vote
7 in the ROP. The vote was 25 to 2 against changing the
8 existing definition agricultural dust. So Mr. Ural is
9 of a very small opinion within the committee.
10 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
11 Microphone 5.
12 ERDEM URAL: Erdem Ural speaking for the
13 motion. I believe the vote was 21 to 5, that's a small
14 point.
15 The issue is for a different material with a
16 different particle shape, there is -- you can actually
17 if you're dealing with corn dust, for example, you can
18 come up with appropriate criteria for your material.
19 For other dust like that may have flakes,
20 you can come up with a different. So that one is going
21 to be a lot larger than 420 microns. And we don't have
22 the knowledge to do that.
23 So just to say 420 fits every single
24 situation is wrong, is wrong more often than not.
25 Therefore, it's a dangerous situation. We are here to

44

♀
1 protect the lives and I strongly urge everybody -- I
2 know some of you have directive, but I strongly urge you
3 to vote your conscious.
4 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
5 Are there any further discussion of motion
6 61-6 to accept Comment 61-4? Seeing none, we'll move to
7 the vote.
8 Before you vote, let me restate the motion.
9 The motion on the floor is to accept Comment 61-4.
10 Please record your vote, one in favor of the
11 motion accept or two oppose the motion reject.
12 You have five seconds. Voting is closed.
13 The motion fails.
14 Let's now proceed with the discussion on
15 certifying amending motion 61-2.
16 Microphone 5, please.
17 ERDEM URAL: Erdem Ural. I am the maker of
18 the motion. Since the substance similar with the
19 difference in just the annex material, I'm not going to
20 pursue this.
21 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
22 We'll proceed with the -- let's proceed with the
23 discussion on certified amending motion 61-3.
24 Microphone 5, please.
25 MARCELO HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH

45

♀
1 International. And I move the acceptance of an

identifiable part of Comment 61-6.

PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you. There's a motion on the floor to accept an identified part of 61-6. Is there a second? We have a second. Please go ahead with discussion.

MARCELO HIRSCHLER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. What we're dealing with here is simply -- excuse me. Excuse me -- is simply an issue of getting consistency in definition.

Just for your information, I'd like to read to you the title of NFPA 61 and the title of NFPA 654. NFPA 61 is the standard for prevention of fire and dust explosion agricultural foods processing facilities. NFPA 654 is the standard for the protection of fires and dust explosion and the handling of combustible particles and solids.

So in reality, 61 is if you will a subset of 654. What this motion says is nothing more than take the definition of this term pneumatic conveying system from 654.

If you look at Page 61-3 of your ROC, you will find that what is in there today is the definition from 654 in 2006. I'm saying take the one from 654 in 2012.

46

If you go in your same ROC book to Page 654 -- excuse me -- 654-5 at the top left-hand of the page you have the definition that was accepted by the 654 committee from pneumatic conveying system which is very similar to the one that is in 61, but it's not identical.

And in my role as a trying to obtain consistency in definitions throughout NFPA, again, I want to repeat I am not representing the glossary terminology committee, but I still have the same goals in mind.

I think it's very important that we adopt NFPA 61 the same definition that is now in 654 rather than taking a definition from 61.

PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: You have one minute.

MARCELO HIRSCHLER: Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you. Mr. Bujewski, would you like to speak?

COMMITTEE CHAIR BUJEWSKI: I would like to comment on that. NFPA 61, agricultural dust is not a subset of NFPA 654. We have been in existence since the 1920s and I believe 654 has been in existence since the '50s or '60s.

654 is primarily for the chemical industry,

47

pharmaceutical industry and deals with those types of dust primarily. And pneumatic conveying has been merged into NFPA 654. It used to be a standalone standard.

NFPA 61 has referenced pneumatic conveying for many years.

And just a little bit of background on this specific. During the ROP stage we accepted the definition that was in the 2006 version of NFPA 654 and we accepted the definition in principal 27 to nothing. NFPA 61 previously didn't have a definition of pneumatic conveying.

12 So we took the 654 definition and we added a
13 sentence AT the end of the 654 definition because we
14 wanted to distinguish pneumatic conveying from dust
15 collection because it would have A significant impact on
16 some of the other requirements in our standards. So we
17 wanted to make sure there was a difference between
18 pneumatic conveying and dust collection.
19 So we added the sentence. We also added the
20 annex material that was proposed at the time.
21 And unfortunately, there was a misprint in
22 the ROP that was printed by the NFPA. The ROP said that
23 this material was extracted from 654. That wasn't
24 entirely correct. It was initially extracted from 654,
25 but then we made a modification for it. So it was

48

♀
1 unfortunate in the ROP stage that showed up.
2 So in the ROC meeting we reconfirmed our
3 position on the definition with the vote of 25 to 1 that
4 there was a need to differentiate between pneumatic
5 conveying and dust collection as it relates to
6 agricultural dust.
7 And then in preparation for this meeting,
8 because there was confusion the NFPA, asked for an
9 informational ballot to be sent out. So they sent out
10 an informational ballot to the committee and with that
11 informational ballot, the committee reaffirmed what was
12 done in the ROP and in the ROC with a vote of 16 to 10
13 to say that this is the definition that we want for
14 agricultural dust.
15 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you,
16 Mr. Chairman.
17 That would now open up the debate on the
18 motion. Please provide your name and affiliation and
19 whether you're speaking in support or against the
20 motion.
21 Microphone 8, please.
22 NICK THIELEN: Yes, hi. My name is Nick
23 Thielen, General Mills. I'm a member of 61 committee.
24 I'd like to echo a couple of things that the
25 chair mentioned. Clearly 61 --

49

♀
1 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: For or against
2 the motion?
3 NICK THIELEN: I'm against the motion, I'm
4 sorry.
5 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
6 MR. THIELEN: I'd like to echo that 61 is
7 not a child or subset of 654, it's a predecessor. And
8 that's important because 61 has been around and we have
9 had a number of discussions and agricultural dust is
10 fundamentally different than regular dust and we wanted
11 to have a clear definition of what agricultural
12 materials are in the collection of those materials.
13 So when we got into pneumatic conveying, we
14 wanted to make it clear that dust collection was a
15 separate subset of the process that we're doing.
16 Pneumatic conveying is not necessarily what
17 happens with dust collection. Dust collection is
18 something where you're dealing with very low
19 concentration and for a number of reasons they are very
20 different. Thank you.
21 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.

22 Microphone 5, please.
23 MARCELO HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler from
24 GBH International in favor of the motion. Just want to
25 point out the basic difference between the two

50

♀
1 definitions is that the definition that 61 has an
2 additional sentence that's information because in the
3 NFPA system, nothing that's in the definition can be a
4 requirement. So it's just information. So a good
5 sentence can even be put in the annex.
6 The additional sentence talks about
7 pneumatic conveying for product as distinguished from
8 dust collection systems. That's fine. That's got --
9 that's got nothing to do with the definition of
10 pneumatic conveying system.
11 And as was pointed out by the chair as well,
12 at the ROP, the committee wanted to take the definition
13 from 654. I know you're right, 654 is not a child OF
14 61, but still it addresses the same issues on a more
15 generic basis. And most of these dusts are cellulosic
16 dust like all the agricultural dust are cellulosic dust.
17 And it's very important that in NFPA we have consistency
18 in definition.
19 A pneumatic conveying system is a pneumatic
20 conveying system. Doesn't matter what is being conveyed
21 as a pneumatic conveying system. I urge you to continue
22 maintaining consistency in definitions within NFPA.
23 Thank you very much.
24 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
25 Microphone 5, please.

51

♀
1 ERDEM URAL: Erdem Ural. I'm sort of --
2 well, I guess I'm kind of for the motion. I truly
3 appreciate what Mr. Hirschler is trying to do because he
4 has been given the task from NFPA to charge, I mean his
5 committee, to make the -- there is a file for the
6 definitions.
7 And I agree with the statement saying that
8 the last sentence is not really a mandatory requirement,
9 it's just informational. So it does belong in the
10 annex.
11 So the issue is not whether it came from
12 654, the chicken came or the egg came. 654 may be
13 younger, but the members of 654 committees is more
14 progressive so they are more open to changes.
15 So I think the definitions are all the same.
16 We're just splitting hair here. Just putting the
17 sentence in the annex versus in the mandatory text, the
18 committee or the document will not be losing anything
19 but putting it in the annex, but NFPA will gain
20 credibility because there is a style and that style is
21 followed by all the committees. Nobody is above the
22 roof.
23 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
24 Is there any further discussion of motion
25 61-3 to accept an identifiable part of 61-6?

52

♀
1 COMMITTEE CHAIR BUJEWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I
2 would like to make another statement. Again, the
3 committee voted three times on this issue and three
4 times we upheld what we voted 27 to nothing in the ROP

5 stage.
6 We are an occupancy standard and as such we
7 think we need to tailor our definitions and the standard
8 to the industry specifically. We're not a generic
9 standard like maybe 654 is. So out of necessity and
10 because of the way the rest of the standard is written,
11 we need to have certain things in our definition.
12 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you, Mr.
13 Chair.
14 Microphone 5, please.
15 MARCELO HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH
16 International for the motion. Just one clarification.
17 I am not speaking on behalf of the glossary of terms
18 committee. Thank you.
19 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Okay. Any
20 other comments?
21 Before we vote, let me restate the motion.
22 The motion on the floor is to accept an identifiable
23 part of comment 61-6.
24 Please record your vote, one in favor of the
25 motion accept, two opposed to the motion, reject.

♀
1 Five seconds. Voting is closed. Motion
2 fails.
3 Let's now proceed to the discussion on
4 certified amending motion 61-4.
5 Microphone 5, please.
6 ERDEM URAL: Erdem Ural. I make a motion to
7 accept proposal 61-19.
8 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: There's a
9 motion on the floor to accept 61-19. Is there a second?
10 There is a second.
11 Please proceed with discussion on the
12 motion.
13 ERDEM URAL: This relates to the threshold
14 for dust accumulation. As I said, I have -- I have -- I
15 am special expert member of all the dust committees. I
16 have also done a project for National Fire Protection
17 Research Foundation about the appropriate, estimating
18 and figuring appropriate accumulation.
19 We all know that excessive dust
20 accumulations can explode the facilities and kill the
21 workers. NFPA 61 says dust on floors, structural
22 members and other surfaces shall be removed from current
23 operations, but it does not specify any targets for
24 cleanliness.
25 It doesn't answer the question does a single

♀
1 cleaning crew for a large plant satisfy the standard?
2 Or does a cleaning between shifts satisfy the standard?
3 OSHA says one-eighth of an inch thick there
4 for grain dust is allowable. And for grain dust -- for
5 other dust it says 1-32th inch thick dust layer.
6 And NGFA, National Grain and Feed
7 Association, actually sponsored some research in the
8 Factory Mutual Global and they have actually found out
9 that even 1-100 of an inch is not safe.
10 This motion is trying to get a reliable and
11 measurable cleaning target into the standard. The
12 proposed method has been adopted in the 2013 addition of
13 NFPA 654 and NFPA 654 has became the new standard
14 without opposition with NITMANs. So I strongly urge you

15 to vote for this motion.
16 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
17 Mr. Bujewski, would you like to give the
18 committee position?
19 COMMITTEE CHAIR BUJEWSKI: Yes. The NITMAN
20 61-4 and 61-5 both deal with the same issue. They are
21 both using the bulk density method to calculate what
22 level of dust is acceptable for a particular plant.
23 This was all new material that was submitted in the ROP
24 stage. The proposal was rejected 26 to 1.
25 The committee did not receive any technical

55

♀
1 or scientific documentation to justify the approach of
2 the bulk density method for agricultural dust. The
3 committee does not believe the method is practical for
4 the large range of operations that are covered by NFPA
5 61 and would be very difficult to apply.
6 The bulk density method again is very
7 appropriate for a more generic type of standard, like
8 654 or possibly the new fundamentals of dust standard
9 that's under development.
10 But for an occupancy standard like
11 agricultural dust, the hazard is well known. The
12 housekeeping requirements are well known. And to go
13 through a very complicated calculation to determine what
14 the appropriate dust level is is just -- is just not
15 appropriate for the committee. And that's why it was
16 voted 26 to 1 in the ROP stage.
17 In the ROC stage, the committee reaffirmed
18 its position with a vote of 25 to 1.
19 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you, Mr.
20 Bujewski.
21 With that, we'll open up debate on the
22 proceeding. Please provide your name and affiliation
23 and whether you're speaking in support or against the
24 motion.
25 Microphone 8, please.

56

♀
1 ANDREW: I'm Andrew (inaudible) speaking
2 against the motion. The committee rejected this
3 proposal 26 to 1 for good reason. The methodology
4 proposed is complicated, complex and very difficult to
5 understand.
6 In addition, this methodology differs from
7 federal regulation imposed on the industry by OSHA.
8 Expecting a small agricultural facility to institute
9 such a complex approach is irresponsible and certainly
10 doesn't promote voluntary implementation of NFPA
11 standards.
12 The substantiation statement for this
13 proposal it states there is no requirement on how clean
14 is clean. While that may be the case, the industry
15 knows what clean is. In fact, the industry is governed
16 by both OSHA as well as the Food & Drug Administration
17 and in some cases the U.S. Department of Agricultural on
18 what is required and what is meant by clean.
19 And actually in the OSHA standard it doesn't
20 quite say that is one-eighth of an inch is acceptable.
21 What it says is one-eighth of an inch you have to take
22 immediate action. Thank you.
23 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
24 Microphone 5.

25 ERDEM URAL: Just a couple of corrections.

57

♀

1 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Name.
2 ERDEM URAL: I'm sorry. Erdem Ural speaking
3 for the motion.
4 Mr. Bujewski referred to this method as a
5 bulk density method which is not correct. Bulk density
6 is only a part it if you care to include that in your
7 assessment. There is a currently a bulk density, a
8 certain bulk density is implied.
9 The other gentlemen, I missed his name, the
10 method is too complicated. It's not true because the
11 method has been -- it has two different approaches. One
12 is the easy approach and one is the more comprehensive
13 approach.
14 Again, if you try to fit everything with one
15 size shoe, that means for it to fit everything in there,
16 the shoe has to be really large like a clown shoe.
17 So right now it is irresponsible for the
18 committee to publish a safety standard saying how often
19 you have to clean, what's the tolerable dust. So
20 because the document doesn't say it, people may assume
21 that you may be allowed to accumulate very dangerous
22 levels.
23 So what this motion is trying to do and also
24 the next NITMAN is trying to do, accept this. If you
25 don't want to accept this, accept something, but you got

58

♀

1 to put something in the standard. You cannot be
2 mystical and say you have to remove the dust
3 concurrently with operations, but not say how concurrent
4 is concurrent. If you have just one worker --
5 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: You have one
6 minute.
7 ERDEM URAL: If you have just one worker
8 trying to clean little spots with large facility, you're
9 going to have a lot of dust accumulation. So that's
10 certainly not safe and I don't think that's the
11 committee's intent.
12 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
13 Microphone 8, please.
14 JIM MANESS: My name is Jim Maness. I'm
15 with the National Grain & Feed Association and Grain
16 Elevator and Processing Society. I'm speaking against
17 the proposal as well.
18 We do not agree with the proposal because as
19 Mr. Ural cited that we did do some research through the
20 National Grain & Feed Association in conjunction Factory
21 Mutual. And in that research they did test up to levels
22 as low as 1-100th of an inch of corn starch on the floor
23 of the gallery.
24 And what they found out was you can have
25 flame propagation for as little as 1-100 of an inch, but

59

♀

1 they did not find out that you had a secondary explosion
2 or explosion hazard. So I think he's incorrect to
3 incorrectly reference that information.
4 In addition, FM itself does not use 1-100th
5 of an inch. They use 1-16th of an inch in their
6 guidelines. So they didn't take it seriously either.
7 In fact, the conclusion of the research is

8 that we need to do decision additional research before
9 we can really pin down what kind of number would cause
10 an explosion.
11 Finally, I would say that the grain industry
12 is made of small companies with a lot of nonscientific,
13 very few grain elevators have a professional or
14 explosion testers at them. They go out and they look at
15 their facility and they look at whether they have
16 housekeeping problems and they identify those and then
17 they address them. That's kind of what the standard
18 says.
19 Look at our standard currently says look at
20 your facility, identify those areas where you have
21 housekeeping occurring during your operations and do
22 that housekeeping concurrent. It doesn't say if you
23 reach some magic formula --
24 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: One minute.
25 MR. MANESS: -- you do calculations to get

1 there. Thank you very much.
2 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
3 Microphone 5, please.
4 MARCELO HIRSCHLER: Marcel Hirschler, GBH
5 International, speaking in support of the motion.
6 I find the arguments I'm hearing in
7 opposition to the motion presented by Dr. Ural amazing.
8 So we shouldn't get better safety because all these
9 companies are small companies and they have no technical
10 knowledge. They are incapable of hiring professors as
11 the speaker said.
12 Then I look at the standard and it says
13 horizontal surface shall be minimized to prevent
14 accumulation of dust in all interior structures where
15 significant dust accumulation could occur. What does
16 that mean? How do I quantify that?
17 I mean this industry, as was pointed out
18 before, does not have an exceptionally good fire safety
19 record. The fact that they are unwilling to go in and
20 do something that is technically more accurate than what
21 they are doing today would just pretty much qualitative
22 is mind boggling. Thank you.
23 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
24 Microphone 5.
25 BILL STEVENSON: My name is Bill Stevenson.

1 My company is CV Technology. I'm speaking in favor of
2 the motion.
3 Like my predecessor here at the microphone,
4 my mind is boggled that you would even consider allowing
5 a standard that's supposed to provide safety for workers
6 and for facilities to not have the simple measurement
7 for how clean is clean, how often should you clean.
8 I'm thinking in terms of putting myself in
9 the shoes of an end user, a company that's trying to
10 decide what level of cleanliness is required to provide
11 modicum of safety.
12 You are not providing with this very vague
13 and nebulous almost worthless information. I just can't
14 believe it. Thank you.
15 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
16 Microphone 4, please.
17 JOHN CHOLIN: Yes. My name is John Cholin

18 from JM Cholin Consultants and I'm speaking against the
19 motion.
20 I find it unconscionable in the aftermath of
21 the explosion that took 14 lives and sent another
22 40 people to the burn unit at Imperial Sugar Refining,
23 that 61 committee did not come up with an explicit dust
24 layer criterion for how much dust is too much dust.
25 Every single one of those victims was a

62

♀

1 victim of flame impingement burns fueled by accumulated
2 fugitive dust.
3 Regrettably, the submitter of this motion
4 did not take the consensus language that was hammered
5 out by the 654 committee.
6 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Mr. Cholin, are
7 you speaking for or against the motion?
8 MR. CHOLIN: I'm speaking against the
9 motion.
10 PRESIDING OfFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
11 MR. CHOLIN: The submitter took language
12 that was halfway of what the 654 committee adopted as
13 being consensus language, which included a simple layer
14 depth method, plus a more complex and more comprehensive
15 mass based method. He only included the mass based
16 method.
17 In my view, this is a fatal flaw in the
18 proposed amendment. We will have to deal with the lack
19 of an explicit layer depth criteria through the TIA
20 process. We can't fix it here. I urge the membership
21 regrettably that we have to defeat this motion.
22 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
23 Microphone 5?
24 ERDEM URAL: Just a couple of corrections.
25 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Name.

63

♀

1 ERDEM URAL: Erdem Ural, speaking for the
2 motion.
3 I just want to make some corrections to what
4 Mr. Maness said earlier. He said in 1-100th inch over a
5 hundred inch think layer of corn starch the flame will
6 propagate.
7 He's absolutely correct. The flame
8 propagates. It burns the people. And if there is
9 confinement, it creates pressure and kills, ruptures the
10 enclosure.
11 He also mentioned that FM uses 1-16th inch
12 method thick layer as a cleaning target or maximum
13 accumulation, maximum tolerable accumulation. He's also
14 absolutely correct in that.
15 In fact, my next NITMAN is trying to seek a
16 simple layer depth method, simple just pick one number
17 and put it in the standard. It's just irresponsible not
18 to have any value in there.
19 Speaking to what Mr. Cholin has said, I also
20 thought he was speaking for the motion, although he was
21 at the red microphone. This method, he's correct, this
22 proposal was published before the NFPA, the complete
23 NFPA 654 language when into effect or was developed.
24 But nevertheless, it has the same equation. It has a
25 simple method. You just take the area of the building

64

♀

1 and multiply it by the height of the building and come
2 up with an accumulated mass and then you can forward it
3 to your layer depth. So --
4 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: One minute.
5 ERDEM URAL: What you have in the proposal
6 is better, absolutely much better than nothing. I
7 disagree that it's hard to use. You just have to open
8 up your mind to change and you will see how easy it is.
9 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
10 Microphone 8.
11 JEFF ROGERS: Jeff Rogers. I'm with Ag
12 Processing in Omaha, Nebraska. I'm a member of the 61
13 committee and I'm also here representing the National
14 Processors Association. It's been stated that there's
15 no requirement for --
16 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Are you
17 speaking for or against the motion?
18 JEFF ROGERS: I'm speaking against.
19 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
20 JEFF ROGERS: It's been stated there's no
21 requirement frequency of cleaning or dust accumulation.
22 But a Chapter 10211 says the facility shall implement,
23 develop and implement a written housekeeping procedure
24 program. And in the annex A 10211 it lists the priority
25 housekeeping areas. It says that all dust accumulation

♀

1 over 1-8th of an inch shall be removed immediately. So
2 I believe that we do have that addressed, the frequency
3 means and the maximum dust accumulation that's
4 allowable. Thank you.
5 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
6 Microphone 2.
7 WILLIAM FISKE: Bill Fiske speaking against
8 the motion. It is incorrect to say that a propagating
9 flame, propagating dust flame along the surface if
10 confined will create structural damage anything
11 resembling an explosion.
12 Unless the dust on the surface is raised
13 into a dust cloud in a combustible mixture or one
14 already exists, it wouldn't just a hundred of an inch or
15 anything like that, there won't be an explosion.
16 Without a combustible dust cloud, there won't be an
17 explosion. Simple as that.
18 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
19 Microphone 8.
20 JIM MANESS: Jim Maness. I'm speaking
21 against the motion as well.
22 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: What's your
23 affiliation, please?
24 JIM MANESS: I'm with the National Grain &
25 FeeD Association and the Grain Elevator and Processing

♀

1 Society.
2 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
3 JIM MANESS: I want to respond to a couple
4 of comments made. First, I think Mr. Cholin is
5 referencing the Imperial Sugar explosion. The US
6 Chemical Safety Board has referenced a number of
7 different serious explosions that they have
8 investigated.
9 I think it's interesting that all those
10 explosions involved tremendous amounts of dust up to in

11 one case a foot of dust. So never did we get into these
12 fractional little inches that are being brought up in
13 the formulas and equations that say the small amount of
14 dust is enough to have a major explosion.
15 As far as I know, no one has proved that a
16 hundred of an inch of dust will propagate an explosion
17 in a facility, as much as Mr. Fiske just reminded you
18 of.
19 So I think that it's clear that the problem
20 that's going on with the major explosions that have been
21 referenced they are not people that are following a
22 small formula or formula that's small quantity of dust.
23 These are major, major ignoring of proper housekeeping
24 and if any housekeeping at all. So those problems pop
25 up where you have zero standards and that's what that

67

♀

1 resulted in when you have that kind of event. Thank
2 you.
3 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
4 Mr. Bujewski?
5 COMMITTEE CHAIR BUJEWSKI: I have another
6 comment.
7 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Go ahead.
8 COMMITTEE CHAIR BUJEWSKI: There was no
9 information given to the committee that would show that
10 approving Mr. Ural's proposal would improve safety for
11 the industry. The industry has a very good safety
12 record and explosions that have happened are because
13 they haven't followed NFPA 61 to begin with.
14 Going back to the questions of having a
15 specific layer amount of dust that's allowable, the
16 committee did not receive any public proposals, the
17 committee did not receive any committee proposals and
18 there have been no questions from the public regarding
19 what the minimum layer of dust is.
20 The users of the documents do not have any
21 confusion whatsoever over the existing standard. And to
22 implement a generic equation would make the standard
23 more complicated and it's likely that it would be used
24 less because it. So I don't see that it would improve
25 safety and there's no proof that it would.

68

♀

1 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Microphone 5,
2 please.
3 ERDEM URAL: Again, we are talking about --
4 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Name and
5 affiliation.
6 ERDEM URAL: Erdem Ural. I'm so sorry. I
7 just keep forgetting. Erdem Ural speaking for the
8 motion.
9 We are looking at NFPA has the consensus
10 process. And also last year I went to the board of
11 directors. I looked at the mission or I forgot the
12 scope of International Fire Protection Association, it
13 also requires that the -- we looked at the data and the
14 science.
15 But when you just talk about the consensus
16 process, again the dust and stuff, they burn. They
17 produce heat. They produce toxic chemicals. They
18 produce acid. And then the heat burns people, produces
19 pressure, explodes. So the consequences are also not
20 much different. Given the equipment may be different a

21 little bit, but we are not talking about two different
22 issues.
23 Now NFPA has in the past compartmentalized
24 these issues. So right now there's an effort to remove
25 that compartmentalization. I don't know how it's going

69

♀

1 to work. Hopefully it will happen in the future.
2 But when you look at the consensus process,
3 NFPA 654 is at the leading edge and that passed, these
4 methods have passed there with the wide margin.
5 I agree with Mr. Cholin there was even a
6 simpler version of 654. So that is not included in the
7 proposal. But the proposal has two components, the
8 simple component and the little more complicated
9 component.
10 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: One minute.
11 ERDEM URAL: I know it's one minute left.
12 So it's just unless you open your mind, you're willing
13 to try, you won't know how easy it is. And once you
14 try, you'll be amazed. You'll identify places where you
15 were way too conservative. You will also see situations
16 where you were not conservative enough. So the improved
17 methods are based on science and they show you they give
18 more flexibility.
19 Again, you can choose to wear clown shoes
20 that will allow everybody's feet to fit in, but it's
21 really not appropriate. Thank you.
22 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
23 Microphone 4, please.
24 WILLIAM FREISS: Good afternoon. William
25 Freiss, Department of Defense. I call the question.

70

♀

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.
2 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: I have a motion
3 and second to call the question. We'll proceed to the
4 vote.
5 Press one if you vote for the motion, two
6 against. You are voting on calling the question.
7 Five seconds. Voting is closed. Motion
8 passes.
9 We'll proceed to voting on the motion on the
10 floor is to accept proposal 61-19.
11 Please record your vote, one in favor of the
12 motion to accept or two opposed to the motion reject.
13 Five seconds. Balloting is closed. Motion
14 fails.
15 Let's proceed with the certified amending
16 motion 61-5.
17 ERDEM URAL: Erdem Ural. I see from the
18 vote on the calling the questions the patience is
19 wearing thin. So I'm going to skip ahead if you guys
20 don't mind too much. Mr. Chairman, would it be possible
21 to move to motion number 61-9?
22 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Yes. I need to
23 clarify. Are you not going to pursue motion 61-5?
24 ERDEM URAL: I will not be doing that.
25 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Okay. And 61-6

71

♀

1 and 61-7?
2 ERDEM URAL: I will not be doing that.
3 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: As I understand

it, we're moving to 61-8 or 61-9; is that correct? They are related motions. Okay. Please proceed.

ERDEM URAL: Most of the death and injuries --

PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Which motion are you --

ERDEM URAL: I'm doing 61 -- oh, move to make a motion to accept proposal 61-20 -- is it 61-20? No. Accept Comment 61-13.

PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Okay. All right. Is there a second? We have a motion on the floor to accept Comment amending motion 61-9. Second? We have a second.

Please proceed.

ERDEM URAL: Most of the deaths and injuries in agricultural dust explosions are caused by improper or no provision for explosion venting and explosion isolation.

This motion deals with the venting issue. And NFPA 61 does not require any venting in existing facilities. That may be understandable, may be a risk management kind of argument.

72

Surprisingly, and this is really upsetting, it also does not require venting in any new facility. Therefore, it encourages new facilities to be built in an unsafe fashion. So it propagates a bad habit, a proven bad habit into newer designs.

Venting is a method proven time after time. The majority of the committee denied this fact for the comments. In reality, the committee acknowledged that fact in the annex material.

If you go to comment 61-26 the committee put in the annex. Situations can occur in which it is not possible to provide calculated document venting as described in NFPA 68, standard of explosion protection venting.

Such situations do not justify the exclusion of all venting. The maximum practical amount of venting should be provided since some venting should reduce the damage potential.

In addition, consideration should be given to other protection and prevention methods.

PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: One minute.

ERDEM URAL: This is all very useful information, but why bury it in the annex while the main body says you don't have to do venting if you can't?

I really hope that you will support this

73

motion and make it pass because it will be irresponsible not to.

PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.

Mr. Bujewski, would you like to present the committee's position?

COMMITTEE CHAIR BUJEWSKI: Yes. This is a very old issue with the agricultural dust committee. Historically the length and diameter ratio of large modern silos that are used to hold grain makes it physically impossible to design explosion vents in accordance with NFPA 68. That's historically why the industry has not been able to do it.

The NFPA 61, however, does state if you do

14 install explosion venting, it shall be installed in
15 accordance with 68. There are certain silos, certain
16 bins that you would be able to install venting. It's
17 just it's not required by 61 because it's very difficult
18 except on an individual basis to determine what would be
19 able to have venting and which ones would not.
20 So during the ROP stage, the committee
21 rejected the proposal 24 to 3.
22 In the ROC stage, Mr. Ural submitted
23 experimental test data for venting of silos. The test
24 data represented a very small range of silo size covered
25 by the scope of NFPA 61.

74

♀
1 As a result of that, the committee again
2 rejected the proposal 21 to 5, but we did submit a code
3 fund project to the NFPA to study explosion venting on
4 the very large grain silos that are in existence today.
5 Hopefully the study can be complete in time for our next
6 revision cycle.
7 So the committee recognizes the question,
8 but there's not enough data to really include it in the
9 standard at this time.
10 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
11 With that, we'll open debate on the motion.
12 Please provide your name and affiliation, whether you're
13 speaking in support of or against the motion.
14 Microphone 8, please.
15 JESS McCLUER: I'm Jess McCluer with the
16 National Grain & Feed Association and I'm against the
17 motion.
18 I'd like to follow up on what Mr. Bujewski
19 said about the experimental test data that was in the
20 report on comments.
21 Some of the material that was in the test
22 data submitted by Mr. Ural was from a study that the
23 National Grain & Feed Association Fire and Research
24 Council did over 30 years ago. It was well known within
25 the industry.

75

♀
1 And as the chairman said, the data does not
2 account for the newer types, larger types of storage
3 units that are currently used within the industry.
4 As a result, the National Grain & Feed
5 Association, the National Grain & Feed Foundation we're
6 currently in the process of conducting a research study
7 on the feasibility of meeting the current NFPA standards
8 to the numerous types of grain storage units that are
9 out there.
10 And we'll also be doing a cost/benefit
11 analysis to see what the costs would be if it would be
12 possible to implement the current NFPA standard. Thank
13 you.
14 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
15 Microphone 5, please.
16 ERDEM URAL: Erdem Ural speaking for the
17 motion. Just a couple of points. Mr. Bujewski pointed
18 out that the difficulty with the silos with a large
19 lower ratios and Mr. McClure said the data -- also Mr.
20 Bujewski also said the data goes up to 500 cubic meters.
21 That's exactly the point. That's no excuse
22 not to design new facilities with huge silos with long
23 LORD. You can still do, if you want to design it to

24 data, you can have the silos or the facilities up to 500
25 cubic meters. 500 cubic meters is huge.

76

♀

1 National Grain & Feed Association they have
2 found their project on the facility that's 500 cubic
3 meters. If they found it was inappropriate, why did
4 they waste their money?
5 What you can do is go to NFPA 68 and NFPA 68
6 took this data going up 500 cubic meters and used the
7 consensus process and NFPA 61 committees values so much
8 to extend it up to 10,000 cubic meters. That's an
9 extrapolation which lets you go a factor of 1.7 or 2.7,
10 it's in the documents in linear dimension that lets you
11 extrapolate up to 10,000 cubic meters.
12 That's a consensus process adopted by the
13 explosion protection systems committee. So you can
14 design smaller vessels. You can design stronger vessels
15 if you increase the strength of your enclosure, NFPA
16 68 --
17 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: One minute.
18 ERDEM URAL: -- will let you -- if you
19 increase the strength of your enclosure, NFPA 68 will
20 allow you to put smaller vents because a vent area goes
21 in the other direction of strength of your enclosure.
22 So I think it's very inappropriate to say
23 there is no data, so we can't do anything. Let's get
24 NFPA to an original project. NFPA is never going to get
25 a million dollars to do it. In the meantime, we'll be

77

♀

1 exposing our workers to death, injury, burning and also
2 hurting the owners by losing their investment.
3 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
4 Microphone 1, please.
5 JOHN CHOLIN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. My name is
6 John Cholin from JM Cholin Consultants. I'm speaking in
7 favor of the motion.
8 If you know you need to vent a vessel, you
9 design the vessel so it can be vented. The problem only
10 comes in when someone is working under the delusion they
11 don't have to vent the vessel.
12 So that by placing this requirement in the
13 standard, it puts designers of facilities on notice they
14 have got to design the vessels so that they can be
15 vented. And you can vent virtually any vessel,
16 including this room.
17 I urge the membership to vote for the
18 proposal.
19 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
20 Microphone 5, please.
21 MARCELO HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH
22 International in support of the motion.
23 I want to read a couple of the negatives
24 that were put. One negative by Mr. McClellan says the
25 statement by the committee excludes all enclosures

78

♀

1 leaving the statement in places both life and property
2 at risk when it could be protected.
3 Mr. Meyers says if the committee's reason
4 for rejecting there's not sufficient evidence that
5 explosion venting is needed for large silos, the
6 committee could have prevented -- required venting for

7 other protection on smaller vessels.
8 But what the committee did is just kick the
9 ball down. This is what it's been doing in all of these
10 proposals that Dr. Ural has been putting forward. The
11 committee is attempting to not address the fire safety
12 issue.
13 I urge this body to support the motion and
14 approve and get some change. If the silos cannot all be
15 vented in accordance with NFPA 68, and Mr. Cholin said
16 they can, then we will work in the future to get some
17 change in some way. But we need the protection because
18 this is a fire safety issue. Please support the motion.
19 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
20 Microphone 5, please.
21 BILL STEVENSON: My name is Bill Stevenson,
22 my company is CV Technology. I'm speaking in favor of
23 the motion.
24 Here is an area where the technical
25 committee for 61 really has I think a valid point. And

♀
1 I'm speaking against him on this. I know there's going
2 to be confusion. But it really is true that there are
3 existing facilities, older facilities, large concrete
4 silos not strong enough to protect, can't be reinforced
5 or indoor silos can't get the venting to the outside
6 because of structural problems or interferences.
7 And so the existing language in the existing
8 structure I think has merit and has a place in the
9 document. The problem is that this is not a universal.
10 There are times, particularly in new construction, where
11 stronger language requiring venting would be
12 appropriate.
13 And I think the overlying consideration
14 which my predecessor at the microphone stated quite well
15 and eloquently, we really do have a risk and we really
16 do need to add it and we can't just keep kicking the can
17 down the street. Thank you very much.
18 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
19 Microphone 8, please.
20 JIM MANESS: My name is Jim Maness. I'm
21 speaking against the motion. I'm with the National
22 Grain & Feed Association and Grain Elevator and
23 Processing Society regarding this issue.
24 The data that was referenced for 500 cubic
25 meters was stated it was collected and done under NFPA

♀
1 research. In fact, I was present during the testing of
2 500 cubic meter silos that was tested and I think there
3 were six data points that one 500 cubic meter silo and
4 the seventh one the silo blew apart.
5 So I doubt that that's an overwhelming
6 amount of data or convincing information that it's a
7 valid use of it.
8 Not only that, they were taking data from
9 20- and 60-cubic meter vessels, using that and the 500
10 cubic meter vessel and the 236 that we also sponsored
11 that research for.
12 The only reason 236 worked is we built it
13 three or four times stronger than any we had ever done
14 before. And even when you saw that 50, it was a jet
15 type event. If anything was near it, it would have been
16 a major problem with the jet venting out of a 236-meter

17 silo.
18 So there is overwhelming information that
19 says we should be doing these smaller silos, like 236 or
20 500 cubic meters. There's a lot of questions that still
21 need to be answered and we're still investigating the
22 silo venting issue.
23 I know that 68 has been rewritten,
24 reformulated. They took data. They got together with I
25 believe the European group and compared data and

81

1 formulas. And yet those formulas --
2 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: One minute.
3 JIM MANESS: -- when they were applied to
4 operations have not proven them to work. Thank you,
5 sir.
6 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
7 Microphone 5, please.
8 ERDEM URAL: Erdem Ural speaking for the
9 motion. What Mr. Maness said is actually supporting my
10 statement. So I think there is hope that he and I will
11 start working together soon.
12 There are a couple of things he said. There
13 was one test where there was a flame jet ignition where
14 the very large pressures were produced and the enclosure
15 was damaged. That's true. That's a well known fact.
16 And in fact, that's why we have the
17 explosion isolation requirements in the other standards.
18 That's why we have it in 654. That's why it's required
19 in NFPA 69 and that's why I have a NITMAN on this
20 committee that we'll discuss later on.
21 If you let the flame come in as a flame jet
22 into an enclosure, nothing works. Explosion suppression
23 doesn't work. Explosion venting doesn't work. So you
24 don't let it happen. You put explosion isolation
25 systems.

82

1 He also mentioned that the methodology in
2 NFPA 68 have been calibrated using data from smaller
3 enclosures, too. That is true. The fact is I was
4 partly responsible for that or maybe I take credit for
5 developing that methodology.
6 The committee has taken scientific method,
7 came up postulated sort of a way to calculate pressure
8 in a vented explosion and come up with simple
9 correlations and then tested that. And one of the
10 parameters in the correlation is the size of the
11 enclosure and the strength of the enclosure.
12 And then we took all the available data
13 going from I forgot what's the smaller size all way up
14 to 500 cubic meters and we have a lot of predicted
15 versus actual in the experiment and that has been
16 reproduced in your -- in your ROC reports for this.
17 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: One minute.
18 ERDEM URAL: It shows that we're in
19 agreement. The methodology captures all the salient
20 features for small vessels as well as large vessels.
21 Tests have been up to 500 cubic meters and that's why
22 the committee feels comfortable enough to extrapolate it
23 to 10,000 cubic meters.
24 So let's not -- let's give up the double
25 talk, a consensus that methodology is good for one

83

standard and not good for the other standards. NFPA explosion protection systems committee specialize on explosion venting. They are specialists in that area and let's rely on their judgment and on the recommendation.

So I strongly urge you to support this motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Microphone 8, please.

JIM MANESS: Jim Maness, National Grain & Feed Association and Grain Elevator and Processing Society speaking against the motion.

I want to point out to everyone that in our industry, these kinds of silos that we talked about, 500, 236, they are very small silos. We have silos that are 60,000 to a hundred 20,000 cubic meters.

So extrapolating data from a 20 cubic meter vessel to even if the 500 were 500 cubic meter vessel was valid, is highly suspect if you can extrapolate that data and that we have any confidence we can really do that sort of thing.

So in practice, the size and scope of our silos in our structures are much greater than what Mr. Ural and others have indicated.

COMMITTEE CHAIR BUJEWSKI: Mr. Chair? Okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Microphone 5, please.

ERDEM URAL: Again, Mr. Maness in a way speaks to my point. It's not quite true that we are using 20 meter data to do venting for. We have do venting for large silos.

We are saying that we have data up to 500 cubic meters and the smallest size used here is 20 cubic meters. And then the methodology works for all the things in between and we don't see any differentiation based on the size.

So if Mr. Maness wants or the committee wants to be super careful and not to believe this methodology about 500 cubic meters, than we are saying don't design any facilities larger than 500 cubic meters unless you have data or until you have data.

But we're also saying the specialists committee on this through the consensus process said you can use it up to 10,000 cubic meters, use it. And then the committee statement says any venting is beneficial. So use it.

So in their conclusion you can design your vessel with smaller silos or vents. You can design it with a smaller LORD and you can design them to resist higher pressures.

I just investigated a grain elevator explosion and also another grain elevator explosion you always see these things rupture and they rupture, they let the flame go away from it. Where do the flames go? Toward to where the workers are. They burn the workers. They kill them and they destroy the silo. If the workers don't get burned, they have some things fall on them and they die because of that. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.

Microphone 2.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Point of order. We would appreciate it if the last speaker would identify himself and his position on the motion.
ERDEM URAL: Thank you for the reminder. It's Erdem Ural speaking for the motion.
PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
Microphone 1.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I call the question.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.
PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: We have a motion and second on the floor to call the question to close the debate.
Please record your votes, one in favor of the motion or two opposed to the motion.

Five seconds. Balloting is closed. Motion passes.
We'll proceed to the vote. The motion on the floor is to accept Comment 61-13.
Please record your votes, one in favor of the motion accept or two opposed to the motion reject.
Five seconds. Balloting is closed. Motion passes.
Let's proceed to the discussion on Certified Amending Motion 61-10 and 61-10 and of 161-11.
ERDEM URAL: Mr. Chair, I have a question before I proceed. During the break, Mr. Cholin asked me to go back to the one that I changed my -- I didn't pursue earlier. Since he and I don't agree very often, I at least would ask if I am allowed to do that.
PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Give me a second, please. Yes, we will allow that. Which one do you want to go back to?
ERDEM URAL: May I ask Mr. Cholin to make the motion?
PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: No.
ERDEM URAL: No? Just one moment, please. They are pretty much identical. Why don't we start with 61-6, accept Comment 61-9?
PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: The motion on

the floor is to accept Comment 61-9. Is there a second? We have a second.
Please proceed.
ERDEM URAL: This motion is trying to bring to NFPA 61 what most other dust standards have. Mainly --
PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Please identify yourself.
ERDEM URAL: I'm sorry. It's Erdem Ural speaking for the motion.
It creates a new chapter called general requirements. So that chapter is in 654. It's in 664 and other standards as well.
So the general requirements you can see if you look at the ROP 61-20 the new chapter is reproduced there. It has guidance for requirements for process and facility design requirements for processing hazard analysis, requirements for management of change, requirements for incident investigation, requirements

20 for pneumatic conveying system design, requirements for
21 objectives for life safety, structural integrity and
22 mission continuity. And lastly, it has section for
23 compliance options.
24 So I did not write this. I just copied it
25 from the other standard. So by adopting in here, they

88

♀

1 are accepting this motion here will give the users the
2 tool to have that information available to them in front
3 of them.
4 The committee actually agreed with this in
5 principal. They put some of it in sort of -- one minute
6 left -- roundabout way saying that.
7 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: One minute.
8 ERDEM URAL: Saying that you can go look at
9 the NFPA 654, that's the annex material. So I'll stop
10 here. I urge you to support this motion and thank you
11 for your attention.
12 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
13 Mr. Bujewski, would you like to present the
14 committee's position on this?
15 COMMITTEE CHAIR BUJEWSKI: During the ROP
16 stages it was all new material for the agricultural dust
17 committee. The proposal was rejected 26 to 1 by the
18 committee.
19 But a task force was formed at that time to
20 write material to possibly put in the annex of the ROC
21 stage. The annex material was added to equivalency
22 clause to state it would be acceptable to do process
23 hazard analysis type of analysis under the equivalency
24 clause.
25 Then in the ROC stage the committee

89

♀

1 reaffirmed its position by a vote of 23 to 3 and the
2 consensus was this process is better served in the new
3 fundamental of dust committee rather than adding
4 something to the agricultural dust committee standard at
5 this time.
6 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you, Mr.
7 Bujewski.
8 With that, we'll open the debate on the
9 motion. Please provide your name, affiliation and
10 whether you're speaking in support of or against the
11 motion.
12 Microphone 1, please.
13 JOHN CHOLIN: Mr. Chair, my name is John
14 Cholin from JM Cholin Consultants and I'm speaking in
15 favor of the motion.
16 The information and proposal that Dr. Ural
17 has provided to this committee is the product of close
18 to 20 years of accumulated analysis and work in the
19 combustible dust community to develop a set of
20 enforceable criteria that lead the operator, the owner
21 of the facility to manage the hazard in accordance to
22 the commonly accepted practices largely derived from
23 much of the OSHA PSM standard.
24 This language has a proven track record of
25 working. It works in numerous other industries. And

90

♀

1 while you have heard that agricultural products are
2 somehow very, very unique, quite frankly, if you believe

3 that, I've got a bridge across the east river I can sell
4 you shares in.
5 Ag products are essentially starches.
6 That's a one/four polymer of glucose. Wood is primarily
7 cellulous. That's a one/five polymer of glucose. Many
8 of your plastics are hydrocarbons. CH20 is their
9 analogous formula. Their combustion characteristics are
10 enormously similar when you get down to the same
11 particle size.
12 So I urge the membership to embrace the
13 proposal made by Dr. Ural.
14 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
15 Microphone 8.
16 MARK FLEISHAKER: My name is Mark Fleishaker
17 behalf of Renewable Fuels Association and Natural Grain
18 & Feed association. This is another --
19 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Speaking for or
20 against?
21 MARK FLEISHAKER: Speaking against the
22 motion.
23 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
24 MARK FLEISHAKER: I'm speaking against the
25 motion. This is simply an attempt to cram down 654 onto

1 NFPA 61 while avoiding the consensus nature of the
2 process.
3 As the chairman of the committee has already
4 reported, the committee is looking carefully at it and
5 there is a separate committee that's been created to
6 evaluate this. The whole purpose of consensus, of a
7 consensus policy making organization or a consensus
8 standard organization is to have an agreement, a broad
9 agreement among the participants.
10 Cramming something like this down the
11 throats of a committee that voted against it 26 to 1, I
12 believe, and 23 to 3 the second time is going to create
13 a negative ability to drive consensus throughout the
14 whole organization and I would encourage the group to
15 reject it at this point.
16 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
17 Microphone 2.
18 MARCELO HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GHB
19 International, in support of the motion.
20 I want to read one more time like I read
21 before the text of the two standards.
22 654 standard provision applies after
23 manufacturing, processing and handling of combustible
24 particulate solid.
25 61 standard prevention of fires and dust

1 explosion and agricultural food processing facilities.
2 The only difference is that 61 represents a
3 subcategory of what is covered in 654. Agricultural
4 dusts are combustible dusts are dust made with mostly
5 cellulosic materials, organic materials and very
6 similar.
7 Mr. Cholin explained to you some of the
8 chemical terms. They are very similar. They are just
9 one subcategory of what -- of what the type of dust that
10 are covered by 654. They should have similar
11 requirements.
12 This committee is trying to prevent

13 something that is a life safety issue. Please support
14 the proposal. Thank you.
15 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
16 Microphone 8, please.
17 NICK THIELEN: Thank you. Nick Thielen,
18 General Mills. I'm against the motion. I'm also an
19 NFPA 61 committee member.
20 Adding complexity to a problem does not make
21 it safer. A simple grain standard that's set by OSHA
22 clearly made many of our grain facilities much safer, a
23 simple straightforward and clearly defined requirement.
24 What this does is makes an extremely complex
25 process be required and an ongoing process be required

93

♀
1 based on an NFPA document.
2 OSHA would dictate a number of these
3 requirements, such as incident investigation. Adding
4 this to the NFPA documents does nothing for improving
5 safety at all.
6 PHA a very complicated process. I've run a
7 number of them. It has a great deal of value when you
8 have a complex system that you're trying to find what
9 the risks are.
10 But when you look at a grain facility or a
11 food facility, you've got very clear known issues. You
12 don't need to run through a meeting with five or six
13 people to talk about the fact that you're conveying
14 grain from one point to another. It doesn't need to be
15 discussed. It doesn't add anything to make this safer.
16 And I ask everybody to reject this. It's
17 just adding complexity. And in fact, because people
18 will avoid using this, it will mean that some people
19 will actually leave their facilities less safe, not more
20 safe. Thank you.
21 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
22 Microphone 9, please.
23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My name is
24 (inaudible). I represent Northwest Insurance Company.
25 I'd like to make a statement.

94

♀
1 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: For or against?
2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: For the motion.
3 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'd like to make a
5 brief observation. The consensus does not stop at the
6 committee level. And this is the action members in this
7 room is part consensus method. Thank you.
8 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
9 Microphone 5, please.
10 BILL STEVENSON: My name is Bill Stevenson.
11 My company is CV Technology. I'm speaking in favor of
12 the motion.
13 I made a statement early in this afternoon
14 session. I'd like to repeat that statement. That is
15 this. This industry, food and grain, food processing
16 and agricultural products industry, in aggregate has the
17 worst safety record with regard to dust explosion in
18 American industry. You don't have to take my word for
19 that. I invite to invite you to visit the CSB website
20 CSB.gov and see for yourself. The data is there. I'm
21 stating a fact.
22 So when I hear that the vote was 26 to 1 or

23 whatever it was, it just means that the committee in
24 general has convinced themselves that everything is
25 okay.

95

♀
1 Everything is not okay, folks. There are
2 problems in this industry. This standard is part of the
3 problem. You need to make this standard stronger. This
4 is too weak. It is too vague. And this particular
5 discussion right now is a case study in that problem.
6 The equivalency clause is going to be
7 substituted for a requirement for things like management
8 of change and PHA and so forth. How is anybody going to
9 make that bridge? I couldn't make that bridge and I'm
10 in this business. It's too vague. You need to be more
11 specific.
12 Think about the people that need to use this
13 information to provide safety for their facilities and
14 for their people. Put yourself in their shoes. What
15 are they supposed to do? They don't know. They are
16 looking to you for help. They are looking for NFPA for
17 help. How is OSHA supposed to enforce this document?
18 It's too vague. You need to fix it. Thank you very
19 much.
20 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
21 Microphone 8.
22 JESS McCLUER: My name is Jess McCluer,
23 National Grain & Feed Association. I also serve on the
24 NFPA 61 committee.
25 I'm obviously opposed to this motion. One

96

♀
1 of the reasons is for the PHA, the process hazard
2 analysis, I don't think everyone takes into account the
3 fact that a majority of the companies, majority of the
4 members of our association and the majority of those
5 companies within the grain handling, the grain feeding
6 processing industry are small businesses, all right?
7 These are small businesses. Many have fewer ten
8 employees and they do not have the resources. They do
9 not have the staff. They do not have the technical
10 capability to be able to implement much of what has been
11 put in here.
12 I think it's been -- what has been discussed
13 this came directly from 654 here into 61 and I think
14 that it explains why the committee whom the trade groups
15 that have the representatives on the committee were
16 opposed to it.
17 I think that's something that needs to be
18 taken into account on the size of the industry and the
19 capabilities they would have to implement this. Thank
20 you.
21 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
22 Microphone 1.
23 MR. CHOLIN: Mr. Chair, my name is John
24 Cholan from JM Cholin Consultants. I'm speaking in
25 favor of the motion.

97

♀
1 It's been alleged that this addition would
2 somehow make facilities less safe. How is a
3 requirement, an enforceable requirement that the person
4 responsible for the facility, tour the facility,
5 evaluate whether or not there's a hazard and document

6 the results, how does that make the facility less safe?
7 How does a requirement that you manage
8 change, not just let it happen, how does that make the
9 facility less safe?
10 How does a requirement that you investigate
11 incidents to find out what their causes were and how
12 they can be prevented, how does that make the facility
13 less safe?
14 Everything in this section that Dr. Ural has
15 proposed has been hammered out for 20 years. Almost a
16 quarter of my clients are Ag dust handling facilities.
17 They refuse to let me use 61 because 61 is so weak. I
18 wind up having to use the requirements in 664 and 654 in
19 order to achieve their loss protection objectives and
20 life safety objectives.
21 I urge the membership to do what is right,
22 not what is expedient, and support the proposal.
23 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
24 COMMITTEE CHAIR BUJEWSKI: Mr. Chair.
25 Again, speaking against the motion, a process hazard

♀
1 analysis is certainly a good tool to use for chemical
2 process industries. 654 was primarily developed for the
3 chemical processing industries and as such they have
4 adopted process hazard analysis.
5 The hazards associated with agricultural
6 dust industry are well known, the processes are well
7 known. To add another layer of unnecessary management
8 or review only complicates the process from the
9 agricultural dust standpoint.
10 So the committee, again, does not feel that
11 a process hazard analysis is necessary in the
12 agricultural dust standard. However, the new
13 fundamentals dust standard it would be appropriate to
14 have process hazard analysis so that you could evaluate
15 dust and combustible dust that aren't well known,
16 processes that aren't familiar, process hazard analysis
17 would be very good to use for that type of a situation.
18 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Is there any
19 further discussion on motion 61-6 to accept Comment
20 61-9?
21 Seeing none, before we vote, let me restate
22 the motion. The motion on the floor is to accept
23 Comment 61-9.
24 Please record your vote, one in favor of the
25 motion accept or two opposed to the motion reject.

♀
1 Five seconds. Balloting is closed. Motion
2 passes.
3 Let's proceed to discussion on certified
4 amending motion 61-8 and 61-9. I'm sorry. Wrong one.
5 We've already been there.
6 Let's proceed to the discussion on certified
7 amending motion 61-10 and 61-11.
8 ERDEM URAL: Erdem Ural. I make a motion to
9 accept proposal number 61-23.
10 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Is there a
11 second? I hear a second. There's motion on the floor
12 to accept 61-23.
13 Mr. Bujewski, do you have committee comment?
14 Sorry. Proceed to make your motion.
15 ERDEM URAL: Mr. Bujewski or me?

16 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: You.
17 ERDEM URAL: Okay. This motion is seeking
18 to create a new chapter on exercising performance based
19 design option. NFPA standards for the last 10, 20 years
20 started still includes the performance portion. But for
21 those who think this portion is more like the clown
22 shoes, try to come up with their own option of
23 performance based design. So this chapter discusses,
24 just tells you how to implement that.
25 Again, I did not write this chapter. I

100

♀
1 copied it from one of the NFPA standards and including
2 is not going to hurt anybody either one way or another.
3 And the committee opinion was although they
4 rejected, the committee rejected this proposal, they
5 sort of agreed in principal because they tried to
6 include it, sneak it through the annex saying that well,
7 you can go use the chapter in 654.
8 So doing it that way, first of all, most
9 people won't see it in the annex because a lot of people
10 don't read the annex material. And secondly, then they
11 will have to go out and buy a copy of 654 which is good
12 for NFPA, but not always good for people.
13 So I don't envision anybody will be
14 objecting including this chapter. So I urge you to
15 support this proposal.
16 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
17 Mr. Bujewski, would you like to state the
18 committee's position?
19 COMMITTEE CHAIR BUJEWSKI: Again, just
20 because NFPA 654 committee believes performance based
21 design should be in their standard does not necessarily
22 mean that agricultural dust standard should adopt it,
23 nor does any other NFPA standard have to adopt
24 performance based design if it's not appropriate for
25 that standard.

101

♀
1 The committee did review it and the
2 committee did accept the proposal in principal by a vote
3 26 to 1 and as such added annex material to the
4 equivalency clause that says if you want to do
5 performance based design, you can. But we're not going
6 to make the standard significantly longer by adding a
7 lot of information of how you do a performance based
8 design.
9 The committee reaffirmed its position by a
10 vote of 23 to 3 at the ROC stage and also said it would
11 again be more appropriate to have this language in the
12 fundamentals of dust committees and not in the
13 agricultural dust standard.
14 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: That will open
15 up the debate on the motion. Please provide your name
16 and affiliation and whether you're speaking in support
17 of or against the motion.
18 JOHN CHOLIN: Mr. Chair, my name is John
19 Cholin, JM Cholin Consultants and I'm speaking in favor
20 of the motion.
21 Performance based designed is a reality.
22 It's a reality that addresses the fact that a bunch of
23 gray-haired old guys sitting in the committee room
24 wondering if they are going to finish their work before
25 their plane leaves can't conceive of all the problems

and all the circumstances that exist out there in the real world.

The reality is is that we found in other documents 654 and 664 that it's necessary to provide the design of the facility with the latitude to invent and to come up with designs that were not necessarily anticipated by the technical committee.

But if you're going to give someone the license to invent, then you've got to establish enforceable rules about what you consider to be responsible design versus irresponsible use of a very vague equivalency clause that is subject to the whim of a code enforcement official who may not be sufficiently expert in the hazard that you're dealing with to make an informed decision.

This chapter has served the wood working community and the combustible dust community very well for over 12 years. It's time that we expand its utility to other occupancy standards. I urge the membership to support the motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.

Microphone 5, please.

BILL STEVENSON: My name is Bill Stevenson, my company is CV Technology and I'm speaking in favor of the motion.

We spoke a short while ago, debated a short while ago the difficulties involved in venting large silos and the limitations of the data that we have available for vent size.

Dr. Ural explained the 68 committee's work on expanding it to 10,000 cubic meters. Mr. Maness explained that some of the silos are well over a hundred thousand cubic meters. I can't think of a better place to use performance based design in a situation such as that.

I would urge the committee to consider. They have already accepted the idea in principal by putting in the annex, all you need to do in my opinion is move it up to the front and you can even still say, it shall be permitted to use performance based design approach, see NFPA 654 for details. It doesn't need to expand the documents as was alluded to.

PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.

Microphone 8.

ANTHONY YOUNG: My name is Anthony Young and I'm against the motion. And I just wanted to point out to Mr. Cholin that the reason I'll never attend another seminar where he's speaking is because of his attitude specifically toward members of 61.

The information is in the annex. That's

where it needs to be. It's as simple as that.

PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.

Any other discussion? Microphone 8.

NICK THIELAN: Yeah. Nick Thielan, General Mills, NFPA 61. I'd like to talk against this.

Again, the purpose of 61 is to have a simple, straightforward document to help people in the food business protect their risk. All of this other

9 stuff that keeps adding does nothing to improve that.
10 All it does is add extra information, makes it harder
11 for a person who is not technically competent, like many
12 of the people in this room, to find the information they
13 need to apply the information they need to protect their
14 facilities.
15 I'm not necessarily against the idea of
16 performance based design criteria, but I don't believe
17 it belongs in the middle of the standard. I believe
18 it's better to have it in the annex or in a place where
19 somebody can go find it if they want later.
20 And again, I have to say this is an
21 extraneous information that makes it harder for somebody
22 to implement this. Thank you.
23 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
24 Microphone 8.
25 JIM MANESS: Jim Maness, National Grain &

105

♀
1 Feed Association and Grain Elevator Processing Society.
2 And I'm speaking against the motion.
3 Well, I want to point out that I agree with
4 the gentleman that just spoke that members in this
5 industry are not Ph.D's. They don't design explosion
6 suppression and venting systems and so forth.
7 They do handle grain. They understand their
8 material pretty well and they understand the hazards.
9 And Mr. Stevenson keeps beating on the
10 industry saying they are the worst industry in the
11 business. That's not true. You can look at the OSHA
12 review of our standard when it came up for review. OSHA
13 overwhelming said we think there's been tremendous
14 improvement in this industry and in reducing dust
15 explosions.
16 The union, who was also part of that review
17 process also agreed that our industry has made
18 tremendous improvements in safety in our facilities.
19 If you look at the incident rate for our
20 facility, it's way down. You look at the dust explosion
21 fatalities and injuries, they are tremendously down over
22 the last 25 to 30 years.
23 So these guys who are saying these things
24 have not looked at the proper data. They are looking at
25 the Chemical Safety Board information that we're not

106

♀
1 even -- I believe it was mostly compiled from internet
2 reviews, not from compiled incident rates that go on and
3 harm the industry.
4 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: One minute.
5 JIM MANESS: The data is clearly available
6 from the Kansas State University compiled incident rate
7 and it shows that we have made tremendous improvements
8 in this industry.
9 What we're seeing going on here is a 654
10 committee who's wanting to take over all the standards.
11 They are wanting to inject their will on all the
12 committees and they want to make a standard process
13 extremely complex.
14 We're going to see users out there
15 scratching their heads and maybe some 654 people getting
16 some additional work. I think that's what's really
17 going on here.
18 And what you really need to do is look at

19 this and make us -- let us have a standard that people
20 in the field can understand, people can implement
21 without having to hire all these people from 654 to do
22 complex things. Thank you.
23 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
24 COMMITTEE CHAIR BUJEWSKI: Mr. Chair?
25 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Microphone 5,

107

♀
1 please.
2 ERDEM URAL: I just wanted to point out --
3 Erdem Ural speaking for the motion. I wanted to point
4 out I think our discussions sort of deviated here.
5 This chapter is not taking anything away
6 from the prescriptive chapters. So anybody who wants to
7 use the prescriptive chapters, the proposed chapter
8 doesn't affect that.
9 The proposed chapter only provides
10 information and requirements if you choose to pursue
11 other avenues. For example, General Mills maybe do
12 better, be more cost effective doing the performance
13 based design. And in that case, they would use this
14 chapter and they would design equivalent or even better
15 protection.
16 And Mr. Maness is right. There has been a
17 significant improvement in the history of the explosions
18 and deaths in the grain industry. In the seventies
19 there has been a huge, lots of losses. It was totally
20 irresponsible designs.
21 And wit doesn't really pertain to the
22 discussion here. The discussion here is giving the
23 users another tool, another option and make your
24 businesses more competitive, more cost effective.
25 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.

108

♀
1 Microphone 1.
2 JOHN CHOLIN: John Cholin from JM Cholin
3 Consultants speaking in favor of the motion.
4 I would take issue with the representation
5 that the people that are working in the agricultural
6 products business are somehow intellectually incapable
7 or intellectually inferior to their counterparts in
8 other industries.
9 I've had the privilege of working for a lot
10 of agricultural products firms and their people are just
11 as sharp as anybody else.
12 But Dr. Ural made an extremely important
13 point. Performance based design and this particular
14 chapter gives the owner/operator a framework in which
15 they can address unique or challenging circumstances in
16 a manner that is enforceable that a statutory code
17 enforcement official can't by under whim just decide not
18 to accept the design.
19 It's a proven framework that is literally
20 derived from NFPA 101. It works. It has been working
21 for the past 12 years.
22 And the reality is is that the overwhelming
23 majority of my clients who take advantage of performance
24 based design wind up saving oftentimes hundreds of
25 thousands of dollars by developing approaches that are

109

♀
1 more cost effective and yet achieve the life safety

2 objectives and mission continuity objectives of the
3 standard.
4 I urge the membership to vote in favor of
5 the proposal.
6 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
7 Microphone 2.
8 WILLIAM FISKE: Mr. Chairman, I'm Bill
9 Fiske. I call the question.
10 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Motion on the
11 floor and second to call the question to close debate.
12 Please record your vote, one in favor of the
13 motion or accept or two oppose the motion reject.
14 Five seconds. Balloting is closed. Motion
15 passes.
16 We'll proceed to the motion. Before we do,
17 let me restate the motion on the floor which is to
18 accept proposal 61-23.
19 Please record your vote, one in favor of the
20 motion accept or two opposed to the motion reject.
21 Five seconds. Balloting is closed. Motion
22 passes.
23 Let's now proceed to the discussion on
24 certified amending motion 61-12 and 61-13.
25 Microphone 5, please.

♀
1 ERDEM URAL: Erdem Ural. I make a motion to
2 accept proposal 61-26.
3 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: There's a
4 motion on the floor to accept proposal 61-26. Is there
5 a second? We have a second.
6 Please proceed.
7 ERDEM URAL: This proposal is addressing the
8 very problem that Mr. Maness has pointed out. He said
9 they have tested a silo and when the flame came as a
10 turbulent jet, then things were so crazy explosion
11 venting didn't work and the silo burst. So that's from
12 Mr. Maness' note.
13 Most other standards at NFPA occupancy
14 standards require at least consideration for explosion
15 isolation. NFPA 69 explosion protocols document also
16 makes a requirement for explosion isolation because if
17 you let things go from one enclosure to another, then
18 none of the protection methods work. Then things go out
19 of control and you are headed to catastrophe.
20 NFPA 68, the explosion venting document says
21 you have to have explosion isolation. Otherwise, you
22 are going to -- venting is not going to work.
23 So I strongly -- also the committee has
24 recognized the importance of this and they didn't reject
25 this proposal in the comment phase, but instead they

♀
1 decided to vote. It's coming to one second so I'm going
2 to pause here for a second to one minute.
3 So the thing I was going to say is we can --
4 the committee put it on hold. So it's going to come in
5 as a proposal in the next cycle. So we can let things
6 sleep for five more years or we can accept this and then
7 the committee maybe put some fire under the seats of the
8 committee, then the committee can, if they can't live
9 with it, come up with a more expedient solution such as
10 TIA.
11 I have, as I said, I have investigated

12 recently grain elevator explosion and explosion
13 isolation is partially responsible for the death of the
14 workers. Thank you.
15 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
16 Mr. Bujewski, would you like to present the
17 committee's position?
18 COMMITTEE CHAIR BUJEWSKI: This proposal is
19 currently on hold as of the ROC meeting because it could
20 require substantial rewriting of the standard. And it
21 may well be covered in the new fundamentals of dust
22 standard.
23 There's nothing in the proposal that would
24 require immediate action by the committee. There's
25 nothing that's going to substantially change the safety

1 or the fire protection at grain handling facilities or
2 food facilities.
3 So the committee felt it was certainly
4 appropriate to put it on hold at this time and it will
5 be addressed next time. Or it will be addressed by
6 fundamentals of dust committee which is currently being
7 developed right now.
8 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you, Mr.
9 Bujewski.
10 With that, we'll open up debate on the
11 motion. Please provide your name and affiliation and
12 whether you're speaking in support or against the
13 motion.
14 Microphone 5, please.
15 ERDEM URAL: Erdem Ural speaking for the
16 motion.
17 Again, I'd like to point to your attention
18 of existing facilities versus new designs. We are all
19 more tolerant, more understanding for existing
20 facilities. But if we wait for another committee cycle
21 for this thing to be adopted or wait for the
22 fundamentals committee and then the correlating
23 committee to complete their acts, we may be talking
24 about five, ten years.
25 Think, before you vote against this motion,

1 think about how many facilities will be built, designed
2 and built in these upcoming years and how many deaths
3 could have been prevented by your vote here.
4 If there is something not livable within the
5 proposal, the committee has always the option of acting
6 quickly and coming up with a TIA.
7 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
8 Microphone 5.
9 MARCELO HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GB
10 International, in favor of the motion.
11 I'm really confused as to how staff would
12 have permitted this to occur. A proposal was put in,
13 which of course proposal presents new material, then the
14 proposal was rejected. A comment was put in to accept
15 the proposal. The comment was held. You only hold new
16 material that's introduced between the proposal and the
17 comment.
18 This is ridiculous. This should have been
19 accepted or this is the way the process should have
20 worked. How can you hold something that says accept
21 what was proposed in the proposal stage?

22 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
23 Microphone 1.
24 JIM CHOLIN: Jim Cholin from JM Cholin
25 Consultants. I'm speaking in favor of the motion.

114

♀
1 I want the membership to know when I walk
2 onto a job site, whether it's an ag dust, metal dust,
3 plastic dust, wood dust or recycled sewage dust, I
4 basically use the criteria that are listed out in Dr.
5 Ural's proposal as one my first steps of developing the
6 hazard management strategy.
7 It works. And I can't fathom why the
8 technical committee would not want this information
9 available to the users of their document. I urge the
10 membership to vote in favor of the motion.
11 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
12 Microphone 5.
13 BILL STEVENSON: My name is Bill Stevenson.
14 My company is CV Technology. I'm speaking in favor of
15 the motion.
16 Let me give an example of why putting
17 something like isolation in as an annex item is weak and
18 my arguments this afternoon have been that 61 is a weak
19 document and it needs to be strengthened.
20 I have Customer A. Customer A makes food
21 product and they have evaluated their risks, established
22 their own internal committee, determined that
23 propagation could occur and have elected to isolate.
24 I have Customer B, direct competitor, looks
25 me right in the eye and says -- this is a true story --

115

♀
1 I don't have to provide isolation because it's optional.
2 It's in the annex. It's not mandatory. Folks, this is
3 wrong.
4 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: One minute.
5 BILL STEVENSON: Thank you. Isolation
6 provides a measurable level of safety and the lack of it
7 provides a measurable level of risk to the process and
8 to the people concerned.
9 You do a disservice to yourself and your
10 industry to by ignoring this problem and by not putting
11 this material in the mandatory section of the document.
12 Thank you very much.
13 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
14 Is there any other discussion?
15 Mr. Bujewski?
16 COMMITTEE CHAIR BUJEWSKI: Mr. Chair,
17 isolation is used extensively in the wood working
18 industry. It's used in the plastics industry. It's not
19 used in the agricultural dust industry. There's been no
20 data that shows that isolation is necessary in the
21 agricultural dust industry.
22 I take exception to Mr. Cholin's comments
23 that the committee did not work hard on every single
24 proposal. We did. Some of the other persons supporting
25 the motion were also free to submit proposals to the

116

♀
1 committee or even make comments in the comments stage,
2 but they did not. Instead they chose to make comments
3 here.
4 Had they made comment here, maybe the

5 committee would have addressed those and maybe there
6 would be a different outcome.
7 But we have to follow what's given to us as
8 a proposal or a comment. We can't just make things up.
9 That's the way the committee works.
10 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you,
11 Mr. Chair.
12 Before we vote, let me restate the motion.
13 The motion on the floor is to accept Proposal 61-26.
14 Please record your votes, one in favor of
15 the motion accept or two opposed to the motion reject.
16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sir, sir.
17 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Sorry. Didn't
18 see you. Microphone 6, please.
19 FRED SANDS: My name is Fred Sands. I'm
20 from Liberty Mutual Insurance Company and this is my
21 first voting session. I'm sure some of you can
22 appreciate how I feel.
23 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Are you
24 speaking for or against the motion?
25 FRED SANDS: I'm speaking against the

♀
1 motion.
2 I'm assuming that the committee is made up
3 of -- I'm assuming it's balanced for one thing and I'm
4 assuming they are made of experts in the field.
5 If they have chosen to keep this standard
6 and it seems to be unfair that a group here is basically
7 rewriting the standard over their heads. And unless the
8 group here has a lot more expertise here, I don't
9 believe we should be overruling the opinion of the
10 committee.
11 So I have great sympathy for their position.
12 I have no doubt from an engineering perspective that
13 some of these proposals are very sound. But I think
14 that committee has chosen to keep their standards simple
15 and basic for the people that use them. And I think we
16 should take that into consideration.
17 Again, unless we have a lot of real experts
18 in this field, I think we're doing the whole process a
19 disservice. Thank you.
20 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
21 Microphone 5, please.
22 ERDEM URAL: Erdem Ural speaking for the
23 motion.
24 The response to the gentleman from Liberty
25 Mutual, the committee is balanced perhaps according the

♀
1 NFPA definition. But NFPA definition is not always
2 right because NFPA people who serve who are
3 representatives of the companies, they retire, and when
4 they retire, they get appointed as the special experts.
5 The committee retains them.
6 So all actuality that shifts the balance of
7 the committee, but NFPA process doesn't capture there's
8 a shift. That's why NFPA process needs to be improved.
9 So let's put that aside.
10 Also this committee is the only committee
11 that I serve on as a lobbyist as a member. So let's put
12 that aside, too.
13 The question was the -- I lost my train of
14 thought. Oh, Mr. Bujewski was saying that these are all

15 unfair. They came at us the last minute.
16 That's not true. The proposal was submitted
17 in time according to the NFPA process. The committee
18 acted on it.
19 And then I didn't like the outcome. I
20 submitted as a comment. Again, that was on time
21 accepted and logged by NFPA. So maybe he's also arguing
22 that NFPA process needs to be improved. But your
23 positive affirmative vote on this motion will save a lot
24 of lives and you will sleep better.
25 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: One minute.

119

♀
1 ERDEM URAL: I hope you will vote for this
2 proposal.
3 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
4 Microphone 6, please.
5 FRED SANDS: Thank you. I don't want to
6 continue --
7 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Name and
8 affiliation, please.
9 FRED SANDS: Fred Sands of Liberty Mutual.
10 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Speaking for or
11 against the motion?
12 FRED SANDS: Against. And I don't want to
13 continue this on like I've seen so many of the others,
14 but I think that from an engineering point of view, and
15 they are only like half a dozen people that are speaking
16 for this, and they are all probably great engineers and
17 there may be a lot of excellent sound engineering
18 judgment.
19 I still say we should respect the opinion of
20 the committee that wants to keep it simple. And then to
21 question the whole process by saying that the committee
22 is not -- by questioning whether or not they are
23 balanced, I think is -- I think is now we're going off
24 in into left field.
25 And after this whole process is over, I

120

♀
1 intend to go back to the microphone and make a motion to
2 reconsider the whole report and send the whole report
3 back to the committee. Thank you.
4 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
5 Is there any further discussion on motion
6 61-12 to accept proposal 61-26?
7 Seeing none, before we vote, let me restate
8 the motion. Motion on the floor is to accept proposal
9 61-26.
10 Please record your votes, one in favor of
11 the motion accept or two opposed to the motion reject.
12 Five seconds. Balloting is closed.
13 Proposal fails.
14 Let's now proceed with the discussion on
15 certified amending motion 61-14 and 61-15.
16 ERDEM URAL: Erdem Ural. I would like to
17 make a motion to accept Comment 61-18.
18 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Motion to
19 accept Comment 61-18. Is there a second? There's a
20 second.
21 Please proceed.
22 ERDEM URAL: This proposal is trying to
23 establish some cleaning frequency into the NFPA standard
24 61.

25 Also, there's a very valuable part about

121

♀

1 cleaning methods which the standard is lacking right now
2 which will be very useful to the users and some people
3 tend to use some dangerous methods to clean the dust.
4 So that will caution the people who are using those
5 dangerous cleaning methods. I'll stop at this moment.
6 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Mr. Bujewski,
7 would you like to offer the committee's position?
8 COMMITTEE CHAIR BUJEWSKI: Yes. Also again
9 as point of order, the committee cannot pick and choose
10 what's in a proposal. No one at either the ROP
11 committee meeting or the ROC committee meeting suggested
12 taking out the methods of housekeeping and leaving in
13 and approving that proposal as opposed to proving the
14 entire proposal.
15 So again, we can only vote on what's
16 proposed. And unless somebody else proposes something
17 different, that's what we vote on. So that's where
18 we're at.
19 This is essentially a housekeeping proposal
20 based on the bulk density health which was rejected by
21 the committee earlier and also rejected today as one of
22 the motions.
23 During the ROP stage, the bulk density
24 method was rejected by the committee in previous
25 proposals, and therefore, the housekeeping frequency was

122

♀

1 based on the existing housekeeping requirements were
2 retained by a 26 to 1 vote.
3 In the ROC meeting committee reaffirmed its
4 position from the ROP with a vote of 24 to 2 to retain
5 existing housekeeping requirements. There was
6 substantiation given by the proposer to show that the
7 new housekeeping requirements would improve safety or
8 housekeeping or fire protection whatsoever.
9 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you, Mr.
10 Bujewski.
11 With that, we'll open debate on the motion.
12 Please provide your name, affiliation, whether you're
13 speaking in support of or against the motion.
14 Any further discussion on this motion?
15 Seeing none, we'll move to a vote.
16 Before we vote, let me restate the motion.
17 Motion on the floor is to accept Comment 61-18.
18 Please record your vote, one in favor of the
19 motion accept or two opposed to the motion reject.
20 Five seconds. Balloting is closed. Motion
21 fails.
22 Is there any further discussion on NFPA 61?
23 Microphone 5.
24 ERDEM URAL: Erdem Ural. I would like to
25 thank all the committee members. I thoroughly enjoy

123

♀

1 working with them.
2 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Is this a
3 motion?
4 ERDEM URAL: I'm just thanking our
5 committee.
6 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: I'm afraid just
7 for motions, please.

8 ERDEM URAL: Okay.
9 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Microphone 9.
10 DAVID: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. David
11 (inaudible) representing Liberty Mutual Insurance. I
12 would like to make a motion return to report to the
13 commitment.
14 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: The motion is
15 in order. Go ahead and proceed, please.
16 DAVID: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Regardless
17 of the ballot results based on the number of amending
18 motions made in this document and the general sense of
19 discussion, I do not believe that the committee has
20 achieved consensus on this revision. And I think the
21 need to further work out some of these issues and
22 perhaps review the constitution of the committee and its
23 general makeup.
24 It sounds like there are manufacturing
25 issues versus engineering issues that this committee

♀
1 needs to work on. Thank you.
2 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
3 Mr. Bujewski, would you like to present the
4 committee's position on this?
5 COMMITTEE CHAIR BUJEWSKI: The committee is
6 a balanced committee. All of the votes on the proposals
7 submitted by Mr. Ural were overwhelmingly rejected by
8 the committee. I doubt returning it to the committee
9 will result in any other outcome than that. I don't
10 know what the purpose would be to reaffirm what we have
11 already done.
12 Again, there will be a fundamentals of dust
13 committee that is in development right now. A lot of
14 these proposals are more appropriate. They are generic
15 proposals. They are general proposals. They should go
16 in the general fundamentals standards, not in the
17 specific occupancy standard of agricultural dust.
18 And again, the NFPA 654 committee is trying
19 to impose their general standards and their will on
20 other committees that deal with combustible dust and
21 there's a lot of push back on that. What's good for a
22 generic standard is not necessarily good for an
23 occupancy standard.
24 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you, Mr.
25 Bujewski.

♀
1 With that, we'll open up debate on the
2 motion. Please provide your name and affiliation
3 whether you're speaking in support of or against the
4 motion.
5 Microphone 5, please.
6 BILL STEVENSON: My name is Bill Stevenson.
7 My company is CV Technology. I speak in favor of the
8 motion.
9 It should be obvious to everybody by now
10 that I have great concerns about 61. I very much feel
11 that committee would benefit from reconsideration and
12 generally looking at the document again.
13 Although I'm a member of 654, I'm not here
14 to impose my will as a 654 member on 61. I am here to
15 urge every one involved to understand that dust is dust
16 is dust. It doesn't matter whether it's a food dust,
17 grain dust, sewage dust, chemical dust, metal dust, the

18 fundamentals and the behavior of dust are similar.
19 And it would be a great service to the users
20 of these documents if there was more harmony, more
21 agreement, more consensus between the documents which of
22 course is part of what the fundamentals, combustible
23 dust fundamentals committee is working on and I'm part
24 of that process, too.
25 What I'd like to do is to preserve the idea

126

♀

1 that industry specific documents have a useful
2 pertinence going forward. And what I need to try and
3 convey to you folks on the 61 committee is you are out
4 of sync, not just with 654, but with all of the other
5 occupancy standards.
6 I urge you to reconsider your documents in
7 that light and try to bring it more into harmony with
8 the other documents. Not to take away the specific
9 issues that your industry faces, but to reinforce those
10 within the context of the whole and to form a greater
11 consensus than you have up to now. You're marching to
12 the beat of a different drummer. I urge you to
13 reconsider. Thank you very much.
14 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
15 Microphone 2.
16 WILLIAM FISKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My
17 name is Bill Fiske and I'm speaking against this motion
18 regardless of its merits.
19 I've been a member of NFPA technical
20 committees for 27 years and I have seen a small number
21 of entire committee reports returned. And I couldn't
22 think of a single one whose outcome was better after the
23 entire document was returned than when it went into
24 begin with. If you ask me, it was just a waste of time
25 to return a report.

127

♀

1 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
2 Microphone 5.
3 ERDEM URAL: Erdem Ural. I also speak
4 against this motion because I do know my fellow
5 committee members --
6 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Are speaking
7 for or against?
8 ERDEM URAL: Against. The outcome will not
9 change. I will continue butting heads. Nothing will
10 happen unless the NFPA standards council takes me away
11 from that committee or maybe change some committee
12 composition, which I don't think they will do.
13 So we have made a lot of useful changes
14 today. We don't want to come back saying coming with
15 the same thing and then going through the same argument.
16 Unlike other people, I pay for this out of
17 my pocket. It has been mentioned that why other people
18 are not here. Because they are not here because their
19 company is not really supporting them. So they have to
20 pay for the travel. They have to register for the
21 meeting. They have to pay for the hotel. They have to
22 pay for the meals.
23 I'm doing it because I'm convinced that we
24 have saved a lot of lives here today. So I hope you
25 will vote against the motion.

128

♀

PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
Microphone 8.
MARK FLEISHAKER: My name is Mark Fleishaker. I speak against the motion in this case in support of Mr. Ural.
Although I must say I am very offended by all the comments about saving lives today. There is no evidence whatsoever anything done today is going to save a single life. And I don't think that should be repeated as it has been so many times without somebody saying the opposite.
In any event, the reason I oppose this motion I don't really understand it because there were two or three of the motions today that were passed. Presumably they will end up back at the committee anyway. The committee also has the freedom whenever it wants to review everything again if it wishes to do. So there's no reason to do it in the context of a motion like that. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
Is there any other discussion on turning a NFPA 61 to the committee? This is a valid followup motion and it will be voted on.
Before we vote, I will restate the motion. The motion is to send NFPA 61 back to committee.

Please record your vote one in favor of the motion accept or two opposed to the motion reject.
Five seconds. Balloting is closed. Motion fails.
Is there any other discussion on NFPA 61?
Thank you, Mr. Bujewski.
ERDEM URAL: I just wanted to thank everybody --
PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: You're out of order. Only motions.
ERDEM URAL: Usually I am. Sorry.
COMMITTEE CHAIR BUJEWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the NFPA.
PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: The next report under consideration this afternoon is that of the technical committee on electrical equipment and chemical atmospheres.
Here to present the commitment report is committee member William Fiske of Intertech Testing Services of Portland, New York.
The committee's report can be found in the white 2011 fall revision cycle ROP and ROC.
The certified amending motions are contained in the motion committee reports and behind me on the screen. We'll proceed in the order of the motions

presented.
Mr. Fiske.
COMMITTEE CHAIR FISKE: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, the report of the technical committee on electrical equipment and chemical atmospheres is presented for adoption and can be found in the reports on proposals and the report on comments for the 2011 fall revision cycle.
The technical committee has published a report consisting of a partial revision of NFPA 499

11 recommended practice for the classification of
12 combustible dust and of hazardous classified locations
13 for electrical installation in chemical process areas.
14 The report was submitted to letter ballot of
15 the technical committee that consists of 17 voting
16 members. The ballot results can be found on Pages 499-2
17 to 499-42 of the report on proposals and Pages 499-2 to
18 499-7 of the report on comments.
19 The presiding officer will now proceed with
20 the Certified Amending Motions.
21 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you,
22 Mr. Fiske. Let's now proceed with the discussion on
23 certified amending motion on NFPA 499.
24 Microphone 5, please.
25 MARCELO HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH

131

♀

1 International and I'm here on behalf the North American
2 Flame Retardant Alliance and I move certified amending
3 motion 499-1.
4 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: There's a
5 motion on the floor to accept an identifiable part of
6 499-6. Is there a second? There's a second.
7 Please proceed.
8 MARCELO HIRSCHLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
9 This is an issue of definitions again. And
10 the issue I'm bringing to the floor is the following.
11 The definition that is included in 499 contains three
12 sentences. The first sentence the actual definition,
13 combustible dusts is finely divided particles dust/fire
14 hazard.
15 What this motion would do if accepted by the
16 membership would be to stop the definition there.
17 Then it goes beyond and starts discussing
18 other things and starts including things like reference
19 a particular NFPA standard and corresponding things that
20 associated with NFPA standard. Maybe that is a
21 requirement. I am not exactly sure. I think it is.
22 This just has no room, no place in the
23 definition. The definition is very clear. First
24 sentence says so. Combustible dust finely divided dust
25 or dust explosion hazard will disperse or ignite in the

132

♀

1 air period. That's the end.
2 Whether this includes hallow particles, all
3 that stuff in actually in fact is discussed in more
4 detail in section four in the document.
5 So I urge you to vote in favor of the motion
6 and have NFPA use clear and concise definitions that
7 include what is required and nothing else. Thank you.
8 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
9 Mr. Fiske, would you like to offer the
10 committee's position?
11 COMMITTEE CHAIR FISKE: Yes, thank you,
12 Mr. Chairman.
13 Much like the previous chair, I would like
14 to point out that this is very much -- it's not an
15 occupancy related standard, but it is usage related.
16 This is the committee on electrical
17 equipment and chemical atmospheres and it relates only
18 to electrical equipment. And this is very strongly tied
19 to another document that's well known and well used in
20 NFPA and this is the national electrical code.

21 The NEC refers to NFPA 499. 499 refers to
22 the NEC. And in fact, the nexus is so strong that four
23 of the members of this committee are also members of
24 code panel 14, myself included, which is responsible for
25 Articles 502 and 506.

133

♀

1 So I believe that the technical committee is
2 due a certain amount of deference for its specific
3 expertise in its specific fields. And as a matter of
4 tradition, not of rule, NFPA's position generally has
5 been that the technical committee are, in fact, due a
6 certain after the deference.
7 This particular comment was accepted in
8 principal in part and the vote was 17 in favor with one
9 abstention.
10 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you,
11 Mr. Fiske.
12 With that, we'll open debate on the motion.
13 Please provide your name and affiliation, whether you're
14 speaking in support of or against the motion.
15 Microphone 5, please.
16 MARCELO HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH
17 International, in support of the motion.
18 I want to point out to the committee --
19 sorry -- to the membership that all the information that
20 is in the additional sentences has been included by the
21 committee in Section 84201 which adds all the
22 information about compliance with 1226, complies with
23 the ISO standards. All of that stuff is included
24 because as the committees correctly noted, all of that
25 is needed information that has nothing to do with the

134

♀

1 definition. It is included elsewhere in the document.
2 So what we're talking about is where the
3 committee should include references to other standards
4 and requirements based on other standards in the
5 definition which are extraneous to the definition
6 itself.
7 I want to point out one more time, as I did
8 earlier today, that NFPA definitions are not
9 enforceable. Thank you.
10 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Microphone 5,
11 please.
12 ERDEM URAL: I'm going to -- I'm going to
13 speak --
14 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Name and.
15 ERDEM URAL: Erdem Ural in favor of the
16 motion.
17 I am a member of this committee. I was also
18 on the task group who developed this definition.
19 Looking at this results here, seems like I voted
20 affirmative. I voted -- am I looking at the right
21 thing? I voted affirmative.
22 I agree with Mr. Hirschler that definitions
23 should be simple. This thing is talking about hallow
24 particles. Hallow particles are so rare I don't even
25 remember seeing them.

135

♀

1 So and I think what this is trying to do is
2 taking the other extraneous material and putting it on
3 the annex and I think that's appropriate because that's

4 information, that's more informational material. Thank
5 you.
6 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Is there any
7 other discussion on this, Mr. Fiske?
8 COMMITTEE CHAIR FISKE: Thank you, Chairman.
9 Quickly if I may, neither of the people who spoke in
10 favor of this motion have stated that there is anything
11 wrong with the definition. Granted, we all like nice
12 simple definitions, but they aren't always that way and
13 when they are or not there's a reason for it.
14 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you,
15 Mr. Fiske.
16 Is there any other discussion on Motion 499
17 to accept an identifiable part of Comment 499-6?
18 Seeing none.
19 RICHARD WOOD: Microphone 7, please.
20 DANNY McDANIEL: Microphone 7.
21 RICHARD WOOD: Richard Wood representing
22 myself. I just want to --
23 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Speaking for or
24 against the motion?
25 RICHARD WOOD: I'm speaking for the motion.

♀

1 I want to point out with deference to the
2 chairman of the technical committee that you are
3 correct. When there is something that's a definition
4 that's specific to your field of expertise, we should
5 show you deference.
6 But in this case we're talking about the
7 definition of combustible dust and that should be
8 consistent across all standards. So as somebody who
9 spent 25 years as an AHJ, certainly an electrical
10 committee doesn't have special expertise in defining
11 combustible dust. So I would ask this group to approve
12 this particular motion. Thank you.
13 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: Thank you.
14 Is there any further discussion of NFPA 499?
15 Is there any further discussion on this motion?
16 Seeing none, we'll move to a vote. Before
17 we vote, I'd like to restate the motion. The motion on
18 the floor is to accept an identifiable part of Comment
19 499-6.
20 Please vote in favor with one or against
21 with a two.
22 Five seconds. Balloting is close closed.
23 Motion has passed.
24 Is there any further discussion of NFPA 499?
25 Seeing none, we'll move on to the next document.

♀

1 Thank you, Mr. Fiske.
2 Before we begin the next document, I'd like
3 to introduce Richard Owen, member of the standards
4 council who will be the presiding officer for the next
5 document and before Dick takes the podium, we will take
6 a 10-minute break.
7 (Recess.)
8 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: The next report
9 under consideration this afternoon is the technical
10 committee on fire pumps. Here to present the committee
11 report is committee chair Gayle Pennel, Glenville,
12 Illinois. The committee report can be found in the blue
13 2012 annual revision cycle ROP and ROC. The Certified

14 Amending Motions are contained in the motions committee
15 report and behind me on the screen.
16 We'll proceed in the order of the motion
17 sequence number presented.
18 Mr. Pennel.
19 GAYLE PENNEL: Mr. Chair, ladies and
20 gentlemen. Page one the report of the technical
21 committee on fire pumps is presented for adoption and
22 can be found in the report on proposals and the report
23 on comments for the 2012 annual meeting revision cycle.
24 The technical committee has published a
25 report consisting of a partial revision NFPA 20,

138

♀

1 standard for the installation of stationery pumps for
2 fire protection.
3 The report was submitted to letter ballot to
4 the technical committee that consists of 30 voting
5 members. The ballot results can be found on Pages 20-2
6 to 20-66 of the report on proposals and Pages 20-2 to
7 20-35 of the report on comments.
8 The presiding officer will now proceed with
9 the Certified Amending Motions.
10 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you, Mr.
11 Pennel.
12 Let's now proceed with discussion on the
13 Certified Amending Motions on NFPA 20.
14 Microphone 9. I'm sorry. My eyesight is
15 not that good.
16 DAVID HAIG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My
17 name is David Haig representing Liberty Mutual Insurance
18 and I move 20-1.
19 DANNY McDANIEL: There's a motion on the
20 floor to return a portion of the report in the form of
21 20-46 and related comments 20-25 and 20-27. I heard a
22 second. Please proceed with the discussion on the
23 motion.
24 DAVID HAIG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
25 This issue went to the floor on the last

139

♀

1 revision cycle of NFPA 20 and has to do with vertical
2 staging of fire pumps and it was overturned on the floor
3 primarily by members of the stand pipe committee.
4 Presenting vertical staging of fire pumps in
5 the high-rise building unnecessarily complicates stand
6 pipe system design. As a result the committee formed
7 the task group to deal with this issue and the task
8 group report of which I was a member.
9 Just prior to the ROC meeting would have
10 permitted vertical staging of fire pumps given redundant
11 pumping on the lower zone. However, that provision was
12 removed at the last minute just prior to the ROC
13 meeting. I thought we had achieved consensus on the
14 issue, but now we're back to square one. I did oppose
15 it during the ROC.
16 I'd like to read a short portion of the
17 technical committee's position statement on this issue
18 which was written actually dated on June 1st and it
19 reads as follows.
20 I quote: There currently is no statistical
21 data on either successful or unsuccessful operation of
22 vertically staged or non-vertically staged fire pumps.
23 So then I had need to ask what problem we're

24 trying to fix if we don't know that there is a problem.
25 I dove into my own database at Liberty

140

♀
1 Mutual involving impairments of systems. That report
2 returned 10,683 reported impairments over a period of
3 several years. Of those, 51 directly related to fire
4 pumps. That's less than one half of one percent.
5 Half of those reported impairments were
6 considered by us to be major; in other words, the pump
7 would not provide water and pressure. That's less than
8 one quarter of one percent. That appears to me to be
9 exemplary performance.
10 What I think needs to happen here --
11 PRESIDING OFFICER McDANIEL: One minute.
12 DAVID HAID: Thank you. What I think needs
13 to happen here is we need a joint task force between
14 pumps and stand pipes so both sides of the issue can be
15 addressed and we can fix this for the next revision
16 cycle. I want to encourage the membership to support
17 this motion. Thank you.
18 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you.
19 Mr. Pennel, would you to offer the
20 committee's position?
21 MR. PENNEL: Yes. The net effect of the
22 NITMAN would be to allow, as David mentioned, vertical
23 staging of fire pumps. What that means is that you
24 could put a fire pump on the lower level first floor say
25 and another fire pump up on the 30th floor in series

141

♀
1 with that fire pump.
2 This from an operational testing viewpoint
3 is just very difficult to deal with. And the statistics
4 on failures seem to indicate that the more complex the
5 system, the higher the probability of failure.
6 We did go through a very detailed discussion
7 of this. We have looked at it from really all aspects.
8 And basically for vertical staging, there's a list of
9 what I would call three pros.
10 One, it will eliminate high pressure express
11 risers in stand pipe and sprinkler system design. And
12 this only occurs in buildings probably 30 floors and
13 higher.
14 The second advantage of this arrangement it
15 reduces the discharge pressure downstream of the
16 downstream fire pump. The second pump in series to
17 discharge pressure on that pump is lower.
18 The third advantage, it reduces the square
19 footage required for the fire pump on the lower floor,
20 which sometimes the architect might prefer if given that
21 option.
22 On the opposite side of this, it does
23 nothing to reduce the pressure requirements. It just
24 changed the portions of the system where the higher
25 pressures come into play.

142

♀
1 With this method, you have to run your fire
2 department connection all the way up to the second pump.
3 That offsets some of the cost savings that you might get
4 with your express riser reduction.
5 You also complicate indicate pump testing.
6 You either need to run a test riser down to the floor,

which again is a high pressure situation, or you're going to have to make arrangements discharge on the roof if the stand pipe goes that high, in which case you better pre-coordinate it with the plumbing engineer, make sure that the drains are sized appropriately, which my add to the cost of the drains.

You also have to run the electrical power up to the higher zone. This is an increase in cost. It makes no different from the analysis I have done, it does not make a difference where tanks are required for water supply systems.

It definitely makes servicing of the fire pumps much more difficult. You run into situations where if somebody comes in and they want to service the low zone fire pump and they are unaware or overlooked the higher zone fire pump and don't coordinate the two, you can end up with problems with the high zone running without the low zone even being available to supply it.

And if you happen to have a fire during the

time that you're servicing the fire pimp, and you've got both of them done, now you've got the issue of getting two pumps back in service on two floors that are 30 floors apart.

In summary, you're talking about a very expensive building. Starting at 30 floors going on up, you're talking, I don't know, a hundred million or higher. You're talking about a very expensive fire protection system.

And the difference in cost, if there is any difference, it's kind of hard to tell which is actually different, but the cost differential is pretty minimal when you really look at it from the viewpoint of even the cost of the fire protection system or the building as a whole.

PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Mr. Pennel, could you wind up your presentation, please?

COMMITTEE CHAIR FENNEL: So in summary, what you're trying to avoid, what you're trying to install is the simple design as you can to make it so that it can be serviced and maintained. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you, Mr. Pennel.

With that, we'll open up debate on the motion. Please provide your name, affiliation and

whether you're speaking in support of or against the motion.

Microphone 5, please.

KEN ISMAN: Thank you. My name is Ken Isman. I'm with the National Fire Sprinkler Association.

The concept of pumps --

PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Are you speaking for or against the motion?

KEN ISMAN: I'm sorry. I'm speaking for the motion.

The concept of pumps and series was brought before you last cycle. At that time the NFPA membership told the committee on fire pumps that they did not want to put all the pumps and series in the same pump room.

The committee expressed a concern then and

17 continues express a concern now about the concept of
18 vertically staging fire pumps. The issue is similar
19 this time, but it's not the same.
20 The committee has made progress in
21 recognizing that there are some situations where pumps
22 and series do not need to be in the same pump room. I
23 want to recognize that progress and thank the committee
24 for that.
25 But unfortunately, the committee did not go

145

♀
1 far enough. And so we need to support this motion to
2 once again return to the language of the 2010 edition of
3 NFPA 20 which is sufficiently handled this design
4 decision for the life of NFPA 20.
5 One example of a situation we were believe
6 you should be allowed to vertically stage fire pumps and
7 series, but the committee wants to require them to be in
8 the same pump room is where redundant fire pumps are
9 installed in the building.
10 We believe with redundant systems,
11 vertically staged fire pumps offer a reasonable level of
12 fire protection, but the committee rejected this
13 concept.
14 The committee put together a document
15 regarding our motion which was circulated outside o this
16 room and some people have seen it, although mount it was
17 not distributed to everyone who is here now.
18 For the part, if you've looked at that
19 document we agree with it. In fact, we help to write
20 some of this. The document lays out the pros and cons
21 of vertically staging fire pumps.
22 As you can see from the document, it is
23 mostly a cost issue. We understand that there are
24 financial benefits to vertically staging pumps as well
25 as additional costs. And whether the pros outweigh the

146

♀
1 cons will be different in every situation.
2 We sure there are situations where the cost
3 of vertically staging pumps outweigh the benefits. And
4 in those situations, we will not want to vertically
5 stage the pumps. But in those few situations where the
6 benefits outweigh the costs, we would like the right to
7 continue to do so.
8 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: One minute, please.
9 KEN ISMAN: Thank you. To continue to do
10 what NPFA 20 has always allowed us to do to vertically
11 stage the pumps. All we're asking is that designer be
12 allowed to decide whether it makes sense to vertically
13 stage the pumps and not to have NFPA 20 outlaw technique
14 that's been successfully used for years in fire
15 protection. We ask you to vote in favor of our notion.
16 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you.
17 Microphone 9?
18 STEVE LATHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My
19 name is Steve Latham, principal member of the NFPA 14
20 technical committee speaking for the myself as a member
21 of the committee and also for the American Fire
22 Sprinkler Association. In the position --
23 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Are you speaking in
24 favor or against?
25 STEVE LATHAM: I'm speaking in favor of the

147

♀
1 motion.
2 Several points about existing widely
3 accepted practice. And to Mr. Isman's comment about
4 maintaining the option of the designer.
5 There are situations where there's tangible
6 benefits to vertically staging the pumps and there may
7 be unintended consequence of the committee's action that
8 they did not consider.
9 That if pumps in tall buildings so-called
10 very high and super high-rise buildings are restricted
11 to being kept in the same room, that room is at a much
12 lower base level of the building, extremely high
13 pressure express will be utilized to push water to the
14 upper floors and the zones created by the use of
15 pressure reducing valves as allowed and prescribed in
16 NFPA 14 or that point of connection valve such as
17 pressure reducing hose values and sprinkler control
18 valves to manage pressure at the lower floors to very
19 high pressure.
20 And that the ownership of the first clause
21 on the ownership of the maintenance of those valves will
22 in fact being much more expensive over the life of the
23 building than the ownership and the maintenance thereof
24 if inspections maintenance is undertaken under NFPA 25.
25 Then with any additional cost or savings we can measure
148
♀
1 at the time the building is built.
2 As the chairman of the 20 committee did
3 state, we're dealing with a generally expensive
4 building. Whether that number is 30 or 40 or
5 $50 million, these costs are not necessarily
6 consequential and I don't think should be measured in
7 the consideration good fire protection.
8 But the chain of events in all the systems
9 is only as strong as its weakest link as we know from
10 NPFA data sprinkler failure is oftentimes related to
11 inadequate or failed inspections.
12 Personally I would like to see stand pipe
13 systems allowed to be designed in that chain of event.
14 I also do not agree with the chairman statement
15 vertically staged stand pipes are difficult to deal with
16 schematically. There's no difference in the
17 functionality between a pump that's been removed --
18 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: 30 seconds, sir.
19 STEVE LATHAM: -- vertically removed from
20 the one staged below it. I believe that it is depend on
21 good maintenance and the functional of the pump at the
22 first stage to drive the second one. They have the
23 power within the sequence that is mandated with NFPA 20.
24 I would ask that this motion be supported
25 and urge task group be created between 14 and 20 and I
149
♀
1 do volunteer my time and energies to that effort in the
2 future.
3 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you.
4 Microphone 7?
5 JEFF SHAPIRO: Jeff Shapiro. I'm speaking
6 on my own behalf primarily because I think more people
7 need to speak to this than just to. I'll speak in favor
8 of the motion.
9 I was a member of the 14 commitment for 20

10 plus years and authored the NFPA handbook chapter on
11 stand pipes some three editions. I'm pretty familiar
12 with the subject matter.
13 What the standard has allowed in series fire
14 pumps for many, many years has not been shown to be
15 inadequate. What I looked for in the committee reason
16 statement and in listening to the committee chair's
17 statement was a compelling reason for NFPA 20 to
18 disallow this practice. I haven't read it. I didn't
19 hear it.
20 If it's difficult to deal with from a design
21 perspective, that's dealt with by the designer. If it's
22 difficult to deal with from a maintenance perspective,
23 that's dealt with by the owner.
24 It's not role of NFPA 20 to determine that
25 something is difficult, therefore, we shouldn't allow

♀
1 it. It's been allowed. It's commonly been used. There
2 are severe disadvantages to disallowing the use of these
3 series pumps in all cases.
4 And I think it's improper as was stated by
5 to this membership last year that the 20 committee to
6 impose this restriction.
7 The offer to do something between and 20
8 jointly is a good one. If you accept this motion, it
9 will send this back to the committee and hopefully
10 initiate a joint action and I urge your approval of the
11 motion.
12 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you.
13 Is there any further discussion at the
14 microphones?
15 Microphone 7?
16 CECIL BILBO: Thank you. Cecil Bilbo with
17 the sprinkler system technology program at Hartman
18 College. I rise in favor of the motion. I am the fifth
19 of six people to speak in favor of this motion.
20 The NFPA membership is second a clear signal
21 to the NFPA 20 committee. I am also a principal member
22 of NFPA 14 which has also sent a message to the NFPA 20
23 committee that we seek approval of vertical staging of
24 fire pumps.
25 This is somewhat different, but very similar

♀
1 to the horizontal staging the water supply that we
2 currently have across the United States and in other
3 parts of the world and I would absolutely endorse this
4 one.
5 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you.
6 Any further discussions at the microphone?
7 KENNETH ISMAN: Before that you close?
8 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Is there any
9 further discussion to return a portion of the report in
10 the form of proposal of 20-46 and related comments 20-25
11 and 20-27?
12 Mr. Chair.
13 KENNETH ISMAN: Couple of points. First,
14 the discussion on the valves. There's no difference
15 whether you horizontally stage or whether you stage the
16 pumps from the same room or vertically stage them as far
17 as the requirements for the valving.
18 Either you have pipe pressure express
19 risers. You don't get into the valves until you get

20 into the zones. The pressure is the same on testing
21 those zones.
22 There is a potential in 14, they do allow a
23 pressure reducing valve to supply a hole stand pipe zone
24 which is a whole different issue.
25 And as far as complexity, it's much easier

152

♀

1 to deal with two pumps that are running together when
2 they were together. I talked about the complexity of
3 it. It's not a situation of having to deal with two
4 pumps in two different rooms that have to run together.
5 That is tough to do.
6 It's easy to design. It's easy to make work
7 under normal circumstances. Testing is more difficult.
8 It is the responsibility of this standard or this NFPA
9 to try to ensure the best reliability we can get. Keep
10 it simple. That's where you get your reliability.
11 Thank you.
12 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you, Mr.
13 Chair.
14 Before that we vote, let me restate the
15 motion.
16 The motion on the floor is to return a
17 portion of the report in the form of proposal 20-46 --
18 oh, I'm sorry. You're going to have to have somebody
19 with a lighter back there to show you there.
20 Microphone 9.
21 STEVEN LATHAM: Steven Latham, principal
22 member of the NFPA 14 committee speaking for myself for
23 committee and for the American Fire Sprinkler
24 Association in favor of the notion.
25 In response to the chairman's most recent

153

♀

1 comments, I do want to quote from the NFPA 20 position
2 statement on fire pumps operating series on a high-rise
3 application dated June 1, 2012.
4 Excerpted quotation. The system design
5 should be as simple as possible so the operation can be
6 understood and maintained. In an emergency there's
7 little time to make adjustment or correct a malfunction
8 thinking or to switch from a primary to a backup pump.
9 I agree. And that is why I favor allowing
10 vertical staging of pumps. I'm not sure I clearly
11 understood the chairman's comments about complexity.
12 In fact, I have designed dozen of high-rise
13 buildings that utilize multiple zones where there is
14 vertical separation. It's a standard practice in the
15 markets where I've done my work over the course of my
16 career.
17 And it does allow us to provide pressure
18 across a wide range from 100 to 173 psi without using a
19 single pressure regulator. And that I think is a more
20 simple design.
21 I believe that it simplifies the inspection,
22 testing and maintenance protocol. I think it increases
23 reliability.
24 I believe that when we talk about cost and
25 complexity, when we -- this proposal, which would have

154

♀

1 vertically staged pumps required to be furnished with
2 their own water supply if they're used, we're adding

3 complexity and we're adding weaker links in that chain
4 of reliability and dependability.
5 Mr. Pennel also spoke to contractors who
6 might not understand there is vertically staged pump in
7 high-rise building when they do inspection, testing or
8 maintenance.
9 And I would say the standard of care needs
10 to be raised about that contractor or the licensing for
11 that contractor in the markets they serve. Any
12 contractor or service provider who would go into a
13 building and not understand the arrangement of the water
14 supply in a high-rise building isn't qualified to be
15 there. And I would hope that's not a qualifying or
16 disqualifying criteria in this discussion.
17 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: One minute, sir.
18 STEVE LATHAM: Again, I just want to
19 reiterate that it is in the same spirit as apparently
20 the committee itself is trying to substantiate their
21 action that I ask you to vote in favor of the motion for
22 the most reliable and simple and cost beneficial
23 arrangements which will be at the designer's option.
24 Thank you.
25 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you.

155

♀
1 Microphone 8.
2 JEFF SHAPIRO: Jeff Shapiro again. I have
3 client interest in this. I'm speaking on my own behalf
4 in favor of the motion.
5 I do want to remind the membership here all
6 you're being asked to do is put this back to the
7 committee to work with the 14 committee to come up with
8 a solution.
9 Nobody is asking you to make a technical
10 judgment on in here today. You're simply being asked to
11 send it back. If you read the technical basis in the
12 committee statement and if you read the technical basis
13 in the negative ballots, you will see there is some
14 significant differences of opinion that need to be
15 worked out. They have not been worked out in the
16 documents.
17 So this motion sends it back so that it will
18 be worked out. You're not being asked to make a
19 technical decision here or second guess anybody. There
20 has been no substantiation that I've heard to make this
21 document change as has been proposed by the committee
22 and the motion on the floor is a good motion that you
23 should support.
24 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you.
25 Anything else?

156

♀
1 Mr. Chair, any final words?
2 COMMITTEE CHAIR PENNEL: No, that's fine.
3 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: All right. Before
4 we vote, let me restate the motion. The motion on the
5 floor is return the portion of the report in the form of
6 proposal 20-46 and related comments 20-25 and 20-27.
7 Please record your vote. One in favor of
8 the motion accept or two opposed to the motion reject.
9 Five seconds. Balloting is closed. Motion
10 passes.
11 Let's now proceed with a discussion on
12 Certified Amending Motion 20-2.

Mr. Rincon? This motion appeared on our agenda. However, the person who is assigned to make the amending motion is not present. Therefore, in accordance with NFPA rules, convention rules 2.7, the motion may not be considered by this assembly as a certified amending motion and is removed from the agenda.

We'll now move on the next motion. We'll now proceed with the discussion on Certified Amending Motion 20-3.

Microphone 5, please.

KENNETH ISMAN: Thank you. My name is Ken Isman. I'm with the National Fire Sprinkler Association

157

and I move to return proposal 20-181 and its related comments 20-90 to the committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Is there a second? Second.

Please proceed.

KENNETH ISMAN: Thank you. During the ROC stage of developing NFPA 20 the committee inserted a requirement for all new diesel fuel tanks to have listed fuel maintenance systems. No data was presented to the committee to justify this requirement. No lost history has been provided to show there's a problem.

More importantly, there is insufficient evidence that this is the only solution to the perceived problem of fuel quality going down.

A few days ago during a conference call, the manufacturers of these fuel maintenance system presented their opinions that the quality of diesel fuel is going down worldwide.

We're not in a position to debate that subject because nobody's presented us with any facts we can check or any analysis of this situation. I guess we just have to take their word for that.

But during the conference call they admitted that there are other ways that the problem can be solved besides their listed fuel maintenance systems. They

158

admitted that their fuel maintenance systems are not the only way to deal with a poor diesel quality fuel situation.

Yet the NFPA 20 has -- I'm sorry -- NFPA 20 has been written to require the use of their fuel maintenance systems and we're not now allowed to consider other options.

All we were asking for here is the language of NFPA 20 be returned to the 2010 edition and that the committee study this issue for the next edition with a more thoughtful approach and perhaps even some science and data starting with the public input stage of the process rather than having one solution forced on us at the ROC stage.

We ask you to vote in favor our motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you.

Mr. Pennel, would you like to offer the committee's position?

COMMITTEE CHAIR PENNEL: This was discussed in pretty good detail. We had a field expert in that kind of went over the situation of what is changing in the world.

23 There is not a lot of the reported failures
24 at this point. There's been a few that I've heard
25 about, but certainly at this point that would not be the
159
♀
1 basis for this kind a change.
2 What is changing is that the way fuels are
3 made. And the sulfur content is being lowered in diesel
4 fuel and bio fuel is being introduced. You're currently
5 allowed I believe five percent bio fuel without even
6 distinguishing that any bio fuel has been added to the
7 diesel fuel.
8 This is a big change in the industry. This
9 bio fuel works well when it's put in diesels and used
10 quickly, which is not the situation in stationery fire
11 pumps.
12 This is an issue that is coming. We either
13 address it now or we wait until we start seeing problems
14 and failures.
15 So the position that the committee took on
16 this was let's address it now and try to avoid what we
17 know is coming. Thank you.
18 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you,
19 Mr. Pennel.
20 We'll now open up debate on the motion.
21 Please provide your name, affiliation and whether you're
22 speaking in support or against the motion.
23 Microphone 5, please.
24 DAVE DESHONAY: My name is Dave Deshonay.
25 I'm speaking on behalf of the health care section
160
♀
1 support of the motion.
2 Yesterday at the health care section
3 business meeting, the health care membership voted to
4 support this motion. There has been no technical
5 justification or no data to support the need for this
6 additional requirement.
7 Health care as we all know is living in
8 patrolled financial uncertainty. An additional
9 unjustified cost to our industry is something we just
10 cannot support.
11 The reality is there's nothing to support
12 the need for this. The thought of doing it so that it
13 doesn't become a problem is a wonderful thought;
14 however, the reality there's no justification to do it
15 now. Let's get the data to support the need, then we
16 can look at it at that point. Thank you.
17 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you.
18 Anyone else? Microphone 4.
19 RICHARD WOOD: Yes, Richard Wood
20 representing myself speaking against the motion.
21 I do want to point out to the assembly that
22 in a session today on NFPA 110 the very same issue was
23 occurring in that standard. So this is more of a broad
24 based perspective than just dealing in fire pumps.
25 There is a fuel degradation issue that is of
161
♀
1 concern. It is being looked at and certainly bio diesel
2 does add to degradation. Days to ignore it is
3 irresponsible to make sure these systems are reliable.
4 So I'd ask you to not support this motion.
5 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you.

Microphone 8.
JOHN WHITNEY: John Whitney. Clark Firefighter protection. I speak against this motion.
I am the original submitter of the proposal to which the resulted in the final language coming out of the ROC. I represent Clark. Clark has no commercial interest in this proposal I submitted. Our interest is strictly in the product that we produce and that is listed diesels for driving an our fire pump. Our interest is it ensure these diesels are reliable and is have the proper quality fuel to provide the fire protection.
NFPA 20 by default is a worldwide standard. We see multinational companies taking the standard around the world building buildings. We see countries around the world adopting these standards.
Around the world bio diesel fuel is made in a lot of different recipes. There's soy bean methol ester here in North America. There's grape seed methol ester throughout Europe. There is palm methol ester in

Asian. There's sugar cane bio in South America.
All of these bios are different. They are different characteristics and yet our product is expected to run on them.
The fact is these engines will run on all these fuels. The problem is the storage of the fuels is a big problem.
We need to accept the fact bio is here. We do not have an opportunity to avoid it. To return 20 back to its 2010 language would be an extremely disservice to our clients and our customers and our people using the product because 2010 rev of 20 said do not use bio, which I'm not recommending.
The fact of the matter is our customers buying fueling does not have an opportunity.
PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: One minute, please.
JOHN WHITNEY: They do not have an opportunity to provide pure petroleum fuel any longer.
PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you.
Microphone 5.
SKIP GREGORY: My name is Skip Gregory speaking in favorite motion.
Yes, the diesel fuel is suspect in many cases. In 2002 PA10 added a section for annual fuel testing and in the next edition of NFPA 110.

The annex material suggests strongly that the testing be done in accordance with AST 975, which is a continuance of AST tests for fuel testing.
So when you have these problems and no one is saying you're not going to have problems storage in diesel fuel, another way to go about testing that or being sure that your fuel has a complete quality is to go to the appropriate ASTM standards and have that fuel tested and cleaned if necessary.
That's another option and shouldn't just latch on to one particular way to do something with sometimes a very expensive method when there are many other methods recognized. Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you.
Microphone 8.

16 HOWARD CHESNOW: Yes. My name is Howard
17 Chesnow. I'm with Fuel Quality Services, Inc. I'm
18 speaking for myself. However, I am a voting member of
19 ASTM 975.
20 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Excuse me, sir.
21 Are you speaking for or against the motion.
22 HOWARD CHESNOW: I'm speaking against the
23 motion.
24 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you.
25 HOWARD CHESNOW: Basically ASTM 975 is

164

♀
1 written to deal with diesel fuel as well as other fuels.
2 And we've been dealing with this issue now for a bunch
3 of years.
4 But the changes recently in the last four,
5 five years have been greater than the changes 20 years
6 prior to this. And the industry itself continues to
7 morph.
8 The problem is it's not so much what we
9 know, it's what we don't know. And you have to
10 understand that diesel fuel is produced by the majors to
11 be consumed within 90 days. You guys do not deal with
12 that industry.
13 You're in a long term storage situation and
14 quite frankly all the testing that's been done has not
15 really dealt with all of the new fuels that are being
16 introduced.
17 And we're not talking about just the United
18 States. This is a worldwide situation. And there have
19 been issues that have arisen across the world.
20 So what we're dealing with right now is a
21 preventative maintenance system that's designed to
22 basically level the field somewhat to areas all over the
23 place that don't have access to the so-called
24 alternative methods.
25 And you have to understand that this removes

165

♀
1 a tremendous responsibility and the need for basically
2 the mistakes of human error.
3 I know this has been a real long day so I'll
4 just leave you guys with a couple quick thoughts.
5 Preventative maintenance does not mean fixing it after
6 it breaks. And denial not a river in Egypt.
7 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you.
8 Microphone 1.
9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.) I'm
10 speaking in favor of the motion. I work with Kinder
11 Morgan, but I'm speaking for myself.
12 We have talked a lot about sludge in fuels
13 which don't grow in fuels, they grow in water interface.
14 Part of a responsible fuel management program is remove
15 that water. Part of testing and maintaining your
16 diesels is to run them. We have talked about bad
17 maintenance and inspection in diesels which is often not
18 running them.
19 So we're trying to fix the wrong problem.
20 Run the diesels, burn the diesel, keep it fresh and keep
21 it moving. Adding another do-dad on to the system is
22 one more thing to complicate it.
23 Just two proposals ago we spoke about
24 keeping things simple because it was the best thing.
25 And now we're talking about adding complexity,

recirculation systems, some other kind of detergent to clean up the fuel instead of saying stick to the standard, do what's already approved and been done for years and years, burn the diesel, test your motor and keep it fresh. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you.

Microphone 4, please.

CHARLES MARK: Charles Mark speaking for myself against the motion.

In looking at exactly what's written in the standard, this doesn't require the fuel maintenance system. It says where environmental fuel quality conditions result in degradation of the fuel.

If you can manage your fuel by burning it, by testing it, by doing some other methods, this is not required. And those other methods are generally required anyway.

PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you.

Microphone 8.

JOHN BLIGHTWIT: My name is John Blighwit. I'm from Scotland. I'd like to tell you my perspective.

PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Excuse me, sir. Can you say whether you're for or against the motion?

JOHN BLIGHTWIT: I'm against the motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you, sir.

JOHN BLIGHTWIT: I'm going to talk slow because I've been told you might have slight difficulty understanding me. Maybe I should have had a translator.

Anyway, here it goes. NFPA 20 is seen as the world good practice in our industry globally. I'm going to emphasize globally. Fuel supply has become very complicated. There are many factors which have previously been mentioned which degrade fuel. So I'm not going to go through them again.

There's debate taking place in the UK which I've been fortunate to be a part of. I've attended the houses of parliament. I've also attended meetings across Europe.

Fuel degradation with bio fuel is a hot topic. We are concerned that even if you offered 100 percent petroleum based fuel, you will still get bio fuel through the system, i.e., the fuel supply system.

Seven percent up to ten percent is available in Europe. In Oklahoma at a filling station you can 15 percent supplied at the pump. And in Arizona it can be 20 percent supplied at the pump.

PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: One minute, sir.

JOHN BLIGHTWIT: That's five percent theory. That's not a problem out there is wrong. NFPA 20, from my facility in Europe, as seen as again I emphasize the

world, we supply more NFPA 20 product worldwide than we have ever done.

As a result, NFPA 20 has to address this. Preventative maintenance has to be the key here. Are we going to wait to till there's a disaster and then address it? Thanks very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you.

Microphone 8.

9 HOWARD CHESNOW: Howard Chesnow with Fuel
10 Quality Services again voting against the motion.
11 Since he brought up 975, I just wanted to
12 read a quote out of 975 in the appendix.
13 Fuels from various sources can interact to
14 give stability properties worse than expected based on
15 characteristics of each individual fuel.
16 In 1951, I have a fuel bulletin by Detroit
17 Diesel that said exactly the same thing that's 60 some
18 odd years ago.
19 So just understand we're adding variability
20 to these fuels now based on the political and the
21 environmental considerations and the testing is
22 incomplete as to the exact, you know, ramifications of
23 the additions of these different fuels.
24 And it's not just bio fuel. We're talking
25 bio fuels, et cetera. And this is worldwide. The jury

169

♀

1 is still out. All that's being suggested here is that
2 you level the playing field a little bit and take some
3 of the responsibility away from people that really don't
4 know and don't have access to some of these other
5 variable methods. Thank you.
6 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you.
7 Microphone 8.
8 JOHN WHITNEY: John Whitney from Clark
9 speaking against the motion.
10 I heard the comment here that why impose the
11 cost of this equipment on these owners. The fact of the
12 matter is it the options that is thrown around here as
13 being viable will cost that owner three to $500 every
14 time he has to come in and filter that tank.
15 And at that point when he leaves, that tank
16 starts to degrade and it will not be clean again until
17 the day he comes back and cleans it the next time. So
18 if we want the tank to be clean every day, we need a
19 system that is there working every day.
20 Knowing the changes that have happened to
21 date and the future changes that are coming and the
22 instability of the fuel that goes along with this, we
23 will be remiss if we do not do something to protect our
24 client. We are the experts. We're supposed to tell
25 them how to build a good system that that's reliable.

170

♀

1 To ensure quality to every fire pump, every
2 day with a built-in system that prevents losses. We
3 would not build a system and put batteries in there that
4 does not have a charger to maintain it. Depending upon
5 an outside source to come once a week to charge those
6 batteries. Why would we depend on outside source to
7 come and make sure the fuel is maintained in a quality
8 manner?
9 I urge this group to vote along with the
10 actions and the work that was done by the technical
11 committee to vote against this motion and rely upon the
12 work out of the ROC. Thank you.
13 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you.
14 Microphone 5.
15 DAVE DESHUNAY: Dave Deshunay speaking on
16 behalf of myself. You've heard a lot of conversation --
17 PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Excuse me. For or
18 against?

DAVE DESHUNAY: In favor of the motion.
PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Thank you.
DAVE DESHUNAY: We have heard a lot of conversations about things that could happen, things that might happen, yet we have seen no technical data to support any of these issues even exist.
The whole premise of NFPA process is based

171

on technical substantiation. Find out if there's a problem, find the fix for it and fix it.
The reality is we're trying to fix something that quite frankly we don't even know exists at this point. The key here is there's no and was no technical data or anything supported the admit to justify this requirement. I urge you to vote in favor of the motion.
PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: Microphone 2.
MARCELO HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH International. I call the question.
PRESIDING OFFICER OWEN: The question has been called. Is there a second? There is a second. Debate will cease and we'll now vote on the motion to call the question.
Please record your vote, one in favor of the motion, accept or call the question, or two oppose to the motion reject.
Five seconds. Motion passes.
We'll immediately go to the main motion. Before we vote, let me restate the motion. The motion on the floor is return a portion of a report in the form of proposal 20-181 and related Comment 20-90.
Again, record your vote, one in favor of the motion or two opposed to the motion reject.
Five seconds. Motion passes.

172

Is there any further discussion on NFPA 20? Seeing none, we'll move on to the next document. Thank you, Mr. Pennel.
Before we begin the next document, we're to have is a two-minute break. We have to change the transcription person.

Reported By:
Ellen L. Ford, CSR No. 846
Job No. 139548
Pages 1 - 49

1

Las Vegas, Wednesday, June 13, 2012
5:30 p.m.

PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: I'm Jim Milke. Member of the Standards Council, and it's my pleasure to preside over these last two documents of the day.
The next report under consideration this afternoon is that of the Technical Correlating

8 Committee on Automatic Sprinkler Systems.
9 Here to present the two parts of the Committee
10 Report is Correlating Committee Chair Kenneth Linder
11 of Swiss Re of Windsor, Connecticut.
12 The committee reports can be found in the blue
13 2012 Annual Revision Cycle ROP and ROC.
14 The Certified Amending Motions are contained in
15 the Motions Committee report. And behind me on the
16 screen we will proceed in the order of the motion
17 sequence number presented. Mr. Linder?
18 COMMITTEE CHAIR LINDER: Mr. Chair, Ladies and
19 Gentlemen, the Technical Correlating Committee on
20 Automatic Sprinklers is presenting two reports for
21 adoption and can be found in the Report on Proposals
22 and Report on Comments for the 2012 Annual Revision
23 Cycle.
24 The first report is consisting of a partial
25 revision of NFPA 13R, Standard for the Installation of

2

♀
1 Sprinkler Systems in Residential Occupancies up to and
2 Including Four Stories in Height.
3 The report was submitted to letter ballot of
4 the Technical Correlating Committee Technical
5 Committee. The ballot results can be found on pages
6 13R-3 to 13R-27 of the Report on Proposals, and pages
7 13R-4 to 13-120 of the Report on Comments.
8 PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you, Mr.
9 Linder. Now, let's proceed with the discussion on the
10 Certified Amending Motions on NFPA 13R. Microphone 7,
11 please.
12 MR. HAAGENSEN: Good evening. Dana Haagensen.
13 I work for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
14 Department of Fire Services. I move to reject Comment
15 13R-1.
16 PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you. There is
17 a motion on the floor to reject Comment 13R-1. I
18 heard a second. Please proceed with the discussion on
19 the motion.
20 MR. HAAGENSEN: Thank you. If you vote in
21 favor of this motion, you will be voting to undo a
22 misleading title change that the committee did at the
23 comment stage to the document NFPA 13R.
24 Hopefully everybody's aware, but that is a Fire
25 Sprinkler System Design Standard for residential

3

♀
1 sprinkler systems in occupancies up to and including
2 four stories in height.
3 A lot of you may be wondering what the big deal
4 is with revising the title. I do want to speak to
5 that and, if necessary, I also have some additional
6 items to address with problems that the committee
7 position presents.
8 First, let me explain that, from its inception
9 in the 1980s, the document has carried a restriction
10 in its scope and title to projects that are no more
11 than four stories in height. In fact, the 2013
12 edition that we're discussing on the floor right now
13 still has that scope restriction. The committee has
14 not changed the scope of the document. Okay? And
15 therein lies the problem.
16 The committee has created a gross inconsistency
17 between the title of the document and its scope that's

18 stated in Section 1.1. If my motion is not passed,
19 the committee's proposed title will mislead the user
20 as it implies that one can use the document on
21 projects with no limit on the number of stories. I
22 can have a five, six, maybe seven-story building as
23 long as the project is not considered a highrise.
24 Additionally, the title uses the term "low
25 rise" that is not defined anywhere. What is a low

4

♀

1 rise building? Okay?
2 More importantly, the only way an agency or
3 code writing committee will know that there is a
4 four-story limitation is that they would have to open
5 up the book and read the specifics the Section 1.1.
6 I personally serve on building code and
7 standards writing committees, as I'm sure many of you
8 are, as well, and probably also have a similar
9 experience. That when a code references another
10 document, it is quite rare that all the committee
11 members --
12 ANNOUNCEMENT: One minute.
13 MR. HAAGENSEN: Thank you -- open up that book
14 and read the entire specifics the referenced standard.
15 Just for a perspective, I did tally up the
16 amount of building codes that adopt this standard, how
17 many reference documents they have.
18 NFPA's Model Building Code has over
19 400 reference documents. And the other Model Building
20 Code has over 600.
21 So I thank you for your time, and I hope you
22 vote in favor of this motion to restore the correct,
23 accurate, and traditional title for this document.
24 PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Mr. Linder, would you
25 like to offer the committee's position?

5

♀

1 COMMITTEE CHAIR LINDER: I would like to defer
2 to the TC Chair for the Residential Sprinkler Systems
3 Committee, Maurice Pilette.
4 TC COMMITTEE CHAIR PILETTE: Maurice Pilette,
5 Chair of the Residential Committees. This motion
6 would be, in effect, inconsistent with what the
7 committee voted on on another proposal, or another
8 comment relative to where when change the -- limited
9 the four-story definition, or the four-story term, and
10 went to 60 feet above the grade plane. So, in effect,
11 the title change that the committee voted on is more
12 consistent with the new scope changes that was
13 actually taking place, and the committee voted on
14 that, as well.
15 PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you, gentlemen.
16 With that, we will open up debate on the motion.
17 Please provide your name, and affiliation, and whether
18 you're speaking for or against the motion.
19 Microphone 4.
20 MR. SHAPIRO: Jeff Shapiro representing
21 National Multi-housing Council speaking against the
22 motion.
23 The proponent actually was an error. He made
24 the statement that the scope of the document has not
25 changed. That is incorrect. If you look in the ROC

6

♀

on Page 13R-6, my comment, 13R-3, was accepted by the committee. There are no amending motions.

1.1 scope, the document scope now says that it applies to buildings up to and including four stories in height in buildings not exceeding 60 feet in height above grade plane. So it's no longer just the story limit in the scope, now it is a story limit and a height limit.

If you go back to the old title of only referencing four stories, then you're implying that any building four stories can be done under 13R.

Now, theoretically, you'd have to go back and read the scope to see what the document limitations are and see that 60 feet. But my point is that with the committee's action to change it to low rise buildings, you're still going to the scope and still picking up the same four-story 60-foot limit.

The title of the document is not enforceable, it is for guidance. Low rise residential building was regarded by the committee as descriptive. The scope is very clear. It's four stories and buildings not exceeding 60 feet in height.

So to argue that this is necessary for consistency with the scope of the document is just flat wrong. The scope has changed. I urge you to

7

reject the motion on the floor.

PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Microphone 8.

MR. ISMAN: Thank you. My name is Ken Isman. I'm with the National Fire Sprinkler Association and we're opposed to the motion on the floor.

We're not aware of any requirement that the title of an NFPA document match every word within the scope of the document. Instead, the title of the document should be enough to tell the user that they have picked up the correct document. From there, the scope should be sufficient to tell the user exactly where they can and cannot use the document.

The scope of NFPA 13R still retains the four-story limit along with some other doc -- some other requirements, as Jeff Shapiro just talked about. The committee is not trying to get rid of those requirements. For an example of some other NFPA documents where the scope is not exactly the same as the title, you can look at NFPA 30. The title of NFPA 30 is the Flammable and Combustible Liquids Code. That's a nice, clear, concise title. But the scope of NFPA 30 says that it applies to the storage, handling, and use of flammable and combustible liquids, and then goes on to say it does not apply to transportation of flammable or combustible liquids, or anyway storage or

8

handling of aerosols, sprays, mists, liquids that have flashpoints but still -- do not have flashpoints but can still burn, fuel tanks that are connected to oil burning equipment or alcohol-based hand rub dispensers.

Does this mean that the title of NFPA 30 should really be the Code for Storage, Handling, and Use of Flammable, Combustible Liquid Except for the Transportation of the Such Liquids, yada, yada, yada, and have all that scope language in it? No. That's

11 not what the title of NFPA 30 should be.
12 NFPA 30 has been successfully enforced for a
13 long time even though the scope is less -- or more
14 descriptive than its title. People still know they've
15 picked up the correct document and they can use it
16 along with the scope to know where the document can
17 and cannot be applied.
18 The same will be true for NFPA 13R. All we
19 have done is refined the scope, and we've made it more
20 cumbersome so we don't want to keep adding that
21 information to the title.
22 ANNOUNCEMENT: One minute.
23 MR. ISMAN: Thank you. We can simplify the
24 title and still have a valid document. We're not in
25 support of the motion on the floor.

9

♀
1 PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Is there any further
2 discussion on Motion 13R-1 to reject Comment 13R-1?
3 Microphone 7.
4 MR. HAAGENSEN: Dana Haagensen, Mass Department
5 of Fire Services speaking in favor of the motion.
6 I think we've got a little dilemma here,
7 because when the committee changed the title, they
8 left out the "up to four stories in height"
9 limitation. If you go back to this motion, then we
10 leave out the 60-foot in height limitation. And in
11 that particular situation I would suggest that we go
12 back and kind of return this back to committee, in
13 essence, which is the same thing as what my comment
14 does.
15 I also would reiterate that I think the
16 Building Code Committees and the agencies that are
17 adopting the standard are going to see that title
18 change and probably assume that the four-story
19 limitation went away because it's being deleted. And
20 that's very misleading, and I'm afraid that the code
21 adoption agencies in the Model Codes will take a look
22 at this particular standard and assume that, oh, gee,
23 we can adopt this up to six, seven stories in height
24 no problem. And those particular adoptions are what
25 drives which standard you use.

10

♀
1 So as soon as those Model Codes do that, or as
2 soon as a code agency adopts this standard
3 incorrectly, then you've got kind of carte blanch,
4 you're going to be able to use it in that incorrect
5 mode.
6 PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Any further
7 discussion on this motion? Microphone 4.
8 MR. SHAPIRO: Jeff Shapiro again speaking
9 against the motion on the floor.
10 I've been around the building code arena for 30
11 years and I've probably got a good 10 years left. I
12 can assure you nobody's going to do this based on the
13 title of the document.
14 The committee heard these arguments. The
15 document title that is proposed by the committee is
16 descriptive. And to go back to the old title of four
17 stories only is flat wrong because you lose the
18 60 feet which is in the scope. You don't want to
19 mislead people with the title, and that's the reason
20 you need to reject this motion.

21 PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Mr. Linder, any final
22 comments?
23 COMMITTEE CHAIR LINDER: I'll defer to Maurice.
24 Do you have any further comments?
25 TC COMMITTEE CHAIR PILETTE: The only comment,

11

♀
1 I would urge the membership to vote the way that the
2 committee went forward on this thing. On the two
3 proposals to change the title and also the scope the
4 vote was 25 to 5 to change the title, and this was
5 vented by task group and long debate during the
6 committee hearings. And, in addition, too, when the
7 scope was changed, the vote was 28 to 2 to see it that
8 way, and was well-debated within the committee itself.
9 PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you. Before we
10 vote let me restate the motion. The motion on the
11 floor is to reject Comment 13R-1.
12 Please record your vote 1 in favor of the
13 motion, that is to accept, 2 opposed to the motion,
14 reject.
15 5 seconds.
16 Balloting's closed.
17 Thank you. The results of the vote are to
18 reject the motion. The motion has failed.
19 Let's now proceed with the discussion on
20 Certified Amending Motion 13R-2.
21 Microphone 7.
22 MR. HAAGENSEN: Dana Haagensen, Mass Department
23 of Fire Services. I move that we accept proposal
24 13R-4.
25 PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you. There is

12

♀
1 a motion on the floor to accept proposal 13R-4. Is
2 there a second? Thank you, we do have a second.
3 Please proceed with the discussion on the motion.
4 MR. HAAGENSEN: Yeah. This motion basically is
5 a vote to restrict the scope and the use of NFPA 13R
6 based on some happenings that occurred in our state.
7 Basically, simply, this proposal was to bring
8 decisions that we made at the state level to the
9 national table to see if NFPA would be interested in
10 sharing the same vision.
11 Basically, over a span of a year and a half
12 from January, 2007 to May, 2008, Massachusetts
13 experienced three large-loss fires, which were also
14 total-loss fires. These fires were in large,
15 lightweight, wood frame residential buildings that
16 were protected with systems meeting the requirements
17 of NFPA 13R.
18 And I personally performed a code-based
19 investigation on a couple of these, and my colleague
20 did on the third.
21 As a result of these a State Farm Marshall
22 submitted a state building code change proposal, which
23 was ultimately accepted, and that proposal did
24 restrict the use of 13R to smaller buildings.
25 With this motion, again, I'm simply trying to

13

♀
1 bring this to the national level.
2 And when we researched this issue at the state
3 level, we realized that Massachusetts was not the only

4 state that was having communities with this issue.
5 I'm sure if you think about the last few years, you
6 probably can recall some similar incidents in your
7 communities.
8 The problem we have and the troubling thing
9 about it is the reaction that we're getting from the
10 public. People are very confused by these systems and
11 residents are questioning why they're staring at their
12 home in ruins when the buildings are newly constructed
13 and everywhere they went in their home --
14 ANNOUNCEMENT: One minute.
15 MR. HAAGENSEN: Thank you -- everywhere they
16 went in their home they saw fire sprinklers.
17 Similarly, fire chiefs are having to do damage
18 control with the media on the benefits of fire
19 sprinklers as a result of many of these incidents.
20 The other issue I did want to speak to is, in
21 speaking to some of my colleagues here at the
22 convention, I know there's a lot of apprehension on
23 this particular motion, on where the 12,000 square
24 foot limitation came from.
25 That basically came out of the Model Building

1 Codes and recognized that many commercial occupancies
2 that exceeded 12,000 square feet would need to have
3 sprinkler systems that were intended to protect both
4 property and life safety. So this was simply
5 extending that level of protection to residential
6 occupancies where we have our major fire problem.
7 PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you.
8 Mr. Linder, would you like to offer the committee
9 position?
10 COMMITTEE CHAIR LINDER: I'll defer to Maurice
11 Pilette, Chair of the TC.
12 TC COMMITTEE CHAIR PILETTE: The committee
13 discussed this proposal at length and found that there
14 wasn't technical justification to pursue it and vote
15 in favor of it. It went back to the NFPA fire history
16 and the origin of the document and felt very
17 comfortable that the way that the document addresses
18 it with unlimited sizes, that it has done and served
19 the United States very well in the code adopting
20 process by the building code due to significant
21 buildings in the last 30 years that wouldn't have not
22 sprinkled if the 13R wasn't in place and wasn't
23 adopted by the Model Building Codes.
24 And additionally, the committee felt very
25 strongly that 12,000 square feet would be the demise

1 of 13R.
2 Now, this is a very, very small building,
3 footprint, when you talk about in the aggregate area,
4 and in an event, this was significantly defeated by
5 the committee at the time.
6 PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you, gentlemen.
7 With that, we will open up debate on the motion.
8 Please provide your name, and affiliation, and whether
9 you're speaking in favor or against the motion.
10 Microphone 4, please.
11 MR. SHAPIRO: Jeff Shapiro representing
12 National Multi-housing Council and speaking against
13 the motion on the floor.

14 Even if you believed that there is a need to
15 put some type an area limit on 13R systems, this
16 proposal is very flawed.
17 For example, it does not recognize any fire
18 separation. Even if I build a four-hour firewall
19 through the center of the building to divide it into
20 two 12,000 square foot buildings, all the way through
21 the attic through the roof with a parapet, this
22 proposal says that aggregate floor area has to be
23 determined ignoring any fire separation assemblies or
24 fire parting walls.
25 This proposal doesn't care whether I build a

16

♀
1 building out of Type 1 construction, concrete, or Type
2 5 construction unprotected wood. Surely, we should be
3 able to build a building bigger out of concrete than
4 wood. That has been firmly established in building
5 codes since the 1920s that I can recall.
6 So to argue that you need an area limit is one
7 argument. To argue that you need an area limit but
8 not allow any variation for type of construction or
9 based on fire separations has no merit in history.
10 And even with respect to the fires that the
11 proponent has argued occurred in Massachusetts which
12 caused them to change the code, I scratch my head and
13 wonder, I can't put a 13R system in a concrete
14 building with parapets more than 12,000 square feet?
15 I don't think that's the mainstream that we want in
16 the United States. If Massachusetts wants to do it,
17 so be it, but we don't want to establish that as a
18 model recommendation.
19 I urge you to vote against this. There is no
20 technical merit for this proposal and it was broadly
21 rejected by the committee.
22 PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Microphone 8.
23 MR. ISMAN: Thank you. My name is Ken Isman.
24 I'm with the National Fire Sprinkler Association. I'm
25 opposed to the motion on the floor.

17

♀
1 There's been no evidence supplied to the
2 committee that shows that the reduction to 12,000
3 square feet or less is necessary to meet the goals and
4 objectives of NFPA 13R. The biggest difference
5 between NFPA 13R and NFPA 13 is the sprinkler
6 protection for combustible concealed spaces such as
7 attics.
8 Now, the proponent of this proposal mentioned
9 some fires, and I believe, if I look at those fires,
10 that the fire got up into the attic and burnt through
11 the attic and that these were really large attics over
12 really large buildings.
13 Now, there may be some justification to
14 limiting the size of unsprinklered combustible attics
15 in a 13R system. That may be something that we need
16 to look at. But that's not what this proposal does.
17 This proposal limits the use of 13R by counting the
18 area of the sprinklered spaces.
19 The proposal that's on the floor in front of
20 you applies to the total building area, not the area
21 per floor. So a three-story apartment building with
22 4,000 square feet per floor and a 4,000 square foot
23 attic would be allowed to use 13R, but a four-story

24 building with the same footprint and the same 4,000
25 square feet per floor and the same 4,000 square foot

18

♀

1 attic would not be allowed to use 13R because it would
2 violate the 12,000 square foot total area limitation,
3 even though it has the same attic as supplied in that
4 three-story building that could use 13R. That just
5 doesn't make sense. It doesn't seem to me that the
6 proponent is actually getting to the root of his
7 problem.
8 There were a number of good reasons to limit
9 the use of 13R vertically, which was done with the
10 four-story and 60-foot limit, and those have been
11 well-documented since the introduction of 13R in 1989.
12 But there's no documentation of why 13R should be
13 limited regarding the horizontal area of the building.
14 PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you.
15 Microphone 7.
16 MR. HAAGENSEN: Dan Haagensen, Mass Department
17 of Fire Services, speaking in favor of the motion.
18 I do just want to clarify one thing that I
19 discovered since the committee did the balloting, and
20 I don't know if it would change anybody's opinion,
21 but --
22 Unfortunately, the NFPA data that was used in
23 that -- the Chair reference has a significant flaw in
24 the analysis that was used in that particular report.
25 Basically, it goes back to the fact that

19

♀

1 there's two different NFIRS codings for sprinkler
2 system failures that were addressed in that report,
3 one of which is where the sprinkler system was outside
4 its design range but present.
5 And from a sprinkler world the interpretation
6 of that coding is that that is a fire where the owner
7 has gone in there and exceeded the hazard level that
8 the sprinkler system was designed to meet, and that's
9 why the sprinkler system failed.
10 Unfortunately, the report assumed that "outside
11 the design range" meant that the sprinkler system was
12 installed in the building but not in the area where
13 the fire started.
14 There's also an NFIRS code for that particular
15 scenario. Sprinkler system failure where the
16 sprinklers were not in the area where the fire
17 occurred is a separate NFIRS code.
18 And what happened in this particular analysis
19 is that they threw out all that data because they
20 perceived that there was two codes and NFIRS that
21 meant the same thing and there was some sort of
22 problem with that.
23 Unfortunately, when you throw out the data for
24 fires where there is a sprinkler system present in a
25 building but not in the area where the fire occurred,

20

♀

1 you just wiped out all of the data for the fires that
2 we were trying to address for this particular
3 proposal. So I just wanted to clarify that.
4 PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you.
5 Microphone 8.
6 MR. BILBO: Cecil Bilbo representing the

Sprinkler System Technology Program from Parkland College. I rise in opposition to the motion, feeling that this issue is better addressed through the building codes, and that perhaps looking at this issue the way Mr. Isman suggested would be correct. I urge rejection of the motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Microphone 4.

MR. SHAPIRO: Jeff Shapiro, National Multi-housing Council in opposition to the motion.

With regard to the new data, that's all fine and dandy. That's the first I've heard of it. I'm sure it's the first you've heard of it, and I would hate to see this membership act on data that's hearsay at the microphone that's not been presented. If that's new information that was not considered by the committee, the process for that is a TIA, not a floor action.

So I urge you to vote against the motion. You haven't had a substantiation based on that to support

12,000 square feet across the board.

PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Is there anything further discussion on Motion 13R-2 to accept Proposal 13R-4? Mr. Linder, any final comments?

COMMITTEE CHAIR LINDER: Maurice, do you want to make any final comments for the TC?

TC COMMITTEE CHAIR PILETTE: I want to urge the membership to support the committee action which voted 26 in favor at the time to affirm not to go with this particular proposal.

And additionally, the committee had at NFPA a tenants meeting to discuss the reporting system, and there was no indication that that report by NFPA was flawed in any way or manner, and the committee relied on that.

So here to challenge NFPA's reporting system I believe would be out of line to take it to that point.

So I urge the membership here today to support the action of the committee as a whole to the consensus process.

PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Before we vote, let me restate the motion. The motion on the floor is to accept proposal 13R-4. Please record your vote 1 in favor of the motion, or 2 opposed to the motion.

5 seconds.

Balloting is closed.

Thank you for the results. Thank you. The results of the vote are that the motion has failed.

Let's now proceed with the discussion on Certified Amending Motion 13R-3. Microphone 7, please.

MR. HAAGENSEN: Dana Haagensen, Mass Department of Fire Services.

I move that we do NITMAN 13R-3 as written on the screen.

PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you. There is a motion on the floor to accept an identifiable part of Comment 13R-53. Is there a second?

Thank you. We do have a second, so please proceed with the discussion on the motion.

17 MR. HAAGENSEN: Well, we're headed for three
18 strikes here. But basically, it was a little
19 confusing on this particular comment at the proposal
20 stage. You heard that the attempt to bring in the
21 Massachusetts stuff into the standard was
22 overwhelmingly rejected. That's fine.
23 I went into the comments stage and said okay,
24 well, most of the arguments that were going against
25 putting a scope restriction on the size of 13R system

23

♀
1 and 13R buildings was that all the data that I
2 presented did not involve any life loss or significant
3 injuries, and that the purpose of the standard is a
4 life safety standard and it's done its job.
5 Basically, that's been the committee's stance
6 all along. That if the building burns to the ground
7 and nobody gets hurt or injured, that's considered a
8 success.
9 Having worked on some of the code development
10 in the state, there are not a lot of people that know
11 that message. And so all I was trying to do with
12 Comment 13R-53 was put that sentiment into the annex
13 of the standard. So it's not enforceable, but just to
14 let people know where the committee was coming from in
15 terms of what the document was trying to address.
16 Unfortunately, I did put a two- or three-story
17 limitation or wording in that particular comment.
18 That was done out of recognition that, of all the
19 people I've talked to and all the buildings I've seen
20 that were built in the time period that this document
21 came out, were two- or three-story garden style
22 apartment buildings.
23 And recognizing that the original scoping
24 didn't actually restrict it that far, I'm asking the
25 membership to provide some guidance to folks out there

24

♀
1 so we can educate people on what the purpose of this
2 standard is. I find it a little confusing that the
3 committee will back up in words what this document's
4 supposed to be doing out there, but they refuse to put
5 it in writing for some reason.
6 But the identifiable piece of this is to take
7 out that two- or three-story --
8 ANNOUNCEMENT: 30 seconds.
9 MR. HAAGENSEN: Thank you -- take out the two-
10 or three-story thing, and would establish an annex
11 section explaining that this is a life safety
12 standard.
13 PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you.
14 Mr. Linder, would you like to offer the committee
15 position?
16 COMMITTEE CHAIR LINDER: I'll defer to the
17 Residential Sprinkler Chair, Maurice Pilette.
18 TC COMMITTEE CHAIR PILETTE: The only comment I
19 have to the membership is that the committee rejected
20 this 29 to 1, which is significant, and felt that what
21 was written in here in the annex material is
22 justifiable by the committee at that point and did not
23 want to change it. 29 to 1 is a pretty strong vote
24 action of a 30-member committee.
25 PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you, gentlemen.

25

♀
1 With that, we will open up debate on the motion.
2 Please provide your name, and affiliation, and as
3 always, whether you are speaking in support of or
4 against the motion. Microphone 4, please.
5 MR. SHAPIRO: Jeff Shapiro, National
6 Multi-housing Council, speaking in opposition to the
7 motion.
8 And I have two points of concern with this
9 proposed annex note. First, at the end, at the last
10 statement in the proposal says, "The committee is of
11 the opinion that as long as none of the occupants of
12 the building have been injured or killed, a building
13 that burns to the ground and is protected with the
14 NFPA 13R system is a success story." The committee
15 rejected this. Therefore, if you accept it on the
16 floor, what would go into the annex is incorrect. The
17 committee did not accept this. It is not the
18 committee's opinion.
19 Secondly, I'd like to point out that I disagree
20 with regard to the proponent's interpretation of the
21 scope and purpose of 13R. If you read 1.2.1 purpose,
22 it specifically states, "the purpose of the standard
23 to provide a sprinkler system that aids in the
24 detection and control of residence fires, and thus
25 provides improved protection against injury, life

♀
1 loss, and property damage."
2 Unlike 13D, NFPA 13R does scope with intent a
3 degree of property protection, and it provides a very
4 high degree of property protection. Whenever the fire
5 starts in an area that's protected by sprinklers, the
6 13R system statistically, historically, has worked and
7 put the fire out.
8 So there's two very good reasons to reject
9 this, and the proponent's statements talking about,
10 you may do -- 13R may do little to protect
11 firefighters, may do little to protect the structure
12 itself, those are personal opinions, they are not the
13 committee's opinion as is stated in this. I urge you
14 to reject the motion on the floor.
15 PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Is there any further
16 discussion on Motion 13R-3 to accept an identifiable
17 part of Comment 13R-53? Microphone 7, please.
18 MR. HAAGENSEN: Dana Haagensen, Mass Department
19 of Fire Services, speaking in favor of the motion.
20 I don't know if this will trigger anybody to
21 get up, but I did notice on this particular item that
22 the only opposition came from the National
23 Multi-housing Council. That is a trade organization
24 for executives of development and property owners, and
25 I did find that an interesting note on this particular

♀
1 motion.
2 PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you. Any
3 further discussion on this Motion 13R-3? Mr. Linder,
4 any final comments?
5 COMMITTEE CHAIR LINDER: I'll defer to Maurice
6 Pilette.
7 TC COMMITTEE CHAIR PILETTE: No further
8 comment.
9 PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

10 Before we vote, let me restate the motion.
11 The motion on the floor is to accept an
12 identifiable part of Comment 13R-53.
13 Please record your vote. 1 is in favor of the
14 motion, 2 opposed to the motion.
15 5 seconds.
16 The balloting is closed.
17 Thank you. The results of the vote are that
18 the motion has failed.
19 Let's now proceed with the discussion on
20 Certified Amending Motion 13R-4. Microphone Number 5,
21 please.
22 MR. ISMAN: Thank you. Ken Isman with the
23 National Fire Sprinkler Association, and we move to
24 reject Sections 5.2.2.2.6 and 5.2.9.2.6 from Comment
25 13R-19 as shown in Motion Sequence 13R-4.

28

♀
1 PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you. There's a
2 motion on the floor to reject an identifiable part of
3 Comment 13R-19. Is there a second?
4 Thank you. We do have a second. Please
5 proceed with the discussion on the motion.
6 MR. ISMAN: Thank you. This subject is a bit
7 difficult to follow through the ROP and the ROC, and I
8 wish that NFPA 13 had come first because it's easier
9 to follow there. But since we have to deal with NFPA
10 13R first, you'll just have to trust us that a series
11 of sections dealing with CPVC compatible was inserted
12 in NFPA 13R during the ROC stage of document
13 development.
14 We don't have a problem with most of the text.
15 We applaud the NFPA for tackling this very difficult
16 subject. But two of the sections go a bit too far.
17 These two sections read the same, it's just one of
18 them applies to pipe and the other applies to fitting.
19 So you see in the summary report of the motions that
20 the paragraph is just printed once, but it is actually
21 in two sections and so we're moving to remove it
22 twice.
23 These sections require the compatibility of
24 pipe to be evaluated with a unlimited number of
25 materials that might exist in the construction

29

♀
1 environment. Since the materials list is infinite
2 that must be compared to CPVC for compatible, this
3 opens the pipe manufacturers and the installing
4 contractors to significant liability in using this
5 product. There is no way that they can guarantee that
6 they have manufactured and installed a product that is
7 compatible with everything.
8 If you take these paragraphs out, as we've
9 asked in our motion, then you still have the
10 requirements for CPVC to be compatible with internal
11 coding of steel, if steel pipe's going to be used in
12 the system with CPVC, and you also have the
13 requirement for draft stopping materials to be
14 evaluated for compatibility.
15 These requirements are good steps forward for
16 the standard, and our motion does not affect these
17 improvements. We ask you to vote in favor of our
18 motion.
19 PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Mr. Linder, would you

like to offer the committee's position?
COMMITTEE CHAIR LINDER: Yes, I'd like to say a few comments. First off, you're going to see this issue again. It is a correlating issue that the committee dealt with to make sure that both 13R and 13 read the same.

30

This particular section originally passed on the floor, but not the letter ballot in 13R, and passed in 13 which we'll get to later.
The committee certainly recognizes the compatibility has been a major issue and has worked hard to try to put some additional items into the standard to deal with that.
I would also like the membership to know that we currently have a TIA in process that would change the CPVC language to nonmetallic pipe because we believe it's really a broader thing and not just limited to one specific product, although CPVC is where most of the issues have been to date.
And so there's a lot of good work here, and I think, as Ken mentioned, there's a lot of things that we don't want to get rid of, and the correlating committee wanted both sides to be the same.
And if Maurice has anything he'd like to say on the 13R specific portion, I'd encourage him to say so.
TC COMMITTEE CHAIR PILETTE: I concur with the TCP Chair on this. We had task groups and worked well together with the 13 task group to resolve this issue, and also a favorable TIA.
PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you, gentlemen. With that, we will open up debate on the motion.

31

Please provide your name, and affiliation, and whether you're speaking in support or against the motion. Microphone 9.
MR. JOHNSON: My name is Gary Johnson. I'm with the Lukazad (phonetic) Corporation. Most everything's been --
PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: I'm sorry. Are you speaking for or against?
MR. JOHNSON: I'm speaking for the motion.
PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you.
MR. JOHNSON: Most everything has been explained. I just wanted to stress the language on this particular motion. "Other construction materials" is so broad that it's going to create a lot of issues if it stays that way with contractors and with HJs. There's going to be a lot of different interpretations of what that means.
I'm also a principal on 13R, and we did vote against this motion. It was given to us late. But the reason that we voted against it was because there was just -- there was some parts of it that weren't worded properly, and that's -- the largest one is what we've got here, "and other construction" term.
So we're voting -- we're hoping to take that particular paragraph out. Thank you.

32

PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you. Microphone 7.

MR. BILBO: Cecil Bilbo with Parkland College Sprinkler System Technology Program. We --

PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Are you speaking for or against?

MR. BILBO: I speak in favor of the motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you.

MR. BILBO: We feel like Mr. Isman's proposal is -- or the motion is most appropriate. We commend the committee for their action and their movement forward. However, the language creates a situation that is nearly impossible to enforce, specifically given the nature of the construction that is currently under way in the United States and other parts of the world. We would encourage voting in favor of the motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you. Is there any further discussion on Motion 13R-4 to reject an identifiable part of Comment 13R-19?

Seeing none, Mr. Linder, any final comments?

COMMITTEE CHAIR LINDER: The only final comment I'd like to make is that the committee has worked hard to try to get some compatibility issues that we think are long overdue into the standard. And if the

♀

membership thinks we've gone too far with this one, I'm much happier with 13R-4 than the next one that's coming up that would throw everything back to the committee, so I would ask you to vote your conscience. If you think we've gone too far, that's okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Before we vote, let me restate the motion. The motion on the floor is to reject an identifiable part of Comment 13R-19.

Please record your vote, 1 being in favor of the motion, 2 being opposed to the motion.

5 seconds.

The balloting is closed.

Thank you. The results of the motion are that the motion has passed.

Let's now proceed with a discussion on Certified Amending Motion 13R-5.

Next motion on 13R-5 appeared on our agenda. However, the authorized maker of the motion or their designated representative -- I'm reading the wrong script.

Next motion on 13R-5 appeared in our agenda. However, the authorized maker of the motion or their designated representative has notified NFPA they no longer wish to pursue this motion. Therefore, in

♀

accordance with NFPA Convention Rules at 2.6, the motion may not be considered by the assembly and is removed from the agenda. We will now move on to the next motion.

To proceed with the discussion on Certified Amending Motion 13R-6. Microphone 5, please.

MR. ISMAN: Thank you. My name is Ken Isman. I'm with the National Fire Sprinkler Association. And we move to reject the new Section 6.2.2.3 that was added to the standards a part of Comment 13R-16, and also to accept Comment 13R-34.

PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you. There's a

13 motion on the floor to reject an identifiable part of
14 13R-16 and to accept Comment 13R-34. Is there a
15 second?
16 Thank you. We do have a second. Please
17 proceed with the discussion on the motion.
18 MR. ISMAN: Thank you. I'd like to thank the
19 NFPA for allowing me to make these two motions
20 together and have the discussion once since the topic
21 is exactly the same, the text just appears twice in
22 the standard. So we can have this discussion once and
23 vote on it once and save some time.
24 The issue here is the use of residential
25 sprinklers at a minimum .05 density in areas outside

35

♀
1 the dwelling unit in any space considered light hazard
2 by NFPA 13.
3 We do not believe that the technical data
4 supports the use of residential sprinklers at a .05
5 density in all of these spaces that are considered
6 light hazard. Our concern is that there are light
7 hazard spaces outside the dwelling unit with high
8 ceilings and large compartments that may not
9 adequately be protected by residential sprinklers.
10 Meeting rooms and four-story atriums are
11 examples of spaces that can be considered light hazard
12 but might not adequately be protected by residential
13 sprinklers at a .05 density.
14 Fire tests have been performed with residential
15 sprinkles in ceilings up to 26 feet in height with the
16 residential sprinkles performing well, but the
17 compartments in these fire tests were limited to
18 600 square feet. The compartmentation helps the
19 residential sprinkler perform.
20 While the spaces inside the dwelling units
21 might be assumed to be fairly well-compartmented, the
22 same cannot be said for spaces outside the dwelling
23 unit. There is no evidence that residential
24 sprinklers at a .05 density can protect every
25 conceivable space that would be considered light

36

♀
1 hazard. We urge you to vote in favor of our motion.
2 PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you. Let me
3 clarify for the audience here that the screen is
4 partially correct that you see on the displays here.
5 So that we have two items that are going here. This
6 is rejecting an identifiable part of Comment 13R-16
7 and to accept Comment 13R-34. So it's an "and"
8 statement we're looking to here.
9 Mr. Linder, comments on a position from the
10 committee, please.
11 COMMITTEE CHAIR LINDER: I will defer to the TC
12 Chair, Maurice Pilette.
13 TC COMMITTEE CHAIR PILETTE: In a committee
14 discussion on this item here, it set conditions for
15 the use of residential sprinklers outside the dwelling
16 unit and voted in favor of going forward with that
17 with a 27 to 3 vote.
18 I would urge the membership to accept the
19 consensus process that the committee went with
20 conditions when using residential sprinklers outside
21 the dwelling units. It wasn't a clearcut. You had to
22 examine the conditions that they saw fit for the

applications at hand.
PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you, gentlemen. With that, we can open up debate on the motion.

37

Please provide your name, and affiliation, and whether you are speaking in support or against the motion. Microphone 7.
MR. SHAPIRO: Jeff Shapiro, National Multi-housing Council, a/k/a The Evil Empire, and I'm speaking in support of the motion.
It is essential from the multi-family industry's perspective that residential sprinklers in multi-family occupancies work and work effectively.
I think that the points that have been brought up by the National Fire Sprinkler Association with regard to the limitations on the use of residential sprinklers in some of these spaces bear further merit, and I do think it's reasonable for the committee to reconsider these issues before they go into the standard. I urge you to support the motion on the floor.
PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you. Is there any further discussion on Motion 13R-6 to reject an identifiable part of Comment 13R-16 and accept Comment 13R-34? Seeing none, Mr. Linder, final comments?
COMMITTEE CHAIR LINDER: Maurice, do you have any further comments?
TC COMMITTEE CHAIR PILETTE: No further comments. I stand by the -- I urge you the membership

38

to stand by the actions of the committee itself.
PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you, gentlemen. Before we vote let me restate the motion. The motion on the floor is to reject an identifiable part of Comment 13R-16 and accept Comment 13R-34.
Please record your vote, 1 in favor of the motion, 2 opposed to the motion.
5 seconds.
Balloting is closed.
Thank you. The results of the vote are that the motion has passed.
Is there any further discussion on NFPA 13R? Seeing none, we will move on to the next document.
Part 2 of the Technical Correlating Committee Automatic Sprinkler Systems Report can be found in the blue 2012 Annual Revision Cycle ROP and ROC.
The Certified Amending Motions are contained in the Motions Committee Report, and behind me on the screen we will proceed in the order of the motion sequence number presented. Mr. Linder.
COMMITTEE CHAIR LINDER: The second report is consisting of a partial revision of NFPA 13 Standard for the Installation of Sprinkler Systems.
The report was submitted to letter ballot of the Technical Correlating Committee the Technical

39

Committee.
The ballot results can be found on Page 13-4 to 13-164 of the Report on Proposals, and Pages 13-4 to 13-120 of the Report on Comments.
PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you,

Mr. Linder. Let's now proceed with the discussion on the Certified Amending Motions on NFPA 13. Microphone 5, please.

MR. ISMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ken Isman with the National Fire Sprinkler Association, and we move to reject Section 6.3.6.4.6 and 6.4.2.4 as shown in Motion Sequence Number 13-1.

PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you. There is a motion on the floor to return a portion of the report in the form of an identifiable part of Proposal 13-67 and related Comment 13-57. Is there a second?

Let me point out that this is similar to a Certified Amending Motion at 13R-4 that we've already talked about. There is much testimony already in the record. In the interest of time, I would suggest that we not duplicate those comments. But with that in mind, Microphone 5 to proceed with the discussion on the motion, please.

MR. ISMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And yes, we were just going to say this is exactly what you voted

on in 13R, it's just in 13 now, and you did approve it there. We're hoping you approve it here for consistency.

And I'll just state in advance, if you approve this as you did with 13R, we will not be making any motion of 13-2.

PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you. Mr. Linder, would you like to offer the committee's position?

COMMITTEE CHAIR LINDER: From the Correlating Committee's perspective, this was a correlating issue, and we want 13 and 13R to be the same, so I would encourage the membership to vote for the amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you. With that, we will open up debate on the motion. Please provide your name, and affiliation, and whether you are speaking in support or against the motion.

Seeing none, we will move on to a vote.

Before we vote, let me restate the motion. The motion on the floor is to return a portion of the report in the form of an identifiable part of Proposal 13-67 and related Comment 13-57.

Please record your vote, 1 for in favor of the motion, 2 opposed to the motion.

5 seconds.

The balloting is closed.

Thank you. The results of the motion are that the motion has passed.

We've just heard that we will not proceed with the CAM 13-2, so we can move on to 13-3.

This motion 13-3 appeared on our agenda. However, the authored maker of the motion or their designated representative has notified NFPA that they no longer wish to pursue this motion. Therefore, in accordance with the NFPA rules, the motion may not be considered by the assembly and is removed from the agenda.

We will now move on to the next motion. Let's proceed with the discussion on Certified Amending Motion 13-4. Microphone 5, please.

16 MR. ISMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Our last
17 motion of the day. We move to reject Comment 13-241.
18 PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you. There is
19 a motion on the floor to reject Comment 13-241. Is
20 there a second?
21 Thank you. We do have a second, so let's
22 proceed with discussion on the motion. Microphone 5?
23 MR. ISMAN: Thank you. Before I get into the
24 technical issue of our motion, I need to spend a
25 minute clarifying the note that's in the Certified

42

♀

1 Amending Motion report.
2 The note says that, "We are seeking to return
3 the language to the annex dealing with measuring the
4 length of a hanger rod in a trapeze hanger."
5 While this note is correct, it underscores the
6 procedural error that occurred in the processing of
7 this comment.
8 The comment introduced a new subject at the ROC
9 stage of the process. There was a long-standing rule
10 in NFPA 13 that says that, "lateral braces can be
11 omitted from cross mains if the main is supported with
12 hangers that have a maximum rod length of six inches."
13 The proposal that is tied -- the proposal that
14 this issue is tied to simply sought to clarify how to
15 apply that six-inch rule to trapeze hangers. The
16 original proposal did not ask to eliminate the rule,
17 it just tried to clarify how to measure that
18 six inches. And the committee did this at the ROP
19 stage by inserting this annex note that you see.
20 For the ROC, the comment was submitted to just
21 completely get rid of the whole concept of the
22 six-inch rod rule and force everybody to put lateral
23 braces on all cross mains.
24 That subject was not opened in the ROP, and the
25 comment should have been rejected as new business or

43

♀

1 held for further study. Instead, it was accepted, and
2 we're now seeking to have it overturned.
3 From a technical perspective, the omission of
4 lateral braces on cross mains has worked well for many
5 editions of NFPA 13.
6 Earthquake experience from systems that have
7 been protected in accordance with this rule has been
8 good. No substantiation has been submitted to show
9 that there is a problem with cross mains hung on
10 maximum six-inch rods. The allowance to omit lateral
11 braces on cross manes with six-inch rods is
12 technically sound. The main just can't move very far
13 and do significant damage if it's hung on short rods.
14 The allowance helps us to install
15 cost-effective sprinkler systems in situations such as
16 hotels where the mains are frequently looped in the
17 corridor and soffitted in along the wall. There isn't
18 room in the soffit for a lateral brace.
19 Taking away the six-inch rod rule will
20 significantly increase the cost of some efficient
21 sprinkler systems with no measurable return benefit.
22 We ask you to vote in favor of our motion and
23 return the rule to the standard that allows us to omit
24 lateral braces from cross mains where the pipe is
25 supported by hangers of rods six inches or less.

PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Mr. Linder, would you like to offer the committee's position?

COMMITTEE CHAIR LINDER: I would like to defer the committee's position to the TC Chair for the Hanging and Bracing Committee, Mr. Jim Biggins.

TC COMMITTEE CHAIR BIGGINS: Thank you. Jim Biggins, Global Risk Consultants. As Ken spoke to, we did try to address the issue of lateral bracing, and we did address it by further defining that the rod is to the building structure, not to the trapeze hanger.

A comment came in trying to further clarify it. We may have overstepped, but the committee did discuss it and we felt it was the proper thing to do. And I know there's a number of committee members here that will speak, as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you, gentlemen. With that, we will open up debate on the motion.

Please provide your name, and affiliation, and whether you are speaking in support of or against the motion. Microphone 3.

MR. DEUTCH: I'm John Deutch representing the City of Brea and I'm in favor of this motion to reject it.

I'm the author of this comment. I made the comment -- I'm in favor of the motion to reject this

comment because I believe that this comment is too conservative and may cause added cost to the public.

The comment is an all or nothing with respect to the cross main sway braces.

If a four-inch feed main, which is still acceptable, is hung with a three-eighths rod and it had no sway bracing, then a smaller cross main would surely be okay with some limited load.

While I am opposed to having unlimited loads being applied to cross mains, I think that NFPA being a minimum standard, that this would just go too far.

I think at this point we should reject this proposal in hopes of a more sophisticated proposal later, something that had an evaluation process similar to what we do with sway braces. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you. Microphone 4.

MR. KIRSCH: Yes. I'm Craig Kirsch. I'm a TC member. I'm against this proposal -- or this motion.

We need to consider the following: The NFPA is an emergency system, and I must espouse the tenants of a surveyed engineering philosophy and not leave desired result to chance.

Chapter 9 tenants were enhanced to control seismic force in conformance to ASC7. We were -- we

were -- we defined the seismic force specific to the project site in Chapter 9. We quantify this force by assisting configuration and control its effects specific to discrete characteristics of the system pipe as evidenced by its resistence to deflection, deformation, and fitting failure.

935-939, which we call the six-inch rod rule, totally ignores the above subject AFCE7 or it's

parameters. So it's a philosophical problem that we have.

Please be advised that the TC overwhelmingly has supported the proposal and have voted 24 to 3. Doing nothing, as proposed by this motion, is not conservative engineering typical to the NFPA 13 engineering system.

Please support the consensus of Hanging and Bracing Committee, the Technical Committee, by rejecting this motion. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Thank you. Is there any further discussion on Motion 13-4 to reject Comment 13-241?

Seeing none, Mr. Linder, any final comments?

COMMITTEE CHAIR LINDER: I will defer to the TC Chair, Jim Biggins, for final comments.

TC COMMITTEE CHAIR BIGGINS: I ask the group to

support the committee action on this, but I do also want to say that this is something that we will be looking at in greater detail during the next cycle.

PRESIDING OFFICER MILKE: Okay. Before we vote, let me restate the motion. The motion on the floor is to reject Comment 13-241.

Please record your vote. 1 is in favor of the motion, 2 is opposed to the motion.

5 seconds.

The balloting is closed.

Thank you. The results of the vote are that the motion has passed.

Is there any further discussion on NFPA 13? Thank you, gentlemen.

This officially concludes this portion of the 2012 Annual Association Technical Meeting. I want to thank you for your participation, interest, and support.

I now declare this part of the meeting officially closed. We resume tomorrow at 8:00 a.m.

(TIME NOTED: 6:30 p.m.)

I, the undersigned, a Certified Court Reporter of the State of Nevada, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me at the time and place herein set forth; that any witnesses in the foregoing proceedings, prior to testifying, were duly sworn; that a record of the proceedings was made by me using machine shorthand which was thereafter transcribed under my direction; that the foregoing transcript is a true record of the testimony given.

Further, that before completion of the proceedings, review of the transcript [ ] was [X] was not requested.

I further certify I am neither financially interested in the action nor a relative or employee of any attorney or party to this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date subscribed my name.

Dated: June 25, 2012

_____
ELLEN L. FORD, CSR No. 846

49

173

I, the undersigned, a Certified Court Reporter of the State of Nevada, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me at the time and place herein set forth; that a verbatim record of the proceedings was made by me using machine shorthand which was thereafter transcribed under my direction; further, that the foregoing transcript is an accurate transcription thereof.

I further certify I am neither financially interested in the action nor a relative or employee of any attorney or any of the parties.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date subscribed my name.

Dated: June 25, 2012

_____
CHRISTY I. PHELPS
CCR NO. 683

174