ANNUAL 2012
NFPA ASSOCIATION TECHNICAL MEETING
CERTIFIED AMENDING MOTIONS

NFPA 75, 105, 150, 275, 1144, 1500, 1582, 1917, 1951, 1971, 1991, 1124, 1127 and 72

Thursday, June 14, 2012
Mandalay Bay Convention Center
Las Vegas, Nevada

Reported By:
Kimberly M. Lowe, CSR 849
Job No. 139549

Pages 1 - 182



P R O C E E D I N G S
-oOo-

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I'm J.C. Harrington, and I have the distinct pleasure and privilege of being a member of your standards council. I now declare that a quorum exists and convene the 2012 Association Technical Meeting.

To assist me is Linda Fuller of the NFPA staff, who is serving as staff coordinator. I'd also like to introduce Amy Beasley Cronin, secretary of the standards council; Jim Pauley, chair of the council, Maureen Brodoff, NFPA's general counsel.

This session will be recorded by Sarnoff Court Reporters of Las Vegas, Nevada.

First, let me address our safety issues. Let's take a minute and note the exits from this room. Now that you've noted the closest exit to you, I'd like to inform you that the fire alarm signal at the Mandalay Bay Convention Center is a



slow whoop, along with the 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 for registration outside this ballroom.

As with any organization, we have certain rules and protocols. First, the use of videos and/or audio recording devices of any type is not allowed during the association technical meeting.

11 I'd like to call your attention to the guide for
12 the conduct of participants in the NFPA's codes and
13 standards development process. As a participant in
14 the process, you should be familiar with this
15 guide.
16 I'd also like to call your attention to
17 the NFPA convention rules which set the process to
18 be followed today. Copies of both documents are
19 contained in NFPA standards directory, which is
20 posted on the NFPA Web site with copies also
21 available at the NFPA registration desk.
22 The certified amending motions that
23 comprise the agenda for today's session will be
24 taken in the order as printed in salmon-colored
25 handouts, entitled "Annual 2012 NFPA Association

3

♀

1 Technical Meeting, Certified Amending Motions."
2 The primary regulations governing the
3 NFPA's codes and standards development process,
4 including process of amending motions of the
5 technical meetings, are the regulations governing
6 committee projects. They're called the "Regs."
7 These Regs are al; posted on the NFPA Web site and
8 published in the NFPA standards directory.
9 I'd like to say a few words about the
10 actions that can be taken today and the voting
11 procedures. At this session, you are being asked
12 to act on certain motions pertaining to technical
13 committee reports. The technical committee reports
14 on eight of these documents -- NFPA 59A, 75, 150,
15 275, 499, 1951, 1971, and 1991 -- are contained in
16 the 2012 NFPA fall revision cycle report on
17 proposals and report on comments, the white book.
18 Twelve documents -- NFPA 13, 13R, 20, 61,
19 72, 105, 1124, 1127, 1144, 1500, 1528, and 1917 --
20 can be found in the "2012 NFPA Annual Revision
21 Cycle Report on Proposals," Volumes 1 and 2; and
22 the "Report on Comments." These are the blue
23 books.
24 Under convention rules, before a motion
25 can be considered for action at the association

4

♀

1 technical meeting, the intended maker of the motion
2 must file a notice of intent to make a motion or a
3 NITMAM prior to the published deadline of April 6,
4 2012. These NITMAMs were reviewed by a motions
5 committee appointed by the standards council chair.
6 The motions committee certified those NITMAMs and
7 in compliance with NFPA rules as certified amending
8 motions and published a final motions committee
9 report on May 7, 2012.
10 The motions committee approved posting a
11 revised report on May 30, 2012, due to several
12 submitters requesting the motions committee
13 approve the withdrawal of their certified amendment
14 motions.
15 Table A of this report, the salmon-colored
16 handout, identifies the certified amending motions
17 for consideration today. Only certified amending
18 motions together with certain allowable follow-up
19 amending motions -- that is, motions that become
20 necessary as a result of a successful certified

21 amending motion -- will be allowed at this meeting.
22 There is a further requirement that a person must
23 sign in to indicate that they are, in fact, here to
24 pursue their motion.
25 As part of these procedures,

5

♀

1 statements for the record -- that is, statements
2 concerning technical committee actions for which no
3 certified amending motion or allowable follow-up
4 motion is available -- are not permitted.
5 In accordance with 4610 of the Regs, if a
6 quorum is challenged and found to be no longer
7 present of a hundred members, the sessions will be
8 terminated without further action on the reports.
9 Any reports on the document that has not been acted
10 on shall be forwarded directly to the council
11 without the recommendation of this meeting for
12 action in accordance with 48 of the Regs.
13 If a quorum is lost during the
14 consideration of a report, any motion to amend or
15 return that report that has passed, prior to the
16 loss of the quorum, will be processed and forwarded
17 to the council in accordance with 46 and 47 of the
18 Regs.
19 Any appeals based on action by the
20 association at this meeting must be filed with the
21 standards council within 20 days of this meeting.
22 That is, by July 4, 2012.
23 Any amendments accepted at this meeting
24 that failed to pass the subsequent committee
25 ballot, will automatically be documented as an

6

♀

1 appeal on the standards council agenda in
2 accordance with Section 162(b) of the Regs.
3 Note, however, that if an automatically
4 docketed appeal is not pursued by a party, the
5 council need not consider it.
6 The votes cast in this association
7 technical meeting today and the discussions that
8 lead to that voting are an integral and important
9 part of the NFPA consensus process. The
10 association technical meeting is a quorum where the
11 membership considers changes to the reports
12 prepared by NFPA technical committees concerning
13 proposed or revised NFPA's codes and standards when
14 such changes are pursued by certified amending
15 motions. Through the motions, debate and voting at
16 this meeting, the membership makes recommendations
17 to the standards council. The standards council,
18 under NFPA rules, is the official issuer of all
19 NFPA codes and standards.
20 The majority vote of the persons present
21 here today is for the sole purpose of making a
22 recommendation to the standards council on the
23 disposition of the report.
24 The standards council will meet on
25 August 6 through 9, 2012, to make a judgment on

7

♀

1 whether or not to issue a document. The council's
2 decision on document issuance is based on the
3 entire record before it, including the discussion

4 and vote taken at the NFPA's association meeting.
5 Limited review following actions by the standards
6 council may also be available through the petition
7 of the board of directors. Any such petition must
8 be filed within 15 days of the council's action in
9 accordance with the regulations governing petitions
10 to the board of directors from decisions of the
11 standards council. The deadline for notice of such
12 petition is August 24, 2012.
13 With respect to the voting procedures, the
14 Regs state that voting at NFPA association meetings
15 shall be limited to the following:
16 Those present who are voting members of
17 the association. That is, those with red badges
18 with "voting" on the top. If you are not a voting
19 member of record of the association registered at
20 this meeting, I ask that you refrain from voting.
21 You need not be a member of a NFPA section in order
22 to vote. You must, however, be a voting member.
23 Only voting members of record should be seated in
24 the front areas. Those seated in the back areas
25 will not be counted.



♀

1 Voting will be undertaken in the following
2 manner:
3 There will be no voice votes. The vote
4 will be taken by using electronic voting devices
5 for regular voting members. I want to say at the
6 outset, I will not cast a vote. Therefore, in the
7 event of a tie vote, the issue automatically will
8 fail.
9 Once a report and certified amending
10 motion is presented, it's open for discussion.
11 Anyone in the room has the privilege for
12 participating. The Chair asks that you preface
13 your remarks with your name and company or
14 organization affiliation. Let me repeat that.
15 Your name and your company or organization
16 affiliation should preface your remarks, even if
17 you have been to the microphone many times, since
18 we are having the meeting transcribed for the
19 record.
20 As you can see, we have red and green
21 signs on the mics in the room. Red signs indicate
22 opposition to a motion. And green sign indicates
23 support of a motion on the floor. I would also ask
24 that you stand at the appropriate mic and state at
25 the beginning of your remarks whether you're



♀

1 speaking in support or in opposition of the motion
2 being debated.
3 Now a couple of things to note during the
4 floor debates today. First, please be aware that
5 no one participating in the floor motions and
6 debates at this meeting is authorized to act as an
7 agent of or speak on behalf of the NFPA. Views
8 expressed during motions and debates, including
9 those expressed on behalf of the technical
10 committees or other entities operating within the
11 NFPA system, do not necessarily reflect the views
12 of the NFPA.
13 Second, a note about NFPA sections. From

14 time to time, the Chair or other representatives of
15 a NFPA section may rise during the debate to state
16 the position of an NFPA section on a motion that is
17 under consideration. NFPA sections are group of
18 NFPA members organized around particular subjects
19 such as the electrical, fire service, or health
20 care sections. Under the regulations governing
21 NFPA sections, a section may take a position on an
22 issue on the floor of an association technical
23 meeting. The position of a section does not
24 necessarily reflect the views of all section
25 members. Rather, a section may state a position on

10

♀

1 a motion if the majority of the section members
2 attending a section meeting have approved that
3 position and there are at least 25 votes cast at
4 that section meeting.
5 The position of a section is accorded no
6 special status in the NFPA codes and standards
7 development process. And just as you would do with
8 any other position expressed during the debates
9 today, you, as voting members of the association,
10 may weigh and assess such positions as you deem
11 appropriate.
12 Given the size of the agenda today and the
13 amount of material we have to get through, we'll
14 start out with three minutes allowed per speaker;
15 but it's my plan to limit time as appropriate in
16 the event that this becomes necessary.
17 There will be a timer that will appear on
18 the middle screen to indicate that you have one
19 minute remaining on your allotted time.
20 The Chair reserves the right to hear a new
21 speaker before yielding the floor to anyone wishing
22 to address the same issue a second time.
23 Motions that are in order, the certified
24 amending motions, are contained in the
25 salmon-colored handout entitled, "Annual 2012 NFPA

11

♀

1 Association Technical Meeting Certified Amending
2 Motions," which are available at the registration
3 desk and at the back of the room today.
4 The motions pertaining to the documents
5 contained on pages 79 and 80 are the annual meeting
6 program. As previously stated, this meeting is
7 conducted in accordance with the NFPA convention
8 rules that are available on the NFPA Web site, and
9 there are copies at the NFPA registration desk.
10 Upon completion of action on all certified
11 amending motions related to an NFPA document, the
12 presiding officer shall entertain any follow-up
13 motions. A follow-up motion is a motion that
14 becomes necessary as a result of a previous
15 successful amending motion.
16 A motion to return a document or return a
17 portion of a document affected by a previous
18 successful amending motion is always in order as a
19 follow-up motion as long as it's not repetitious.
20 The presiding officers shall make the
21 determination on whether a motion is a proper
22 follow-up motion. The maker of the motion shall be
23 required to explain why it is a proper follow-up

24 motion. A follow-up motion shall also require two
25 seconders.

12

♀

1 Before we begin today, I'd like to address
2 the electronic voting devices that we'll be using
3 today. The devices will be recording your support
4 or lack of support of the motion that's on the
5 floor.
6 There's a few rules I need to make you
7 aware of. All voting members that were issued an
8 electronic voting device are responsible for that
9 device. Each device is linked to the voting
10 member's name, and if the device is lost or broken,
11 they will be held responsible for the replacement
12 of the device.
13 Additionally, at no time can you hand out
14 your device to anyone to input your vote. Anyone
15 found with multiple voting devices will be asked to
16 leave the association technical session. You must
17 return your device to the NFPA person who is
18 manning the table at the back of the room as you
19 leave the association technical session at the end
20 of the day.
21 So we're now going to test the system, and
22 I'm going to ask you to vote on a motion. I want
23 everyone to vote either to click one in favor of a
24 motion to accept or to click two if you are opposed
25 to the motion reject. I'll give you ten seconds to

13

♀

1 vote, and then I'll give you a five-second-warning
2 countdown indicating the balloting will be closing.
3 I'll then announce that balloting is closed, and
4 the results will be displayed on the middle screen
5 behind me. Ready?
6 So the motion on the floor is to accept
7 comment 101.20. It's not up there? Okay.
8 So please record your vote as one in favor
9 of the motion or two opposed to the motion.
10 The balloting will be closed in five
11 seconds. And the balloting is closed. So the
12 motion passes.
13 So now that we know how the voting devices
14 work, let's proceed.
15 Finally, I'd like to stress that the rules
16 that we are operated under today are designed to
17 improve the efficiency and the quality of the
18 association technical meeting by eliminating the
19 need to present uncontested documents by giving you
20 the NFPA memberships advanced notice of the
21 amending motions that are to be presented and by
22 giving me, as the presiding officer, greater
23 discretion in managing the debate to ensure that
24 the issues are as fully debated as possible in the
25 available time.

14

♀

1 It's my hope and expectation that together
2 we will make the association technical meeting a
3 success, and I thank you in advance for your
4 cooperation and patience and, when we are done,
5 your comments and suggestions for the future. Also
6 we will be taking comfort breaks as necessary this

7 morning.
8 So at this point, before we begin the
9 documents, I would like to introduce Jim Pauley,
10 the chair of the standards council, and Amy Beasley
11 Cronin, who will present committee service awards.
12 MR. PAULEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
13 Committee service award is given to a technical
14 committee member for continuance and exemplary
15 service on one or more committees over a
16 substantial period of time and in recognition and
17 appreciation of distinguished service to the NFPA
18 and the development of NFPA codes and standards.
19 I'm pleased to present this award today to the
20 following very deserving individuals.
21 Our first recipient of the committee
22 service award is Jess Beitel.
23 MS. CRONIN: Jesse J. Beitel of
24 Hughes Associates, Incorporated, in Baltimore,
25 Maryland serves on the technical committee on fire



♀
1 tests from 1980 to present and as chair from 1990
2 to 2001, the Technical Committee on Air
3 Conditioning from 1999 to present; the Technical
4 Committee on Exposure of Fire Protection, 2005 to
5 present; building code Technical Committee on
6 Structures, Construction and Materials 2006 to
7 present; building construction 2003 to present.
8 And Jesse also received the special achievement
9 award in 2002.
10 MR. PAULEY: Please join me in
11 congratulating Jesse Beitel.
12 (Applause.)
13 MR. PAULEY: The next recipient of the
14 committee service award is Randall Bradley.
15 MS. CRONIN: Randall K. Bradley is from
16 the Moraga-Orinda Fire District in Orinda,
17 California; and he serves on the Technical
18 Committee on Forest and Rural Fire Protection 1992
19 to present, chair since 2003. And the Technical
20 Correlating Committee on Fire and Emergency
21 Services Protective Clothing and Equipment from
22 2006 to 2008. Randy also served on the NFPA
23 standards council starting in 2012.
24 MR. PAULEY: Please congratulate Randy.
25 (Applause.)



♀
1 MR. PAULEY: The next recipient of the
2 committee service award is Rodger Reiswig.
3 Rodger, could you please join me here at
4 the podium.
5 MS. CRONIN: Rodger Reiswig of
6 Tyco's SimplexGrinnell in Apopka, Florida, serves
7 on the Technical Correlating Committee on Signaling
8 Systems for the Protection of Life and Property,
9 2007 to present; and some of its technical
10 committees, including supervising station's fire
11 alarm and signaling systems, emergency
12 communication systems, carbon monoxide detection,
13 the Technical Committee on Telecommunication, the
14 Technical Committee on Premises Security, the life
15 safety code, building code Technical Committee on
16 Building Service and Fire Protection Equipment and

17 Fundamental, the Technical Committee on Fire Risk
18 Assessment Methods, the Technical Committee on
19 Commissioning and Integrated Testing, and finally
20 the Technical Correlating Committee on Health Care
21 Facilities.
22 MR. PAULEY: Please join me in
23 congratulating Rodger.
24 (Applause.)
25 MR. PAULEY: When I have a really long

17

♀
1 list, I have time to get back over to the podium.
2 Our last recipient of the committee
3 service award could not be with us today; so we do
4 want to acknowledge and thank him for his service.
5 MS. CRONIN: The member who could not be
6 here today is Glen P. Benarick of Aiken,
7 South Carolina. And he serves on the Technical
8 Committee on Hazardous Materials Response Personnel
9 from 1987 to 2005 and the Technical Committee on
10 Fire Service Occupational Safety and Health, 1992
11 to 2002; and chair from 2002 to 2012. Glen also
12 served on the NFPA standards council from 1999 to
13 2004.
14 MR. PAULEY: This concludes the awards
15 presentation for this morning. We will now
16 continue on with the technical committee session in
17 the final documents that we had remaining.
18 Mr. Harrington.
19 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you,
20 Jim. Thank you, Amy.
21 The first document this morning, NFPA 75,
22 appeared on our agenda; however, the authorized
23 maker of the motion has notified NFPA that they no
24 longer wish to pursue their motion on this
25 document.

18

♀
1 Therefore, in accordance with the NFPA
2 rules, regulations at 456 and convention rules at
3 27, the document will not be considered at this
4 meeting and instead becomes a consent document. It
5 will be forwarded directly to the standards council
6 for issuance or other action.
7 We would like to thank the committee for
8 their work on this document and will now move on to
9 the new document.
10 The next report under consideration this
11 morning is out of the Technical Committee on Fire
12 Doors and Windows.
13 Here to present the committee report is
14 Committee Chair Bruce Kendall of Hughes Associates,
15 Lafayette, Colorado. The committee report can be
16 found in the blue 2012 annual revision cycle ROP
17 and ROC. The certified amending motions are
18 contained in the motions committee report and
19 behind me on the screen. We'll proceed in the
20 order of the motion number presented.
21 Mr. Campbell.
22 MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chair, ladies and
23 gentlemen, report on the technical committee on
24 Fire Doors and Windows is presented for adoption.
25 It could be found in the report on proposals and

19

♀
1 report on comments for the 2012 annual meeting
2 revision cycle.
3 The technical committee has published a
4 report consisting of a partial revision of
5 NFPA 105, standard for the installation of smoke
6 door assemblies and other opening protecters. The
7 report was submitted to letter ballot of the
8 technical committee that consists of 28 voting
9 members. The ballot results can be found on pages
10 105-22 to 105-3 of the report on proposals and
11 page 105-2 on the reports of comments. Presiding
12 officer now proceed with the certified amending
13 motion.
14 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay.
15 We're now are going to proceed on the discussion of
16 Certified Amending Motion 105-1.
17 Microphone 5.
18 MR. LAMMER: Hello, my name is
19 Pete Lammer. I'm with the Department of Veterans
20 Affairs. I've been a designated rep for
21 Josh Elvove, the maker of this motion.
22 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
23 Do we have a second?
24 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Second.
25 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay.
20
♀
1 Please proceed.
2 MR. LAMMER: The motion is to accept
3 comment 105-4.
4 The committee did not actually accept
5 Mr. Elvove's public comment in principal as his
6 public comment to permit any initiating device to
7 be used to initiate damper closures, be it a smoke
8 detector, manual pull station, or water pull
9 switch. The current edition only discusses using a
10 smoke detector.
11 The committee changed Mr. Elvove's comment
12 such that a detector and another initiated device
13 be tested to initiate damper closure. Changing or
14 to and has a serious impact on the testing process
15 as it could result in potentially having multiple
16 contractors on site in order to perform damper
17 testing -- the damper contractor, the fire alarm
18 contractor, and the sprinkler contractor, and also
19 a result in testing initiated devices more than
20 once due to NFPA 72 requirements.
21 The scope of NFPA 105 is to ensure that
22 dampers close properly. This can be done even
23 without the use of the fire alarm system simply by
24 dropping the power to the damper. The scope of
25 NFPA 105 is not to recommend what the device is to
21
♀
1 initiate damper closure. NFPA 72 is the current
2 document responsible for testing the initiating
3 devices that interface with emergency control
4 functions, and soon this will all be covered with
5 NFPA 4 for integrated testing.
6 Thank you.
7 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON:
8 Mr. Campbell, would you like to give the
9 Committee's position?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, sir.
Of 28 members that were eligible to vote, 27 voted affirmative; and one did not return their ballot. And during the committee meeting, there was not a whole lot of discussion on this point, but in general, the committee members felt as though it was more comprehensive to test all the devices versus just one, and we did not discuss the impact of NFPA 4 on our decision at that point.
PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Campbell. So with that, we'll open up the floor for debate on this motion. As a reminder, please provide your name and affiliation and whether you're speaking in support of or against the motion.
Microphone 8.

22

MR. CADERLY: Good morning. My name is Rick Caderly, building and safety associate here in Las Vegas. I rise in opposition of the motion and in support of the Committee's position for the following reasons.
Where fire and smoke dampers are incorporated within a building smoke control system, it is imperative that such smoke dampers be tested across the interconnection to the smoke control system. It is at this time also appropriate to acknowledge the development of NFPA 4, the standard for integrated testing for fire protection life safety systems. Thus this standard will require the integrated testing of all fire smoke dampers in accordance with the building's basis of design and this current recommendation of the NFPA 105 technical committee.
Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Is there any further discussion on Motion 105-1 to accept Comment 105-4? Seeing none, we'll move to a vote.
Before we do that, Mr. Chair, do you have any final remarks or anything you'd like to say?
MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. I just want to reiterate that the position of the committee was to

23

ensure that a comprehensive test was performed to ensure the damper will close in all cases with all devices.
PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay. Thank you.
So we're going to move to a vote. Before we do that, let me restate the motion. The motion on the floor is to accept Comment 105-4. So please record your vote one in favor of the motion or two opposed to the motion.
The balloting will be closed in five seconds. Balloting is closed. And the motion fails.
Thank you, Mr. Chair.
MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: The next report under consideration this morning is out of the Technical committee on Animal Housing Facilities. Here to present the committee report

is Committee Chair Brad Cronen of Newport Fire Department of Newport, Rhode Island.

The committee report can be found in the white 2001 fall revision cycle ROP and ROC. The certified of amending motions are contained in the motions committee report and behind me on the

24

screen. We'll proceed in the order of the motion's number presented.

Mr. Cronen.

MR. CRONEN: Thank you.

Mr. Chair, ladies and gentlemen, the report of the Technical Committee on Animal Housing Facilities is presented for adoption and 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 150, standard on fire and life safety and annual housing facility. The report was submitted to a letter ballot of the technical committee that consists of 24 voting members. The ballot results can be found on pages 150-2 to 150-6 of the report on proposals and 150-2 to 150-7 of the report on comments.

The presiding officer will now proceed with certified amending motions.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you, Mr. Cronen. Let's now proceed with the discussion on the certified group amending motion on NFPA 150.

Microphone 7.

MR. SCIBETTA: My name is Joe Scibetta.

25

I'm a principal member on the technical committee for NFPA 150. I rise to call for the acceptance of Group Amending Motion 150-1.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Do I have a second?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Second.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Please proceed.

MR. SCIBETTA: NFPA 150 separates animals into two categories, Category A and Category B.

Category A animals or those that, one, pose a potential risk in the health and safety rescuers; two, cannot be removed without risk to their health or the health of other animals; three, are impossible or impractical to move; four, are not mobile or within a mobile enclosure.

Given that wording, facilities such as zoos, animal research labs, veterinarian clinics contain Category A animals; therefore, this motion does not apply to those facilities.

In Chapter 9 of NFPA 150, Section 8 it reads, "Animal housing facilities with Category A animals shall be sprinklers throughout and shall have a smoke control system."

You'll note that Category B animals are

26

not included in that statement. That is because NFPA 150 does not mandate sprinkler protection or

3 smoke control for Category B animals, defined
4 simply as those animals not in Category A.
5 A prime example of a Category B animal is
6 the horses in a commercial stable. In most cases,
7 horse do not pose a potential risk to the health
8 and safety of rescuers. They can be removed
9 without risk to their health or the health of other
10 animals are both possible and practical to move and
11 are mobile, able to be led with the use of a
12 halter.
13 NFPA 150 was created as a response to a
14 series of tragic racetrack stable fires in the
15 1970s. In fact, the first version of NFPA 150 was
16 entitled "Fire Safety in Racetrack Stables."
17 With tragic irony, NFPA 150 now includes
18 the very animals that document set out to protect
19 when it was first formulated by excluding horses in
20 commercial stables and all other animals in
21 Category B for sprinkler and smoke control
22 protection.
23 The purpose of this motion, therefore, is
24 to extend the protection of sprinklers and smoke
25 controls already afforded to Category A animals to



♀
1 Category B animals as well.
2 I'll pause for the one-minute warning,
3 Mr. Chairman.
4 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Yes. You
5 do have one minute remaining. Thank you.
6 MR. SCIBETTA: This addition to this
7 standard will only affect newly constructed
8 commercial animal housing facilities that contain
9 Category B animals. Existing facilities with
10 Category B animals will only be affected if there
11 were changes in occupancy or use or if there was a
12 renovation modification reconstruction or addition.
13 Each class of facility will also be protected for
14 both animal categories. That is, facilities with
15 no access to animals or with limited access to
16 animals or with general access to animals.
17 To my fellow NFPA members, I thank you in
18 advance for considering this important motion.
19 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you,
20 Mr. Scibetta.
21 I just want to clarify that the motion on
22 the floor is a group amending motion. So,
23 actually, the motion is to accept proposal 150-11,
24 150-13, 150-14, and 150-15 as a group.
25 Mr. Cronen, do you have any comments from



♀
1 the committee?
2 MR. CRONEN: Yes. Of the 24 voting
3 members, 20 returned votes. And out of those 20,
4 with the exception of one of the proposals, it was
5 19 in favor. With one extension, they were all
6 unanimously in favor of this change -- or excuse
7 me -- this remaining the same.
8 And the reason for that is the committee
9 is not against sprinklers, not against sprinklers
10 in these types of facilities. In fact, in our
11 substantiation, we put forth that we're going to
12 look at this in between revision cycles and that we

13 are bringing it up again in the next revision
14 cycle.
15 I know many of you out there are probably
16 passionate about sprinkler systems. Maybe you sell
17 them, install them, design them; or you've just
18 seen their benefit over the years; and these
19 committee members on this committee are no
20 different.
21 And what we wanted to do is to simply get
22 more input from the associations that are going to
23 be affected by the industries that are going to be
24 affected by this sweeping change in facilities.
25 As Mr. Scibetta said, the document started

29

♀
1 out as racetrack stables; and it has only changed
2 in scope in the last two revision cycles to include
3 all animal housing facilities.
4 Because of that change and because of its
5 adoption in 2009 into the Uniform Fire Code by
6 reference, we now have a multitude of facilities
7 that are included under the scope of this document.
8 Because it was just recent and these changes were
9 just recently made, we haven't had the input from
10 the industries that are going to be affected by
11 this thing; and we think that they deserve that
12 input.
13 Thank you.
14 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you,
15 Mr. Cronen.
16 So with that, we'll open up the floor for
17 debate on the motion. Please provide your name and
18 affiliation and whether you're speaking in support
19 of or against the motion.
20 Okay. Seeing nobody rise to speak on this
21 motion, we're going move on to a vote. Sorry.
22 Microphone 7.
23 MR. SCIBETTA: Joe Scibetta, technical
24 committee for NFPA 150 speaking in favor of the
25 motion on the floor.

30

♀
1 Next year will mark the 100th anniversary
2 of Ms. Francis Perkins' address to NFPA in 1913,
3 which was a plea for changes to be made to the
4 existing fire codes in her day. Regarding those
5 who work in factories, she made this remark.
6 Quote, "They cannot secure fire protection
7 for themselves. It is because they are not their
8 own masters, that it is necessary for organizations
9 like yours to insist upon safety for them," end
10 quote.
11 Those words apply with equal, if not
12 greater force, to confined animals who most
13 certainly are not their own masters and are
14 powerless to secure protection for themselves.
15 NFPA 150 defines animals as "sentient
16 beings." The word "sentient" is no longer common
17 use today, but it is defined as having the power of
18 perception by the census -- conscious.
19 When caught in a fire, animals don't
20 understand why they can't breathe or why they are
21 in such agony. They do, however, perceive and are
22 conscious of the sheer terror of their situation

23 and the terrible sensations of burning,
24 suffocation, and pain.
25 To quote Ms. Perkins again with regard to

31

♀

1 this issue, we must insist upon safety for them.
2 In commercial animal housing facilities, when we
3 confine animals to suit human purposes, we have an
4 obligation to secure fire protection for them,
5 especially due to the fact that in most of the
6 recent fire -- animal housing fire cases, humans
7 were not on hand to effect rescue.
8 This motion does not introduce some new
9 revolution concept or speaking change to the
10 standard or to our industry. I feel that very
11 strongly. On the contrary, this motion calls for
12 the extension of known and proven fire protection
13 technology to all animals in newly-constructed
14 facilities.
15 Thank you.
16 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
17 Seeing no one else rise, Mr. Chair, do you have any
18 final remarks?
19 MR. CRONEN: Okay. Thank you.
20 I will just say, in response to
21 Mr. Scibetta, it was absolutely the Committee's
22 feeling that that protection of animals as sentient
23 beings is what drove us to rejecting this proposal.
24 It is an adopted standard by reference in the
25 Uniform Fire Code, and as now, we have protection

32

♀

1 for some groups in some areas; and our fear was
2 that it will certain -- it will be removed by
3 reference in jurisdictions if it was given this
4 blanket sprinkler requirement.
5 Thank you.
6 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you,
7 Mr. Chair.
8 So before we vote, let me restate the
9 motion that's in front of you -- well, he's back.
10 Okay. Excuse me. Microphone 7.
11 MR. SCIBETTA: Joe Scibetta, technical
12 committee member for NFPA 150, speaking in favor of
13 the motion on the floor.
14 Two recent incidents underscore the
15 difference the sprinkler protections make in an
16 animal housing fire.
17 A fire broke out at 3:00 a.m. at the
18 Plainville Racetrack in Plainridge, Massachusetts
19 on May 9, 2010. The racetrack had sprinkler
20 protection in each barn, and the sprinkler system
21 was tied into the fire alarm. The signal was sent.
22 The fire department was dispatched while the
23 sprinklers, according to the fire chief on
24 location, were essential for knocking down the
25 blaze. All 42 horses were rescued without injury.

33

♀

1 In contrast, just two months ago on
2 April 11, a fire broke out at 5:00 p.m. at the
3 unsprinkler Black Tie Stable in McHenry County.
4 Were there people on hand to assist? Most
5 definitely. But the fire was too powerful too

6 intense. More than 100,000 gallons of water had to
7 be tanked in by 21 departments to put out the
8 blaze, which had a long and deadly head start,
9 killing 18 horses.
10 As an industry, we are faced with far more
11 technical and costly challenges than what this
12 motion is calling for. We do not need more
13 research, more time than money spent to discover
14 what we already know to be true -- sprinkler and
15 smoke technology work.
16 An interesting comment was made in the
17 most recently edition of the NFPA Journal regarding
18 sprinkler protection. The context was detention
19 facilities, but the words can be applied equally to
20 animal housing facilities.
21 Here's the quote: "In a building without
22 readily access, life safety must be provided by
23 managing the fire in place. Automatic fire
24 sprinklers give us that capability," end quote.
25 There are no readily accessible access for



♀
1 a confined animal. In most cases, when fire breaks
2 out, there are no humans on hand to get them safely
3 to the access before they are engulfed in smoking
4 flames.
5 Please pass this motion so that NFPA 150
6 will be able to actually stand by one of its
7 fundamental goals; namely, to provide an
8 environment for animal occupants inside or adjacent
9 to a structure that is reasonably safe from fire.
10 I'll pause for the one-minute warning,
11 Mr. Chairman.
12 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: You do have
13 one minute remaining.
14 MR. SCIBETTA: Leaving animals to the
15 ravages of fire confined unable to escape without
16 sprinkler protection or smoke control placed, is
17 not an environment that can be deemed reasonably
18 safe from fire. Our industry is unique in its
19 intelligence, flexibility, and ingenuity.
20 When we add to that willingness to apply
21 those attributes, then nothing can stop us from
22 moving forward in achieving whatever we set out to
23 do. I hope that our votes today indicate that we
24 are ready to bring that intelligence, flexibility,
25 and ingenuity to this issue; and coupled with



♀
1 technology we already possessed with the
2 willingness to apply it.
3 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
4 Do you have any final comments? Are you
5 all set?
6 MR. CRONEN: No.
7 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay.
8 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
9 Before we vote, we're ready now to vote.
10 Let me restate the motion so it's clear what we're
11 voting on.
12 The motion on the floor is to accept the
13 group proposals 150-11, 150-13, 150-14 and 150-15.
14 So please record your vote one in favor of the
15 motion, two opposed to the motion. The ballot is

closing in five seconds. Balloting closed. And the motion passes.

Is there any further discussion on NFPA 150? Seeing none, we'll move on to the next document.

Thank you very much, Mr. Cronen.

MR. CRONEN: Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay. The next report under consideration this morning is that of the Technical Committee of Fire Tests.

36

Here to present the committee report is Committee Chair Barry Badders of Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, Texas. The committee report can be found in the white 2011 fall 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's sequence number presented.

Mr. Badders.

MR. BADDERS: Mr. Chair and ladies and gentlemen, the report of the Technical Committee on Fire Tests is presented for adoption and can be found on report for proposals and report on comments for the 2011 fall meeting revision cycle. The technical committee has published a report consisting of a partial revision of NFPA 275, standard method of fire tests for the evaluation of thermal barriers used over foam plastic insulation.

The report was submitted to letter ballot to the technical committee. Ballot results can be found on pages 275-2, 275-4 of the report on proposal and Page 275-2 of the report on comments.

The presiding officer will now proceed with the certified amending motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you,

37

Mr. Bedders. So we will proceed with discussion on the certified amending motion on NFPA 275.

Microphone 5.

MR. HIRSCHLER: Mr. Marcelo Hirschler, GBH International, speaking for the North American Flame Retardant Alliance.

And I move to reject comments 275-1.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Do I have hey second? I didn't hear. Do I have a second?

SPEAKER: Second.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay. Thank you.

Please proceed.

MR. HIRSCHLER: Thank you. This is different from what the things I was talking about yesterday. This is a technical issue. What we're talking about is that the committee chose to replace in the test method, which is the room corner test, replace the pass/fail criteria by eliminating the pass/fail criteria.

So what we're now faced with, if this motion fails, is that a thermal barrier will be a product that is tested in the room corner test. That test is run. Flashover occurs. That test continues, and after the test, in some way the

laboratory determines that the plastic insulation it still remains in place. I'm not sure how they can determine whether it remains in place. A number of problems with this.

Number 1, the problem of safety to the lab. The lab is required to run a test long past flashover. This is a 15-minute test. It could be the flashover occurs in two or three minutes, and we'll have to continue running the test for another 12 minutes or so during flashover.

Number 2, there is an issue of we are determining that the material that fails a test, because it goes to flashover, is suitable for protecting other materials as a thermal barrier.

The rationale for the issue can be found. If you look at the proposal, one page above the comment, proposal 275-12 in page 275-4 for proposal, and that's where the key thing is. When Mr. (inaudible) explained that wood structural panels currently meet the thermal barrier requirements of the past and should be continued to be used --

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: One minute remaining.

MR. HIRSCHLER: -- if the belief is the



thermal wood structure panels are suitable, then that is a code issue; and that's not a standard issue. The test shouldn't be revised to approve particular materials and endanger the lives of the labs and endanger lives of people because now we have a test without a proper criteria.

Please approve this motion. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.

Mr. Bedders, would you like to give the Committee's perspective on that?

MR. BEDDERS: Mr. Chair, I wish to defer to Jess Beitel, a member of the fire test committee to speak on behalf.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.

Microphone 8.

MR. BEITEL: Jess Beitel, Hughes Associates, speaking for myself on this issue and try to give some clarity to what we are debating.

Basically --

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: And are you speaking for or against?

MR. BEITEL: I'm against the motion on the floor.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay. Thank you.



MR. BEITEL: In essence, the issue here is a thermal barrier product is a product which goes through two tests -- a fire resistance test and then a room corner type test. It evaluates whether or not it will protect underline foam plastic that this material was covering.

What we have found, as we developed NFPA 275 -- it's a new standard -- is that we

9 recognize, after the first standard is published,
10 that there was an issue with respect to certain
11 materials which have been used as thermal barrier
12 products because they can meet the fire resistance
13 portion of the test but yet not meet the room
14 corner test.
15 So, for example, if I have an assembly
16 with foam plastic in the wall, I cover that with,
17 let's say, a thickness of wood of a wood product,
18 whatever thickness that is. That thickness can
19 pass the first portion of the 275 test, which is
20 the fire resistance test; and then we put that
21 assembly into a room corner test. What will happen
22 is that the wood material typically will flashover
23 that roof and will fail that test. However, what
24 we are asking in this change is that, in essence,
25 that you allow that room test, even though it



♀

1 flashes over, it continues to run for the entire
2 15-minute duration that's specified for that test.
3 And at the end of that, extinguish the fire, remove
4 that protective material, and see if the foam is
5 involved.
6 If the foam has not been involved in that
7 fire, then the wood product did exactly what it's
8 supposed to do. It acted as a thermal barrier.
9 A couple of issues that I'd like to
10 quickly rebut, one is that our laboratories that
11 can run that test for post flashover conditions,
12 they are out there. Maybe not all, but there are
13 laboratories that can intersect testing, and
14 San Antonio is one.
15 The other issue is, in the same manner
16 which we protect structural steel, we allow
17 combustible materials, at the correct thickness, to
18 protect structural steel. We're just allowing a
19 combustible material to protect a foam plastic.
20 At the end of the day, the flame spread
21 characteristics of the protective membrane are
22 basically regulated by the interior section of the
23 code, either 101 or 5000. So those products are
24 then regulated by that. So if they cause a
25 flashover or if they cause a -- have a Class B or



♀

1 Class A flame spread, they may not be able to be
2 used even as a thermal barrier based on those other
3 regulations.
4 We feel that this was an appropriate
5 change to make to recognize alternate products to
6 be used as alternate thermal barriers.
7 Thank you.
8 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
9 So with that, we'll open up for floor debate on the
10 motion. Again, as a reminder, please provide your
11 name, affiliation, and whether you're going to be
12 speaking in support of or against the motion.
13 Microphone 5.
14 MR. KOVACIK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
15 I'm John Kovacik, Underwriters Laboratories. I
16 speak in support of the motion on the floor.
17 UL has the member on this committee, and
18 our vote was to reject this comment. We do not

19 believe that the material that the committee is
20 proposing to put into the document is appropriate
21 and represent some real safety concerns,
22 specifically related to the testing procedures
23 themselves.
24 In our negative ballot, we stated the
25 following:

43

♀
1 For the test method referenced in
2 Section 5, specifically UL 9 -- excuse me --
3 UL 1715 and NFPA 286, flashover typically indicates
4 conclusive test results; and consequently the tests
5 are terminated. These methods are not intended as
6 post flashover tests. Test laboratories have
7 limited or no experience conducting these tests
8 potentially well beyond flashover for the purpose
9 of examining the foam for MCM being protected.
10 There are test safety concerns as well as equipment
11 safety concerns.
12 In addition, determining whether the foam
13 or MCM contributes to the fire growth may be
14 difficult through visual inspection when the room
15 corner assembly has gone beyond flashover.
16 I urge the members of this body to vote in
17 support of this motion.
18 Thank you.
19 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
20 Microphone 8.
21 SPEAKER: Timothy (inaudible) American
22 Wood council speaking against the motion.
23 This motion is a backhanded effort to
24 regulate interior finish through 15-minute thermal
25 barrier. One place where wood product is commonly

44

♀
1 used to protect foam insulation is on houses that
2 are built on stilts like close to the ocean to
3 prevent storm surge from getting into house.
4 If you're going to use foam insulation on
5 the underside of the house, you need to protect the
6 foam; and typically you can use gypsum board
7 because it's exposed to -- and what's commonly used
8 right now is wood product that meets the 15-minute
9 thermal barrier requirement.
10 There was a question about the
11 laboratories can actually conduct the test proposed
12 by the committee. There are two labs that are
13 capable of conducting it. That's Southwest Reserve
14 as well as Western Fire. I urge you to reject this
15 motion.
16 Thank you.
17 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Microphone
18 Number 5.
19 MR. DAVIS: Dick Davis, FM Global speaking
20 in support of the motion. I would like to make it
21 clear to everyone that the language on 275-2 in the
22 ROC is only language, even though some of it has
23 been underlined.
24 This concern over the performance of the
25 thermal barrier, after the test, it's stated to be

45

♀
1 based on visual examination. The language in this

2 proposal is not proper. It doesn't say how to
3 provide visual examination. It doesn't tell you
4 what the pass/fail criteria should be. It may be
5 obvious to some of us, perhaps, more so with the
6 foam. But this also includes metal composite
7 materials will be more difficult for someone to
8 assess whether or not it actually passed or failed
9 without a specific pass/fail criteria in the
10 standard.
11 And just not to repeat what's been said,
12 but I've overseen many of these tests. There are
13 four different corner tests that are allowed to be
14 used by the standard ranging from 8 to 50 feet in
15 height. And typically, when they do fail, it
16 happens relatively earlier in a fire, which means
17 you have to continue running the test for at least
18 another five or ten minutes. And there is a very
19 good chance it may over task the pollution control
20 system, and it does put the personnel in jeopardy
21 that are running the test. And I've seen quite a
22 few tests that are pretty scary and failed these
23 tests.
24 So I urge you to support this proposal.
25 Thank you.



♀
1 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
2 Microphone Number 4.
3 MR. HOLLAND: Joe Holland, Hoover Treated
4 Wood Products. Speaking against the motion.
5 When you -- I need to respond to a couple
6 of comments by folks that are supporting the
7 motion.
8 When you're running a test, you know,
9 you've got to look at what's the end result of the
10 test that you're trying to achieve. I think Jess
11 explained that quite well in that, in this
12 particular case, you want to ensure that the
13 material behind the thermal barrier is not going to
14 be impacted. And the fact that you have flashover
15 is not an indication that the material behind the
16 material is going to be impacted. All that means
17 is that we have a fire, but what we want to be sure
18 is that, in this case, the foam plastic does not
19 become involved in the fire and add to it. So that
20 is the purpose of the thermal barrier.
21 The purpose of the thermal barrier is not
22 to ensure that we don't have flashover. The
23 problem that the test lab have, those are problems
24 that the test lab have. That has nothing to do
25 with what we are trying to achieve in running this



♀
1 test. We just want to make sure that foam plastic
2 is not becoming involved in the fire.
3 I urge you to reject the comment -- I
4 mean, to -- against the motion. How is that?
5 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
6 Microphone Number 5.
7 MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler GBH
8 International for NAFRA. I want to rebut a couple
9 of things.
10 First of all, this test is referenced in
11 all the building codes, both NFPA 5000 and IBC --

12 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Are you
13 speaking for or against the motion?
14 MR. HIRSCHLER: Excuse me. I'm speaking
15 for the motion.
16 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
17 MR. HIRSCHLER: Okay. Excuse me about
18 that.
19 This is referenced in the code. So that
20 pass/fail criteria come here will have an impact in
21 the code. This is not a backhanded way of
22 address -- of addressing the code. If someone
23 wants to have a specific exclusion for a specific
24 material, like a wood structural panel that happens
25 to behave well, then the code is the place to do

48

♀
1 that.
2 The code requires that interior finished
3 foam plastic shall not be used exposed. It needs
4 to be covered by thermal barrier. What's the point
5 of that? The point of that is to demonstrate that
6 we don't get flashover; that we don't get a serious
7 situation.
8 I just noticed the gentleman before,
9 Joe Holland, saying that flashover just indicates
10 there is a fire. No, flashover indicates a hell of
11 a lot more then there is a fire. There's a big
12 fire. That room is gone.
13 So if we have a room corner test, the test
14 where we test the entire room and if we go to that
15 room to flashover, we're now saying that this
16 material that is going -- that has gone to
17 flashover is safe to protect another material.
18 I don't think so. Thank you.
19 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
20 Microphone 8.
21 MR. BEITEL: Jess Beitel, Hughes
22 Associate. Representing myself on this issue and
23 stand against the motion on the floor.
24 I just like to reiterate a couple of
25 things. There are labs which can do this test. If

49

♀
1 any lab takes on wanting to do this test, then that
2 lab report, because of all their procedures, will
3 determine whether or not they can run that test
4 from a lab safety point of view either for
5 personnel or equipment protection.
6 With respect to the use of this type of
7 assembly, which would be a combustible material to
8 protect foam plastic, we think that's a viable
9 alternative. It's not going to be common. It's
10 not going to be used a lot because, if you can
11 think about that, if you can picture that room
12 corner test continuing to flashover for another ten
13 minutes, that's an excessive amount of severe fire
14 which is going to be imposed onto that thermal
15 barrier material and whether or not it can
16 withstand that and still protect the foam
17 underneath it.
18 If it can, we feel that that material
19 should be allowed to be used. That material
20 surface flammability is regulated by other sections
21 of the code, which will address that issue; and in

22 a very similar manner, as we protect things such as
23 structural steel, we can use combustible materials
24 to protect structural steel hourly ratings, two
25 hours rating. This is the same thing, just

50

♀

1 protecting the foam plastic.
2 I urge you to reject the motion.
3 Thank you.
4 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
5 Is there any further discussion on
6 Motion 271-51 which is to reject Comment 275-1?
7 Any final comments from the Chair?
8 MR. BEDDERS: Not at this time.
9 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay.
10 Thank you. So at this point, we're going to move
11 on to vote, and before we vote; let me restate the
12 motion.
13 The motion on the floor is to reject
14 Comment 275-1. So please record your vote, one in
15 favor of the motion or two opposed to the motion.
16 Balloting closing in five seconds. Balloting
17 closed. And the motion passes.
18 Is there any further discussion on
19 NFPA 275? Seeing none, we'll move on to the next
20 document.
21 Thank you, Mr. Bedders.
22 The next report under consideration this
23 morning out of the Technical Committee on Forest
24 and Rural Fire Protection. Here to present the
25 committee report is Committee Chair Randall Bradley

51

♀

1 of Moraga-Orinda Fire Department of Orinda,
2 California. The committee report can be found in
3 the blue 2012 annual revision cycle ROP and ROC.
4 The certified amending motions are contained in the
5 motion committee report and behind me on the
6 screen. We'll proceed in the order the of motion's
7 sequence number presented.
8 Chief Bradley.
9 MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chair and ladies and
10 gentlemen, the report of the Technical Committee on
11 Forest and Rural Fire Protection is presented for
12 adoption and can be found in the report on
13 proposals and the report on comments for the 2012
14 annual meeting revision cycle. The technical
15 committee has published a report consisting of a
16 partial revision of NFPA 1144, standard for
17 reducing structure addition hazards from wildlife
18 fires.
19 The report was submitted to letter ballot
20 of the technical committee that consists of 26
21 voting members. The ballot results can be found on
22 pages 1144-2 to 1144-7 of the report on proposals
23 and pages 1144-2 to 1174-4 on the report on
24 comments.
25 The presiding officer will now proceed

52

♀

1 with the certified amending motions.
2 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you,
3 Chief Bradley.
4 So we'll now proceed with discussion on

5 the certified amending motion for NFPA 1144.
6 Microphone 5.
7 MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH
8 International, speaking for North American Flame
9 Retardant Alliance. I move to accept
10 Comment 1144-4.
11 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
12 So there's a motion on the floor to accept
13 Comment 1144-4.
14 Is there a second?
15 SPEAKER: Second.
16 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay.
17 Please proceed with the discussion.
18 MR. HIRSCHLER: Thank you.
19 This has two -- addresses two parts.
20 First of all, it's a continuation of something that
21 we discussed yesterday. NFPA definitions shall not
22 contain requirements. The present definition that
23 the committee had was a product that, when tested,
24 it said to comply with all of this stuff. This is
25 a requirement. So what this proposal would do --



1 sorry -- the comment, this comment would, just like
2 we did yesterday with noncombustible material, it
3 placed the requirements in a section of the
4 document and placed the -- in the definition
5 section simply something that goes to say see that
6 particular section document, which is 414.
7 There is one additional item in this which
8 complicates the issue a little bit further in that
9 last year ASTM Committee E515 standard, approved a
10 new standard E2768, which was intended to -- well,
11 which is identical to what all the labs have been
12 doing for years. And this extended ASTM E84
13 extended to 30 minutes instead of 10 minutes,
14 measuring the significant progressive combustion;
15 and measuring with other flame front doesn't
16 progress more than 10 1/2 feet. And in order to
17 pass that, it shall be required that the flames
18 were(inaudible) smoke more than 25.
19 So all of that stuff, instead of just
20 putting in the definition, which is against NFPA
21 requirements, that stuff is being put in
22 Section 4142.
23 I want to point you to Comment
24 Section 1144-3, where the Committee also pointed
25 out and added an annex section that says that --



1 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: One minute
2 remaining.
3 MR. HIRSCHLER: Thank you. That UL 733,
4 ASTM 84 is a way of doing the same thing; but ASTM
5 E2768 was specifically passed for the purpose of
6 doing this, and I urge you to support the motion.
7 Thank you.
8 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
9 Chief Bradley, would you like to give the
10 Committee's position?
11 MR. BRADLEY: Yes. Thank you.
12 The Committee feels that the comprehensive
13 definition of ignition resistance materials should
14 remain in Chapter 3. Removing the definition from

15 Chapter 3 and placing a mandatory language in
16 Chapter 4 will require resistance material only
17 meets the requirement of ASTM E2768 standard test
18 methods for extended duration surface burning
19 characteristics of building materials. That's a
20 30-minute tunnel test.
21 The Committee has developed additional
22 language as the motion or the person who made the
23 motion suggested in Annex 3.31 -- in Annex 3.1.13
24 in order to clarify there are other factors that
25 need to be addressed in addition to burning

55

♀

1 characteristics such as weathering abrasion and
2 other durability issues.
3 The Committee also feels that the proposed
4 addition belongs in the annex so that other testing
5 methods are not excluded.
6 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you,
7 Chief Bradley.
8 With that we'll open up debate on the
9 floor on the motion.
10 Please provide your name and affiliation
11 and whether you're speaking in support of or
12 against the motion.
13 Microphone 4.
14 MR. HOLLAND: Joe Holland, Hoover Treated
15 Wood Products. We support the Committee's action.
16 We're against the motion.
17 As Chief Bradley said, the Committee
18 considered -- I am a member of the committee. As
19 Chief Bradley said, the Committee considered that
20 there were other factors that needed to be
21 considered in ignition resistance material besides
22 the flame spread and the smoke developed in
23 significant progressive combustion and things that
24 are covered by this new standard, 2768.
25 And one of the things I do need to clarify

56

♀

1 is that 2768 does not cover or permit testing in
2 accordance with UL 723. UL 723 is the tunnel test
3 and also E84 test. So in order to provide the most
4 flexibility to users of the standard, we wanted to
5 maintain that reference to 723. All of the
6 requirements are in the 1144 as to the flame
7 spread, the time limit.
8 Referring to the new standard hasn't
9 changed that. Also for the information of the
10 persons assembled here, 2768 has been proposed for
11 incorporation into 5000. All of those have been
12 recommended for this approval. There are some
13 considerations that have been raised about the
14 standard. In addition, it was also proposed to the
15 International Building Code, the International
16 Mechanical Code. And those also had been
17 recommended for disapproval.
18 So in order to be consistent, this has
19 been put into the appendix to notify the user of
20 the standard that they have some options, and this
21 is one of those options.
22 We speak against the motion.
23 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
24 Microphone 5.

25 MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH

57

♀

1 International and for NAFRA.
2 Let me point out a couple of things.
3 First of all, it was pointed out by the
4 chair and by the opponent --
5 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Speaking
6 for or against the motion.
7 MR. HIRSCHLER: Excuse me. Speaking for
8 the motion.
9 It was pointed out that there were other
10 characteristics required for additional resistance
11 material. I would tend to agree; however, neither
12 in the present definition nor in my proposed
13 language is there anything about that; so that's
14 irrelevant to what we're talking about because
15 that's not addressed here.
16 Number 2, when you run ASTM E2768, if you
17 actually read it, you'll notice ASTM E2768 says,
18 "run ASTM E84" because that's what you do. You run
19 ASTM E84. And as you will happily concur with me,
20 ASTM E84 is identical to UL 73. It's the same
21 test. So you run it one way as you run the other.
22 It's exactly the same thing.
23 And Number 3, just to clarify, remember
24 that the AST -- sorry. NFPA definitions shall not
25 contain requirements. What we're doing is putting

58

♀

1 the requirements in the body of the standard as
2 opposed to into the definition.
3 Thank you. Please support the motion.
4 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
5 Is there any further discussion on
6 Motion 1144-1 to accept Comment 1144-4?
7 Microphone 4.
8 MR. CHOLIN: Yes, my name is John Cholin,
9 JM Cholin Consultants. And I'm speaking against
10 the motion.
11 This definition merely states that, if a
12 material complies with all of the following
13 criteria, some of which are quantitative, we're
14 going to call it "ignition resistance material."
15 When I go to the store to buy dog
16 biscuits, the folks at Milk Bone have on the box
17 "50 to 100 pounds," "for big dogs."
18 It doesn't require that my dog weighs more
19 than 50 pounds. It just says that, if the dog
20 weighs between 50 and a hundred pounds, we're going
21 to call it "big.
22 The same logic is what the technical
23 committee has done. This definition does not
24 establish a requirement. It merely states that, if
25 you comply with the following criteria, we're going

59

♀

1 to call the material ignition resistant.
2 I urge the committee -- I urge the
3 membership to vote against this motion.
4 Thank you.
5 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
6 Is there any further discussion on
7 Motion 1144-1 to accept Comment 1144-4?

Chief Bradley, do you have any final comments?

MR. BRADLEY: Okay. No final comments.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay. Thank you.

So with that, we're going to move on to a vote; and before we vote, let me restate the motion.

The motion on the floor is to accept Comment 1144-4. Record your vote, one in favor of the motion or two opposed to the motion. Voting closes in five seconds. Voting's closed. And the motion fails.

Thank you, Mr. Bradley. Oh, excuse me. My apologies. We have another motion here on this one. Sorry about that. So let's now proceed with discussion on Certified Amending Motion 1144-2.

Microphone 5.



MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH International, speaking for NAFRA.

And I move to accept Comment 1144-5.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Do I have a second?

SPEAKER: Second.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay. Please proceed.

MR. HIRSCHLER: Okay. Thank you.

I'm not going to reiterate all the discussions we had yesterday. This is identical to what we did yesterday with noncombustible material. And I want to point out this way to address noncombustible material has now been done in all the NFPA major codes and NFPA 5000, 101-1, and several other documents. And it just takes -- in the definition it just puts a "see" and then puts a requirement to Chapter 4.

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.

Chief Bradley, would you like to give the Committee's position?

MR. BRADLEY: Yes, thank you.

The committee feels a comprehensive definition of noncombustible should remain in



Chapter 3 to increase the document's usability.

The Committee did not believe eliminating the definition of noncombustible from Chapter 3 and incorporating mandatory abstracts from NFPA 101 into Chapter 4 would be appropriate.

The Committee did not want to require that the user of the document follow NFPA 101 requirements but rather refer to 1144 contents for supplemental information.

That concludes my remarks.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you, Chief Bradley.

So we will now open up a debate on the motion. Please provide your name, affiliation, and whether you're speaking in support of or against the motion.

Microphone 5.

18 MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH
19 International and NAFRA for the motion.
20 I just want to point out this is just
21 taking an abstract from 101.
22 Thank you.
23 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
24 Is there any further discussion on
25 Motion 1144-2? Okay.

62

1 MR. BRADLEY: No further comments.
2 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
3 Any further comments, Chair? Okay. Thank
4 you.
5 So we'll move to a vote. Before we vote,
6 let me restate the motion.
7 The motion on the floor is to accept
8 Comment 1144-5. Please record your vote, one in
9 favor of the motion or two opposed to the motion.
10 Voting closes in five seconds. Voting's closed.
11 And the motion fails.
12 Is there any further discussion on
13 NFPA 1144? Seeing none, we'll move on to the next
14 document.
15 Thank you, Chief Bradley.
16 So the next report under consideration is
17 that of the Technical Committee on Fire Service
18 Occupational Safety and Health. Here to present
19 the two parts of the committee report is
20 Committee Chair Randy Krause of Port of Seattle
21 Fire Department, Seattle, Washington.
22 The committee report can be found in the
23 blue 2012 annual revision cycle ROP and ROC. The
24 certified amending motions are contained in the
25 motions committee report and behind me on the

63

1 screen. We'll proceed in the order of the motion's
2 sequence number presented.
3 MR. KRAUSE. Good morning, Mr. Chair and
4 ladies and gentlemen. The Technical Committee on
5 Fire Service Occupational Safety and Health is
6 presenting two reports for adoption and can be
7 found in the report on proposals and report on
8 comments for the 2012 annual revision cycle.
9 The first report is consisting of a
10 partial revision of NFPA 1500, the Standards on
11 Fire Department Occupational Safety and Health
12 Program. The report was submitted to letter ballot
13 of the technical committee consisting of 33 voting
14 members. The ballot results can be found on pages
15 1500-2 to 1500-28 of the reports on proposals and
16 pages 1500-2 to 1500-19 of the reports on comments.
17 The presiding officer will now proceed with the
18 certified amending motion.
19 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you,
20 Mr. Krause. We'll now proceed with the certified
21 amending motion on NFPA 1500.
22 Microphone Number 7.
23 MR. DUGGAN: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
24 Good morning, ladies and gentlemen and members of
25 the technical committee. My name is Hayden Duggan,

64

1 retired deputy fire chief, instructor of Mass Fire
2 Academy and licensed psychologist.
3 I move to accept the comment on 1500-16 as
4 in motion sequence 1500-1.
5 I'm speaking for Charlie Popp, Boston
6 Fire --
7 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: And are you
8 speaking for or against the motion?
9 MR. DUGGAN: Okay. I'm speaking for
10 accepting the Comment 1500 and against the revision
11 suggested. First, I would like to state that
12 this --
13 SPEAKER: Point of order.
14 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Excuse me.
15 I need to get a second before we proceed.
16 Do I hear a second? Did I get a second?
17 SPEAKER: Second.
18 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: So please
19 proceed.
20 MR. DUGGAN: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
21 We would like to express respect for the
22 incredible amount of work the committee did. We
23 realize we're coming in here at the 11th hour. We
24 have read and studied it. I think we understand
25 its rationale and points. I think we understand



♀

1 the psychological first aid. Many of us teach it.
2 And I think we understand the method that Dr. Gist
3 was suggesting regarding the "hot wash method."
4 But I would say we're standing in favor of
5 maintaining the language respecting of critical
6 incidents and respecting of critical incident
7 stress management. We feel it would be a giant
8 step backwards to remove that.
9 A critical incident is defined as any
10 incident in the life of a firefighter, which causes
11 unusually strong emotional reactions, which
12 interferes with their ability to function at the
13 scene or later and represents a systematic
14 multicomponent, multimodal method, including an
15 early intervention with 20 or 30 years of basis
16 behind it.
17 I will address the research later, but we
18 feel that this method has provided the strongest
19 method we have to deal with critical incidences.
20 We have approximately 600 teams across the nation.
21 All of those teams are volunteers, and in the state
22 which I come from, we have a system where a chief
23 only needs to make one call. And once he makes
24 that call, then we assess the incident as to what
25 type of incident it is. We deal with a list of



♀

1 exposure to line-of-duty death, suicide of a
2 working partner, death or serious injury to the
3 child during the course of emergency operation --
4 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: One minute
5 remaining.
6 MR. DUGGAN: Thank you, sir.
7 -- any incident in which there are
8 multiple casualties and any incident in which the
9 first responder's safety isn't usually jeopardized.
10 We feel that the Cochran report identified

that every crisis intervention component should have an intervention to it. It should have multicomponents because no one method fits all. It should address the time component. What you would do on a first-day incident is not the same as what you would do six months out, and it should be manualized.

With all due respect to the committee's work, we do not see any other systems that represent that kind of systematic approach to a critical incident, which is team based.

With respect to the research, which we will also --

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Ten seconds remaining.



MR. DUGGAN: Thank you. We will submit that, in fact, the research in favor of CISM did not receive a fair hearing.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.

Mr. Krause, would you like to give the Committee's position?

MR. KRAUSE: Yes, I would. And thank you.

The Committee stands against the motion, and in the committee, the body of work that was created was to take it, not to not recognize critical incident and stress management because the Committee does recognize that as very important and critical to fire service as a component.

But to position the document more at the 30,000 foot view to incorporate and include more than just critical incident and stress management in the behavorial of health to the men and women of fire service.

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you, Mr. Krause.

So with that, we'll open the floor for debate on the motion. Please provide your name and affiliation and whether you're speaking in support



of or against the motion.

So is there any further discussion on Motion 1500-1 to accept Comment 1500-16?

Microphone 4.

MR. DUFFY: Good morning. My name is Rich Duffy, representing the International Association of Firefighters.

I stand against the motion on the floor at this moment, but I want to clarify that I certainly agree with the chair of the committee and the work that was done in the revision of this standard. There was nobody involved in the process looked at taking critical incident stress management, employee assistance programs, and so forth out of the standard. What we did in revision was to expand and recognize behavorial health has many components and many facets of which CISM may be one of them.

We were very restrictive in the earlier editions, and I think the Committee's efforts

21 expanded most importantly the whole area of
22 behavorial health in the fire service.
23 So I stand against the motion, and I want
24 people to understand that this does not get rid of
25 critical incident stress management programs

69

♀

1 throughout the country or Massachusetts.
2 Thank you very much.
3 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
4 Microphone 7.
5 MR. GREENHALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
6 Ladies and gentlemen of the audience, my
7 name is Tom Greenhall. I'm from the State of
8 Massachusetts.
9 I currently -- I'm on my 31st year of
10 public safety --
11 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Are you
12 speaking for or against the motion?
13 MR. GREENHALL: For the motion.
14 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay.
15 Thank you.
16 MR. GREENHALL: I'm currently in my 31st
17 year of law enforcement, EMS, as well as fire
18 service, as well as credentialed with a master's in
19 social work.
20 When we look at this, we have a strong
21 need for peer support within the fire service. As
22 we look in the work that I've done as co-director
23 of a regional CISM team, as the coordinator for
24 training from Massachusetts in CISM currently, I
25 have never seen a negative impact from the CISM

70

♀

1 personally.
2 When we have the need for peers, no one
3 knows our people better than we do. There is some
4 talk about having EAPs stronger influence, having
5 clinical stronger influence. I can tell you, from
6 my personal experience as a clinician, my work with
7 safety people and any connection to them, comes
8 from my actual doing work in the street; and that's
9 what our people are looking for.
10 One of our biggest challenge is that we
11 face a stigma. It serves in the military, and it's
12 well documented, and it's well documented in public
13 safety. That's why the CISM movement was in part
14 created. It was an ability to reach out to peers
15 that have been there, not from your own agency but
16 from an outside agency that does not have any
17 potential conflict with administration.
18 When we look at behavioral health and
19 EAPs, there is a definite need to include them in
20 the process. They are included in the CISM model
21 continuum of care. We do not replace them. We do
22 not try to become therapist. With peer support, we
23 can be the conduit to those agencies.
24 But it is a model that's been identified.
25 It has worked. It's well done, and most of our

71

♀

1 people that come into the field to provide these
2 services that we've seen over the years are people
3 that have been recipients of the services. To me,

4 there is no better testament that someone that
5 comes into the intervention, whether it be as an
6 individual or a group, who comes forth and says,
7 "That worked for me. I want to share that now with
8 someone else."
9 I would suggest that we not make a change
10 for the sake of change. The studies presented
11 earlier to make these changes that says the CISM
12 did not work, were flawed. They did not follow the
13 model as described. It was not done by teams
14 trained in the model, and therefore, I would
15 respectfully request to re-examine that to make
16 sure the changes are not based on faulty
17 information.
18 Thank you.
19 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
20 Microphone Number 8.
21 MR. GIST: Thank you, sir.
22 Dr. Richard Gist, Principal Assistant to
23 the fire chief of Kansas City Missouri and
24 behavioral health consultant for the National
25 Fallen Firefighters Foundation.



♀
1 I was the author of --
2 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Are you
3 speaking for or against?
4 MR. HUGHES: I'm speaking for -- I'm
5 speaking against the motion rather as the author of
6 the original proposal on behalf of the National
7 Fallen Firefighters Foundation, FLSI 13. That is
8 the behavioral health initiative.
9 The process that went into making this
10 proposal on which we now are being asked to rescind
11 is a multiyear process. It involves the best
12 researchers and best practitioners on the planet in
13 terms of posttraumatic stress disorder and anxiety
14 disorder, issues facing the fire service. It
15 involves people from top research programs --
16 National Center for Posttraumatic Stress Disorder,
17 the National Crime Victims Center at the Medical
18 University of South Carolina, the Employee
19 Assistance Professional Association, the National
20 Research and Development Institute.
21 On the fire side, weekly represented by
22 practitioner groups, by field groups actually
23 involved with fire services constituencies, IAFF,
24 Mr. Duffy speaking earlier. International
25 Association of Fire Chiefs, National Volunteer of



♀
1 Fire Council, NFPA, the National Association of
2 Fire Training directors.
3 Across three sections, the research on
4 behavorial and health was reviewed in depth.
5 Models were examined to look at what are the best
6 supported things available for utilization now and
7 ways available to adapt those things so they can be
8 made available to fire departments to implement
9 quickly, efficiently, easily on the ground.
10 Many things will be coming from NFF over
11 this year that will allow departments and their
12 mental health providers to access on-line
13 inexpensive or even in-person training without

14 cost.
15 Nothing in here is designed to take
16 anything away. The motion set forward maintains
17 everything that was in the original Chapter 12.
18 What it does is it debrands it. It changes it to
19 include more options and to give the fire
20 department a way to reflect the best research and
21 best techniques available through all sectors.
22 The research involved in backing this was
23 widely discussed and debated in the technical
24 committee as well as in the FLSI 13 process. It
25 was three, two-day consensus groups, worked over

74

♀
1 three years to build the models in question.
2 In the technical committee, this was
3 reviewed at both at the proposal level and comment
4 level and received --
5 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: One minute
6 remaining.
7 MR. HUGHES: Thank you, sir.
8 -- and received nearly unanimous support
9 of the committee, representing, again, people with
10 broad knowledge of health, safety, and behavorial
11 health in the fire service on two occasions; and
12 the motion -- the proposal change came forward in
13 this fashion.
14 What is asked in this particular amendment
15 is to ignore all of that work, the work of the
16 committee, the work of the consensus groups, the
17 input of both fire service organizations and
18 practitioners and research groups and go back to
19 something that simply restates what has been there
20 before.
21 Again, the proposal that was put forward
22 by the committee takes nothing away but adds many
23 options for the fire service to use in moving
24 forward. It's up to the individual departments and
25 their providers how to proceed.

75

♀
1 So, again, I urge your support for the
2 work of FLSI 13 from the foundation and of the
3 technical committee in allowing the proposal to go
4 forward and rejecting the amendment.
5 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
6 Microphone 7.
7 MR. DUGGAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.
8 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Yes, go
9 ahead.
10 MR. DUGGAN: I'd like to rebut that and
11 speak again in favor of the motion --
12 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Could you
13 identify yourself and your affiliation.
14 MR. DUGGAN: Thank you.
15 My name is Hayden Duggan, retired deputy
16 fire chief and licensed psychologist, instructor at
17 Mass Fire Academy.
18 We do recognize --
19 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: You're
20 speaking for the motion?
21 MR. DUGGAN: Okay. I am. Thank you.
22 We do recognize a tremendous amount of
23 work that has gone into this. We're not suggesting

24 that all of that work be ignored. What we're
25 trying to say is that the critical incident

76

♀
1 stress -- management method, as well as the 55
2 studies that it has to support it, as well as the
3 six randomly-controlled studies that it has to
4 support it, as well as the three most-recent
5 studies done with military veterans were not given
6 a fair hearing.
7 What we're saying is that, in fact, the
8 methods used by the International Critical Incident
9 Stress Foundation and its components were not --
10 did not, in fact, receive a fair hearing. When we
11 speak of evidence-based work, whose evidence?
12 Based on what?
13 When we speak on all of the studies
14 allegedly being against the efficacy of critical
15 incident stress debriefing, let's go to the Cochran
16 report. Twelve studies in the Cochran report
17 reported to be against critical incident stress
18 management and CISD's effectiveness. Not one study
19 in the 12 Cochran report research documents was
20 done on emergency services personnel or military
21 veterans. They were all on primary victims.
22 Critical and incident stress debriefing,
23 if we just take that one component in itself, was
24 never designed to be used for civilians. It was
25 created for emergency services personnel. That

77

♀
1 particular intervention, which is 1 of only 12 used
2 in a system of interventions, beginning from the
3 critical incident itself all the way though to six
4 months afterwards, is a seven-stage process,
5 designed for people who are already stress
6 resilient and only to be used when it is needed;
7 and it should never be forced on anybody.
8 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: One minute
9 remaining.
10 MR. DUGGAN: To my knowledge -- and I have
11 read the work of the committee, and I respect it
12 greatly. I respect Dr. Gist. I was present at one
13 of his first presentations years ago at the
14 International Critical Incident Stress Foundation
15 of step-by-step management of line-of-duty death,
16 which was excellent. But I respectfully submit to
17 you that there is not a fair hearing on this method
18 when we haven't taken critical incident stress
19 management done by an accredited team with a
20 critical incident with firefighters who received
21 this intervention and firefighters who did not.
22 There are other methods of measuring
23 effectiveness. It's difficult to do a
24 randomly-controlled study because it means
25 withholding interventions from certain people, but

78

♀
1 it can be done.
2 I don't see a single study with a
3 significant end, a sample size across a number
4 of --
5 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Nine
6 seconds left.

7 MR. DUGGAN: Thank you, sir.
8 -- performed by accredited teams following
9 the method that shows that it did harm. All of the
10 research is on civilians.
11 Thank you.
12 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
13 Is there any further discussion on
14 Motion 1500-1?
15 Microphone 7.
16 MS. BALBONI: Good morning. My name is
17 Anne Balboni. I am speaking in favor of this
18 motion. I am the state coordinator and the
19 clinical director of the Rhode Island CISM team.
20 I just want to bring to your attention
21 that this is a process that is embedded in the fire
22 service in the State of Rhode Island. It is well
23 accepted. Peer support is what we use to provide
24 care for our firefighters. It is part of a
25 component of behavorial health that is offered to



1 all of the firefighters in the state.
2 I just want to also tell you of the use
3 that we have had of CISM because it is embedded in
4 the fire service, 2003 the Rhode Island station
5 nightclub fire. I was in charge of the behavorial
6 health care for all of the responders from fire,
7 police, and EMS. I want to tell you that CISM
8 works. We were on that scene, and we followed
9 through. And to this day I still follow through.
10 That is a team effort. It is one that
11 works. Any language that in any way insinuates
12 that it should not be part of a component of a good
13 behavorial health program I think is doing a
14 disservice to our firefighters.
15 Thank you.
16 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
17 Any further discussion on this motion?
18 Okay. I don't see any.
19 Any final comments, Mr. Chair?
20 MR. KRAUSE: Yes. Just my request to the
21 body that you support the committee and vote
22 against this motion.
23 Thank you.
24 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay.
25 Thank you.



1 So before we vote, let me restate the
2 motion that you're going to be voting on.
3 The motion on the floor is to accept
4 Comment 1500-16. Please record your vote one in
5 favor of the motion or two opposed to the motion.
6 Voting closes in five seconds. Voting's closed.
7 And the motion -- the motion fails.
8 So we will now proceed with the discussion
9 on the second motion on this document, Certified
10 Amending Motion 1500-2.
11 Microphone 7.
12 MR. DUGGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Same
13 person again, Hayden Duggan, licensed psychologist
14 retired deputy, and instructor at Mass Fire
15 Academy.
16 I'm going to --

17 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: And you're
18 speaking for, obviously?
19 MR. DUGGAN: Yes. I am speaking for my
20 own 1570-17 --
21 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Yes, I need
22 a second before we proceed. If you can pause for
23 one second.
24 SPEAKER: Second.
25 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay. We

81

♀
1 have a second.
2 Please proceed.
3 MR. DUGGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move
4 to accept the Comment 1500-16 as found in 1500.2.
5 Once again, we don't stand here in
6 opposition to the excellent work done by the
7 committee. Let's just take the issue of critical
8 incident stress debriefing itself. Nodding with
9 critical incident stress management, we appreciate
10 the comments by the committee that they do
11 understand the usefulness of it. But we even
12 maintain that this particular intervention, CISD,
13 has not received a fair hearing.
14 The Committee maintains its original
15 position that the changes adopted by the committee
16 adequately reflect the state of scientific and
17 medical evidence and serve the best interest to the
18 fire service and its members.
19 I've read the research on both sides.
20 I've read the 55 studies in the foundation. I've
21 read their version of randomly-controlled studies.
22 I've read the committee's research.
23 Again, I submit to you that we have not
24 done a fair examination of this particular
25 seven-stage method based on it being implemented by

82

♀
1 an accredited team and studied in the case where
2 you withhold that intervention from a group of
3 firefighters who face the traumatic incidents, and
4 then you randomly assign others to a control group.
5 We don't have that body of literature.
6 Most of the literature which attacks CISD,
7 just the debriefing process or studies, is not done
8 on police, fire, and EMS. It's done on everybody
9 else. We can take the business study. This is, to
10 me, where we get into some intellectual dishonesty
11 test.
12 A debriefing is not nurses handing out to
13 burn victims a questionnaire asking how does it
14 feel to be burnt. That's not an intervention by a
15 CISD team, and to purport that that's a fair test
16 of this particular methods's efficacy in lessening
17 the impact of an event that firefighters and EMS
18 and policemen face in accelerating recovery is not
19 correct. So I think we're seeing an unfair reading
20 of a particular method which we have found over the
21 years to be essential.
22 We're very late on coming to this process.
23 It's the 11th hour. I wish that we had appeared
24 before the committee. You can count on us
25 appearing from now on after this vote.

83

♀
1 We've been out practicing this method. We
2 went back to Oklahoma City twice. To 9-11 25 days.
3 To Worcester Cold Storage plant, all eight days
4 there we were there.
5 Probably our state alone --
6 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: 30 seconds
7 remaining.
8 MR. DUGGAN: Thank you, sir.
9 -- since 1989, we've probably conducted
10 conservatively 3- to 4,000 interventions. We have
11 600 teams across the nation trained in a method
12 that can be taught as a system, and it's
13 manualized. I don't see that in any other system.
14 And I don't see the standards in the team process
15 that had been implemented, not only in this
16 country, but it's worldwide in 12 other countries.
17 Just this intervention alone needs further
18 study.
19 Thank you, sir.
20 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
21 Mr. Krause, would you like to give the
22 Committee's position?
23 MR. KRAUSE: Yeah, the Committee's
24 position on this is similar to the first position
25 in that, what the Committee does not dismiss is the
84
♀
1 importance and success that critical incident and
2 stress management has had within the fire service.
3 So it's not trying to leave anything out,
4 but like I said before, it did include more options
5 and created a thousand-foot view of which critical
6 incident stress management is definitely a critical
7 piece of, not left out of this work of the
8 committee.
9 Thank you.
10 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you,
11 Mr. Krause.
12 So we will now open up debate on the
13 motion. As a reminder, please provide your name,
14 affiliation, and whether you're speaking in support
15 of or against the motion.
16 Microphone 8.
17 MR. GIST: Thank you again, sir.
18 Once more, Dr. Richard Gist, principal
19 assistant with fire chief of Kansas City, Missouri;
20 behavorial health consultant for the National
21 Fallen Firefighters Foundation, and research and
22 field faculty at the University of Kansas,
23 University of Missouri, Kansas City; and the Kansas
24 City University of Medicine and Biosciences.
25 I am speaking against the motion. Once
85
♀
1 again, we bring up the question of whether the
2 committee gave a fair hearing, whether the FLSI 13
3 consensus group gave a fair hearing. These
4 organizations, as we described before, vetted the
5 research on all sides of the question very
6 extensively. In the comment section before the
7 technical committee representatives of the point of
8 view being expressed by Mr. Duggan were, indeed,
9 present throughout the entire session. The

10 opportunity to make comments on this has not just
11 been given to those individuals. The information
12 in question has been sought out, has been vetted,
13 has been discussed in great detail.
14 And the referee of the search --
15 literature, medical and psychological
16 professions -- it has been debated in it -- for ten
17 years now in great detail, and the conclusions are
18 pretty well consistent across the board in all
19 studies involved again. Good, controlled
20 populations both inside the industry and outside
21 the industry, in military populations and other
22 populations.
23 The consistency is that there are many
24 ways to skin a cat, some of which are proving to be
25 better than others. Again, to emphasize one more

86

♀
1 time, the work of the committee as well as the work
2 of FLSI 13, did not intend to take anything away
3 from fire departments but to add to their options
4 and more importantly to open those options to
5 informed information as it develops from the best
6 research on the planet.
7 One more time, to emphasize the fire
8 service was represented throughout the process. In
9 the consensus group that put forward the original
10 proposal, it was represented by IAFF, IAFC, NDFC,
11 NFPA of the National --
12 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: One minute
13 remaining, sir.
14 MR. GIST: Thank you.
15 -- the North American Fire Training
16 Directors, the National Association of EMS
17 Physicians, of the researchers represented. The
18 very best in the business from NCPTSD, from MUFC,
19 from a variety of places reviewing that literature
20 in detail. In the technical committee. Some of
21 the best minds and the most experienced people in
22 occupational medicine ranging from Mr. Duffy of
23 IAFF through the people of Sandy Bogucki,
24 Yale University, all debated these issues,
25 considered these issues, as we have for a number of

87

♀
1 years, and brought forward a proposal to improve
2 what was available to fire service entities
3 throughout the nation and the world without taking
4 anything away.
5 The proposal we put forward does this. It
6 does this with a bunch of support that will be
7 coming out to make it easier for firefighters or
8 organizations that --
9 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Ten seconds
10 remaining.
11 MR. GIST: -- mental health providers to
12 adopt. And we've given you a reasoned way to
13 approach it. The Committee has supported it
14 unanimously. We urge you to support them.
15 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
16 Any further discussion of Motion 1570-22
17 to accept comment 1500-17?
18 Microphone 7.
19 MR. GREENHALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

20 Tom Greenhall (inaudible) Support Network,
21 in favor of the motion.
22 As we listen to this about the studies and
23 the research piece, we have yet to hear of a
24 research that has been done that says CISM does not
25 work. In a presentation done by Dr. Gist in

88

♀

1 October, which I have the slides at the ROC
2 meeting, the research presenter was leading to
3 believe that CISM did not work and it led people to
4 feel that way.
5 I agree that there is more than one model
6 than CISM to effectively intervene to help
7 firefighters. Hands down, there is not one
8 intervention type that is the end-all and be-all.
9 There is many ways to accomplish it. However,
10 critical incident -- CISD, CISM -- has become names
11 associated with interventional support for our
12 public safety people. Much like when we say we
13 need to look up something on the Internet, we call
14 it we need to Google it. There are many search
15 engines to get that information, but we all use the
16 term "Google."
17 It's no different than, when I get a call
18 from my team from someone saying, "We need the team
19 because we need a debriefing." And that's not what
20 they're really requesting. They need psychological
21 support. So the limiting terminology can be
22 confusing to all of the firefighters down the road.
23 A couple of e-mails that was sent that I
24 was asked to read in. One came from Mr. Larry
25 Bennett, a member of the NFPA Fire Service

89

♀

1 Organizational and Technical Health Committee.
2 In his e-mail dated June 13 at 4:56 p.m.,
3 "This is to confirm I oppose all changes from 2007
4 edition regarding CISM. I strongly believe CISM is
5 very effective if the CISM protocols are strictly
6 enforced. Following the designs with the
7 populations that it was designed for, we find it
8 works."
9 A second e-mail was asked to be read from
10 the former chair of the IFC, Chief Jack Carrol.
11 "We believe there needs to be a CISM
12 program in 1500. We don't agree that there needs
13 to be CISS as standalone. The CISM model does not
14 promulgate CISD as a standalone.
15 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: One minute
16 remaining.
17 MR. GREENWALL: There is one tool in the
18 continuum of care that we offer to our people. So,
19 again, it would be great if someone would provide
20 the research that says this doesn't work before we
21 remove the name from the standards that our people
22 are very well familiar with and respond to in times
23 of crisis."
24 Thank you.
25 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.

90

♀

1 Any further discussion on Motion 1500-2?
2 Any final comments from the Chair?

MR. KRAUSE: Yeah. Just, once again, ask the body to support the committee and vote against this motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Before we vote, let me restate the motion. The motion on the floor is to accept Comment 1500-17. Please record your vote one in favor of the motion or two opposed to the motion. Voting closes in five seconds. Voting's closed. And the motion fails.

Is there any further discussion on NFPA 1500? Seeing none, we'll move on to the next document.

Part 2 of the Technical Committee on Fire Service Occupational Safety and Health 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'll proceed in the order of the motions sequence number presented.

Mr. Krause.



MR. KRAUSE: The second part consists of a partial revision of NFPA 1582 standard on comprehensive medical program for fire department. The report was submitted to letter ballot of the technical committee consisting of 31 voting members. The ballot results can be found on pages 1582-2 to 1582-48 of the report on proposals and pages 1582-2 to 1582-32 of the report on comments.

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

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.

So we'll now proceed with discussions on the certified group amending motion 1582-1.

Microphone 5.

MR. ARVIZU: Good morning. My name is Jay Arvizu. I am in favor of the second proposal 1582-13. I am with the Los Padres National Forest and survivor service liaison for the Alisa Ann Ruch Burn Foundation. Right now --

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: I have to get a second before you proceed further.

Okay. So do we have a second?

SPEAKER: Second.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay. So



there is a motion on the floor to accept Proposal 1582-13, Comment 1582-5. This is going to be dealt with as a group amending motion.

So we have the second; so you may proceed.

MR. ARVIZU: Thank you, sir.

Just to give some brief background for the topic at hand. Right now the current standard for firefighters in regards to monocular vision is restricting all monocular firefighting candidates from employment because the Category A -- it's a Category A issue, Category A meaning that it's an essentially blanket exclusion. If you're

13 monocular, therefore, you're not capable of
14 performing the job as a firefighter and, therefore,
15 not allowed to be a firefighter.
16 The purpose for this is to try to move it
17 from Category A to Category B. By moving it to a
18 Category B, we're essentially changing it to the
19 opportunity to have an evaluation and have a little
20 bit more leniency in making a formal decision as to
21 whether that candidate would be able to perform the
22 task of a firefighter or not.
23 Right now, the only reason the candidates
24 are excluded from the NFPA because the NFPA states
25 in 1582 the candidate needs to be able to perform

93

♀
1 essential task Number 10 of 13 points which states,
2 "Firefighters must be able to operate fire
3 apparatus or other vehicles that need emergency
4 mode with emergency lights and sirens."
5 However, the NFPA claims the
6 Department of Transportations does not allow people
7 with monocular vision to hold a commercial driver's
8 license which is required to driving most fire
9 apparatus.
10 Now, why the current standard doesn't
11 work?
12 Like I said before, it's a blanket
13 category called "exclusion." Because this
14 doesn't -- for one reason of it being a categorical
15 exclusion, it doesn't really follow any sort of
16 current disability law or with the EEOC. In fact,
17 in 2003, the chairman of EEOC wrote a letter
18 warning the NFPA of maintaining standards which
19 automatically band individuals with certain
20 conditions, and it specifically named diabetes and
21 monocular vision.
22 Also, the argument for not being able to
23 perform essential job function Number 10, driving
24 apparatuses and valves, the Department of
25 Transportation actually does have --

94

♀
1 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: One minute
2 remaining.
3 MR. ARVIZU: Thank you, sir.
4 -- a demonstrative abilities program for
5 commercial drivers, including a specific vision
6 exemption program; and every local state licensing
7 authority has one as well. Yet the technical
8 committee still claims firefighters should be
9 excluded because of other exemptions, which we can
10 bring up later.
11 The current standard even contradicts
12 itself. Right now we do allow monocular
13 firefighters who have lost their vision, after the
14 fact, to be evaluated from performing their duties
15 by moving it from a Category A to Category B.
16 We're essentially putting the opportunity for a
17 performance-based evaluation in the hands of fire
18 chiefs and the officials in the fire department to
19 make the decision who they want for a candidate
20 rather than just making it a blanketed exclusion --
21 PRESIDING OFFER HARRINGTON: Ten seconds
22 left.

MR. ARVIZU: Thank you.
-- from eliminating the opportunity for other candidates to be able to apply for fire

95

service.
Thank you for your time.
PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
Mr. Chair, would you like to give the Committee's position?
MR. KRAUSE: Yes, I would. Thank you.
The Committee's position is that it's to remain a Category A exclusionary requirement for candidates in fire service, as Jason talked about, in regards to driving apparatus. There is data -- limited data does exist on there is some deficit, and the deficit, as perceived by the committee, warrants it to maintain -- or to remain as a Category A requirement.
Thank you.
PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you, Mr. Krause.
So we'll now open up the floor for debate on the motion. Please provide your name, affiliation, and whether you are speaking in support of or against the motion.
Microphone 5.
MR. ARVIZU: Jason Arvizu Las Padres National Forest in support to accept the proposal.
As Mr. Krause mentioned that there is

96

limited data right now that the committee has reviewed in order to see this proposal pass.
One of the issues with the actual standard right now is the limited data is preventing us from making a good assessment of what the actual issues are. I can guarantee you that most people in this room right now, in regards to this proposal either at one point in the last five minutes have probably closed, maybe, at least one eye to ask, "Well, if you're blind in one eye, would you really be able to function as a firefighter to even drive a fire apparatus?" And that's totally fine. That's human nature to assume that.
But what we are discounting here and also discounting by the lack of research that the technical committee has done on this is the ability of the human body to actually compensate for issues like this. Just to give an example to relate to you -- and not to make this a personal agenda because there's a lot of fine individuals who have been restricted from the firefighters because of the standard -- is for myself, I was born blind in my left eye. It's never been an issue my entire life. I was a three-season athlete for school -- football, wrestling, and tennis. I have been a

97

commercial driver -- or I've held a commercial driver's license from the State of California for driving fire engines for the last four years without issue, including driving Code 3 for one of the busiest stations the forest service has in

6 California. On top of that, I am a licensed pilot
7 with the FAA.
8 I can guarantee you that, if I had an
9 issue with depth perception, I would have already
10 in my assessment when I tried to land it. And
11 everything up to that point has never been an
12 issue; yet the only thing that has kept me from
13 doing anything, because of my vision, has been the
14 standard of vision for NFPA 1582.
15 And so that's something we need to take
16 into consideration when we're limiting candidates
17 from being able to apply for fire positions. We
18 had the same issues when it came to diabetes in the
19 fire service. Diabetes used to be a Category A
20 exclusion list, restricted firefighters from -- or
21 candidates being able to be full-fledge
22 firefighters.
23 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: One minute
24 remaining.
25 MR. ARVIZU: Thank you, sir.

98

♀
1 But by moving it to a Category B and
2 having it be performance based, then we remove that
3 exclusion; and now we have a much larger and
4 broader candidate pool of people who are evaluated
5 on performance basis. All the decision and data is
6 being placed onto the evaluating physician,
7 specifically an ophthalmologist and optometrist in
8 the case of my proposal for them to make the
9 evaluation. And from there it doesn't stop there.
10 The evaluation continues throughout the process as
11 it goes through a firefighter in the academy and
12 further on into probation. And during that time,
13 it's the department and men and women who are going
14 to be supervising and working with that individual
15 who gets to make the determination if they want him
16 next to them.
17 I totally agree, if they're not capable of
18 performing a job because of their disability or any
19 reason, they shouldn't be doing the job.
20 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Ten
21 seconds.
22 MR. ARVIZU: But we should at the very
23 least give them the opportunity to do that. And by
24 doing that, not only are we doing the right thing
25 but we're putting the standard in line of what's

99

♀
1 actually legal.
2 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
3 Is there any further discussion on
4 Motion 1582-1 to accept proposal 1582-13 and accept
5 Comment 1582-5?
6 Mr. Chair, any final comments? Sorry
7 about that.
8 Microphone 4.
9 MR. DUFFY: Just trying to follow --
10 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Following
11 the protocol. We appreciate that.
12 MR. DUFFY: My name is Rich Duffy. I
13 represent the International Association of
14 Firefighters. I stand here against the motion. I
15 just want to make some clarity.

16 We've been working the standard for a
17 considerable period of time and have made
18 significant adjustments in medical evaluations and
19 the outcomes of the evaluations over the course of
20 the years.
21 I agree with the submitter that in part we
22 changed the requirements, for example, for diabetes
23 because we were able to come back and put a
24 specific criteria for a physician to make an
25 evaluation. It still addresses what diabetics are
100
♀
1 allowed or not allowed as candidates for the fire
2 service.
3 On this particular issue, we had to rely
4 on the research that was done, a considerable
5 research by the Department of Transportation;
6 whereby, they do restrict a commercial driver's
7 license. They never consider the fire service, but
8 they look at vehicles with passengers in it, and we
9 felt they're excluding people with passengers.
10 They would certainly exclude -- we believe we had
11 the need to exclude firefighters that -- albeit,
12 the number of passengers are less if they were
13 driving emergency vehicles in city streets, and I
14 don't have to go on. Everyone in this room knows
15 how fire trucks drive.
16 So we did our best on the standard. I
17 think the committee, through the physicians and the
18 technical people that worked on this process, did a
19 (inaudible) job, and I stand here in support of the
20 committee and against this particular motion.
21 Thank you.
22 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
23 Microphone 5.
24 MR. ARVIZU: I appreciate it, and --
25 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Please
101
♀
1 identify yourself.
2 MR. ARVIZU: Jason Arvizu with Los Padres
3 National Forest and for accepting these proposals
4 for 1582-13.
5 I respect Chief Duffy's position on this
6 matter, and I appreciate the fact that there was
7 research done in order to evaluate the
8 effectiveness of having a standard such as this,
9 but when it comes to the idea of having -- well,
10 for the first part, when it comes to the idea of
11 actually having something for a physician to go
12 back and refer to as to whether this candidate
13 qualifies or not in having hard data like he
14 explained in relation to the diabetes issue, that's
15 great. And I do agree there should be at least a
16 baseline of what we're looking for.
17 There is the line that we've drawn in the
18 sand, anything beyond this line, then we need to go
19 ahead and seriously consider if this person is
20 going to qualify or not.
21 In regard to everything the DOT is saying
22 and what Chief Duffy is saying with the exclusion
23 from in regards to passenger vehicles, I don't
24 think it's necessarily being properly interpreted.
25 Passenger vehicles, from everything that I gathered

1 in my research from the Department of Motor
2 Vehicles, et cetera, they're looking for passenger
3 vehicles as classified as someone -- as up to
4 ten -- or ten or greater occupants within that
5 vehicle, such as school buses, limousines, et
6 cetera. And I can understand that.
7 But on the other hand, too, that's still
8 not an absolute exclusion. They will still go in
9 and do an evaluation and an individual assessment
10 to see if you are -- if you qualify for what you --
11 for the task at hand.
12 When it says that the DOT hasn't -- did an
13 account for the task of driving fire engines, I
14 don't think that's necessarily fair to assume
15 because it's still an individual assessment at that
16 point.
17 When I took my driving test in particular
18 to be able to get my commercial driver's license,
19 the State of California --
20 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: One minute
21 remaining.
22 MR. ARVIZU: -- the State of California
23 DMV had me drive a fire engine in order -- you
24 know, a behind-the-wheel examination for two hours
25 to make that individual perform its base assessment



1 that I was capable of doing so. That's exactly
2 what we should be doing across the board.
3 We should make an individual assessment
4 for the subject matter experts at the licensing
5 authorities, on top of the medical experts as an
6 ophthalmologist and optometrist to do their medical
7 evaluation and sign off candidates and make the
8 decision, be it the educated decision, of fire
9 service -- of fire service chief and personnel to
10 determine if everything, given all the information
11 at hand from the subject matter experts and
12 whatnot, to determine if that person's going to be
13 able to meet all the essential job functions.
14 If the only issue right now is the
15 essential job function at hand --
16 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Ten
17 seconds.
18 MR. ARVIZU: -- and we're already showing
19 that that's something people are able to get past,
20 obviously, then we really need to consider
21 rewriting the standard, changing it to Category B.
22 Thank you, sir.
23 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
24 Any other further discussion on the
25 motion?



1 Microphone 7.
2 MR. DUFFY: Rick Duffy, International
3 Association of Firefighters.
4 I'm not here asking for another bite of
5 the apple, but I would just like the record to be
6 clear --
7 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Well, are
8 you speaking for or against?

MR. DUFFY: Just a point of information. I'm speaking that I'm not a chief; so please don't record me as Chief Duffy. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you for that clarification.

Any other further discussion on this motion?

Any final comment from the Chair?

MR. KRAUSE: Just to the body to support the work of the committee and vote against the motion.

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.

So before we vote, let me restate the motion that we're going to be voting on.

The motion on the floor is to accept



Proposal 1582-13 and to accept Comment 1582-5.

So please record your vote one in favor of the motion or two opposed to the motion.

Voting closes in five seconds. Voting's closed. And the motion passes.

Is there any further discussion on NFPA 1528? In seeing none, we'll move on to the next document.

Thank you very much, Mr. Krause.

MR. KRAUSE: Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: The next report under consideration this morning is out of the Technical Committee on Ambulances. Here to present the committee report is Committee Chair David Fischler of Pompano Beach, Florida. The committee report can be found in the blue 2012 annual revisions cycle ROP and ROC. The certified amending motions are contained in the motions committee report and behind me on the scene.

We'll proceed in the order of the motion's sequence number presented.

Mr. Fischler.

MR. FISCHLER: Thank you. Good morning.

Mr. Chair, ladies and gentlemen, the report of Technical Committee on Ambulances is



presented for adoption. It can be found in report on proposals and the report on comments for the 2012 July meeting revision cycle.

The technical committee has published a report consisting of a new document, NFPA 1917, standards for automotive ambulances. The report was submitted to letter ballot of the technical committee. It consists of 32 voting members. The ballot results can be found on pages 1917-2 to 1917-283 of the report on proposals and pages 1917-2 to 1917-13 of the report on comments.

The presiding officer will now proceed with the certifying amending motions.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you, Mr. Fischler. So we'll now proceed with the discussion on certified amending motions on NFPA 1917.

Microphone 5.

19 MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH
20 International, speaking for NAFRA. And I move
21 19 -- accept Comment 1917-15.
22 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
23 There's a motion on the floor to accept Comment
24 1917.
25 Is there a second?

107

♀
1 SPEAKER: Second.
2 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: You have a
3 second. Please proceed.
4 MR. HIRSCHLER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
5 There are several motions that I have on this
6 document, but the bottom line is very simple. And
7 I think it can be summarized by reading. If you
8 look at page 1917-2 in the comments book, there's
9 two negatives from Mr. Meyer and Mr. Thackery, both
10 of who represent ambulance organizations, who say
11 that this -- basically this committee didn't do its
12 job of providing a doc -- a document that provides
13 additional fire safety for ambulances.
14 And my motion addresses the only stuff I
15 know a little bit about, which is fire testing. So
16 the first motion, this one right now, 1915,
17 addresses the padding components; and other ones
18 will address insulation and interior finish.
19 The bottom line is that all that this
20 document says is that everything inside this
21 ambulance shall comply with FM -- in terms of fire
22 safety of the component -- FMVSS 302. And NFPA
23 issued a document, NFPA 556, which has demonstrated
24 that FMVSS 302 is totally useless and has totally
25 no value in providing fire safety.

108

♀
1 So in providing a fire requiring that the
2 components, the padding components, the seat
3 padding components, the insulation and so on only
4 have to comply with FMVSS 302 is a complete waste
5 of time. They will always -- everything will
6 comply with that.
7 So what I'm -- this particular motion
8 upgrades a little bit to California TB 117. The
9 others address other things. The other thing is
10 that if FM --
11 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: One minute
12 remaining.
13 MR. HIRSCHLER: -- FMVSS 302 excludes
14 everything that is not inside the passenger
15 compartment.
16 So, for example, this standard draft that
17 requires insulation be tested for FMVSS 302, which
18 means it does not get tested. So overall, I'm
19 discussing all the comments, all the motions at the
20 same time. If this particular one addresses
21 padding materials, padding materials of seats need
22 to be tested or something, it provides some degree
23 of fire safety. California TB 117 will do that.
24 FMVSS 302 will not do that.
25 Thank you.

109

♀
1 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.

2 Mr. Fischler, would you like to give the
3 Committee's viewpoint?
4 MR. FISCHLER: FMVSS, which is the Federal
5 Motor Vehicle Safety and Standards, Section 302,
6 already provides the amended standard that is
7 appropriate for vehicles.
8 The comment that's suggesting -- that
9 suggested applies a non vehicle standard used by
10 the furniture industry to apply to a vehicle. The
11 federal standard is the minimum standard that
12 applies to all vehicles.
13 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you,
14 Mr. Fischler.
15 So we will now open up debate on the floor
16 on the motion. As a reminder, please provide your
17 name and affiliation and whether you're speaking in
18 support of or against the motion.
19 Microphone 5.
20 MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH
21 International for NAFRA in support of the motion.
22 Yes, FMVSS 302 is the federal standard for
23 the cars that we all drive. It doesn't provide any
24 fire safety. We're developing a new standard for
25 ambulances -- for fire safe ambulances. Using the



♀
1 same standard is a complete waste of the
2 opportunity of providing adequate fire safety.
3 California TB 117 is not a very severe
4 standard but will ensure that the foam will at
5 least have to resist some degree of ignition
6 service. FMVSS 302 was the standard developed in
7 the 1960s with the intent of addressing cigarette
8 smoldering ignition. That's why NFPA had a
9 committee on hazard (inaudible) that furnishes,
10 developed NFPA 556 that showed to the world that
11 FMVSS 302 does not provide fire safety and
12 ambulances should have some degree of fire safety.
13 Thank you.
14 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
15 Any further discussions on Motion 1917-1?
16 Any final comments from the Chair?
17 MR. FISCHLER: Thank you.
18 The development of 1917 came from a
19 response to -- from the -- for the emergency
20 response committee from our firefighters and EMS
21 personnel. Well, in reference to Mr. Hirschler
22 referenced two people voted against the standard,
23 it is interesting to know that we had 32 members on
24 the committee of which 25 voted -- excuse me -- 26
25 voted in the affirmative, the two negatives which



♀
1 we have heard about, and four who did not return
2 ballots.
3 The standard is a fire safety standard.
4 It's a crash-worthiness standard. No
5 crash-worthiness standard existed -- exist out
6 there for ambulances similar to what we have under
7 the 1901 standard that NFPA has adopted.
8 1917 provides a standardized performance
9 designed and testing criteria for automotive
10 ambulances. Currently, no national standard exists
11 to evaluate such vehicles. The committee developed

12 this document based on existing material from GSA
13 purchasing specifications, KKK 1822. This document
14 provided minimum safety requirements for
15 ambulances.
16 Well, many people have the misconception
17 that KKK is a federal standard. It is nothing more
18 than a purchasing document used by the federal --
19 by the federal administration to purchase
20 ambulances, but no other document exists to provide
21 a crash-worthy vehicle. And looking at incidents
22 that have occurred in which EMS providers --
23 whether they are from the fire service, proprietary
24 services, a voluntary service -- were dying in
25 crashes of ambulances. We are looking to provide a

112

♀

1 crash-worthy ambulance that will improve the safety
2 for the responders as well as the patients.
3 Therefore, we ask that -- let me just track one
4 second backwards.
5 In a document that was published by GBH
6 International concerning standard NFPA 556, it
7 reflects a statement, I quote, "In order for any
8 change to occur in the USA, a petition to that
9 effect has to be made to the National Highway
10 Transportation Safety Administration to set any
11 regulatory activity in motion."
12 The FMVSS will stay in effect. The
13 manufacturers will continue to meet that standard.
14 We have put that standard in our document, and as
15 Mr. Hirschler indicated in his own document, if
16 there's changes to be made, it has to be made by
17 petitioning the federal NHTSA for those changes to
18 occur. Therefore, with the substantial support of
19 our committee, there's only two people voting
20 against moving forward with this document.
21 I ask that this body vote in the affirm --
22 vote to support the committee's action and against
23 the motions that are being made.
24 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you,
25 Mr. Chairman.

113

♀

1 Microphone 5.
2 MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler GBH
3 International, speaking in favor of the motion. I
4 had to rise because, since a paper I wrote was
5 quoted, I want to make sure that I explain what
6 word -- what that paper stated is that, if we want
7 a federal requirement, which I do, to change for
8 the safety of all vehicles, then a federal
9 requirement will require to change things ANPRM and
10 PRM and all that stuff. That's not what we're
11 talking about here.
12 What we are talking about here is we're
13 developing a census standard for ambulances, and
14 whether it actually says in there that the phones
15 have to meet FMVSS 302 and it doesn't, it doesn't
16 matter because the federal government tells you you
17 have to.
18 Anything used on the road, any highway
19 vehicle has to meet FMVSS 302; and any foam in the
20 world pretty much meets it. So that's not the
21 issue. The issue is that we're dealing with

22 something where we want additional fire protection.
23 We want a little bit better for those people who
24 are driving an ambulance, and that's why I'm
25 requesting TB 117.

114

♀
1 I have no quarrel with the statement that
2 the federal government unfortunately has not
3 improved the requirements, but putting FMVSS 302 in
4 here doesn't make any difference. You have to meet
5 it whether it's in there or it isn't in there. If
6 you want fire safety, do a little bit better.
7 Thank you.
8 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
9 MR. HIRSCHLER: I have no further
10 comments.
11 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
12 So at this point, we'll move to a vote.
13 Before we vote, let me restate the motion.
14 The motion on the floor is to accept
15 Comment 1917-15. Please record your vote with one
16 being in favor of the motion or two opposed to the
17 motion. Voting closes in five seconds. Voting's
18 closed. And the motion fails.
19 We will now proceed with the next motion,
20 Certified Amending Motion 1972-2.
21 Microphone 5.
22 MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH
23 International for NAFRA and I move to accept
24 Comment 1917-22.
25 Thank you.

115

♀
1 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: There's a
2 motion on the floor to accept Comment 1917-22.
3 Do I have a second? Do I hear a second?
4 SPEAKER: Second.
5 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Second.
6 Okay. Proceed.
7 MR. HIRSCHLER: Thank you. I don't want
8 to belabor the issue. This is part of the same set
9 of proposals, but there is one issue I want to
10 point out.
11 This talks about the insulation shall meet
12 the requirements of FMVSS 302. Since insulation is
13 not exposed within the ambulance, means the
14 insulation shall not meet anything. That's what it
15 means. So if you really mean that you want to do
16 something, then do something. And I am
17 recommending that you do what insulation does
18 through out the world anywhere -- throughout the
19 United States anywhere, not throughout the world.
20 So if you really mean you want to do
21 something, then you have to do something because
22 what you're saying here, "meet FMVSS 302," which is
23 not -- which says that you exclude everything
24 that's not exposed, you don't do anything.
25 Thank you.

116

♀
1 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
2 Mr. Chair, would you like to give the
3 Committee's position?
4 MR. FISCHLER: Similar comments. The

5 FMVSS already provides the minimum standard for the
6 appropriate -- that's appropriate for these
7 vehicles. The commentator is suggesting applying a
8 nonvehicle standard. Thank you.
9 So now we'll open up for debate on this
10 motion. As a reminder, please provide your name
11 and affiliation and whether you're speaking support
12 or against the motion. Is there any further
13 discussion on the Motion 1917? Seeing none, we'll
14 move straight to a vote.
15 Before we vote, let me restate the motion.
16 The motion on the floor is to accept
17 Comment 1917-22. Please record your vote one in
18 favor of the motion or two opposed to the motion.
19 Balloting closes in five seconds. Voting's closed.
20 And that motion fails.
21 We will now proceed with the next motion,
22 Certified Amending Motion 1917-3.
23 Microphone 5.
24 MR. HIRSCHLER: I will not pursue 13 -- 3
25 or 4. I'll go straight to Number 5. And I hereby

117

♀
1 move -- sorry.
2 Marcelo Hirschler, GBH International for
3 NAFRA; and I move that we return the entire report.
4 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay. So
5 there's a motion on the floor to return the entire
6 report.
7 Do I have a second?
8 SPEAKER: Okay.
9 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Please
10 proceed.
11 SPEAKER: Again, Marcelo Hirschler, GBH
12 International for NAFRA.
13 This document does nothing to improve the
14 safety of ambulances. We don't need something
15 that'S just going to repeat the same thing that we
16 already know. And then I want to repeat the people
17 representing the ambulance organizations who are
18 critical on this issue, Mr. Meyer and
19 Mr. Thackery -- Mr. Meyer for the Life American
20 Ambulance Association; Mr. Thackery, American
21 Medical Response. Both says that this does
22 nothing. It's not worth bothering to issue it.
23 With the part that I'm responsible for
24 that I know something about the fire testing of the
25 materials, it just parrots FMVSS whether it's

118

♀
1 applicable or not applicable. In most cases, it's
2 not applicable to what it does. So it does
3 absolutely nothing.
4 Please return this document to provide
5 something that will provide safety for our
6 ambulances.
7 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
8 Mr. Chair, would you like to give the
9 Committee's position?
10 MR. FISCHLER: Yes. Thank you.
11 Again, I'm going to reiterate what my
12 prior comments some of them were that 1917 provides
13 standardized performance, design testing criteria
14 for automotive ambulances. Currently, no national

15 standard exists to evaluate such vehicles. The
16 Committee developed this document based on existing
17 material from GSA purchasing specification,
18 KKK 1822. This document provides minimum safety
19 requirements for ambulances.
20 The Committee did improve on what the KKK
21 standards had in it and will continue, as our work
22 goes forward, to improve on the crash worthiness of
23 ambulances; and that's critical. That's where
24 people were dying -- the EMS responders,
25 firefighters, police officers, EMS, career and

119

♀
1 volunteer providers.
2 The two organizations represented in
3 negative votes are proprietary ambulances. People
4 involved in our committee and the organizations
5 they present -- represented were within the
6 manufacturing. We had the Progressive Engineering;
7 Spartan Motors, Lifeline Emergency Vehicles,
8 West Angeles Fire Department, Ford Motor Company,
9 National Institute for Occupational Safety and
10 Health, Underwriters Laboratory, Will Coach,
11 James Juno, who is an attorney at law; Oshkosh
12 Corporation, Westmont Stable Fire Department
13 representing the National Volunteer Fire Council,
14 the U.S. General Service Administration who runs
15 the KKK document who puts that together for the
16 purchasing; New York State Emergency Medical
17 Service Council, the Fire Apparatus Manufacturers
18 Association, the International Association of Fire
19 Chiefs, Navistar, National Association of State EMS
20 Officials, National EMS Management Association,
21 Plano Fire Department representing the NFPA fire
22 service section, National Truck Equipment
23 Association, Delaware Volunteer Firefighters
24 Association, and Emergency Vehicle Technician
25 Certification Commission.

120

♀
1 These people worked diligently to ensure
2 that what we document that we put together what was
3 going to provide a level of safety for those
4 providers in the back and the patients, something
5 that does not exist today -- and then will give us
6 the foundational -- the foundation on which to
7 proceed as we move forward in the new cycle to keep
8 improving; but we will now have a document that
9 establishes criteria for crash worthiness for
10 ambulances similar to what we have for fire
11 apparatus already.
12 Therefore, I urge you to reject the
13 motion.
14 Thank you, Mr. Fischler. We will now open
15 up the floor for debate on the motion. As a
16 reminder, please provide your name, affiliation,
17 and whether you're speaking in support of or
18 against the motion.
19 Microphone 9.
20 MR. McCARTNEY: My name is Alan McCartney.
21 I'm speaking for the motion. I'm employed by the
22 Tennessee Valley Authority, but I'm speaking on my
23 behalf. My membership with NFPA is paid for by me.
24 I've been a paramedic for 30 years. I was

25 an EMT for eight. Before that I worked in all

121

♀

1 types of ambulances -- vans, boxes, '68 Cadillacs.
2 I've been a firefighter. I've been a member of the
3 International. I'm also a certified safety
4 professional. I'm an industrial hygienist as well.
5 One of the things I want everybody here to
6 understand is realize that, in the United States,
7 the majority of our ambulances or essentially
8 buildings on the back of truck frames built just
9 like we build homes and commercial buildings.
10 Yes, crash worthiness is really, really
11 important. And it's absolutely necessary for our
12 firefighters, EMS, and other professionals in these
13 emergency vehicles. In the compartment that's
14 related to the vehicle but on the back is a house,
15 a building. Grant it, it meets KKK minimum
16 standards; but some of the standards that we're
17 attempting to talk about here are standards that
18 are designed and oriented towards the type of
19 structures that we put on the back of the truck.
20 We also have these structures that do catch fire at
21 the time -- at the time of the crash, and it makes
22 absolute positive sense to ensure that we have
23 adequate fire safety as part of a crash-worthiness
24 standard. So I stand here in support.
25 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.

122

♀

1 Any further discussion on 1917-5 to return
2 the entire report?
3 Any final remarks from the Chair?
4 MR. FISCHLER: No further comments.
5 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay. So
6 we will move right to a vote. Before we vote, let
7 me restate the motion.
8 The motion on the floor is to return the
9 entire report. Please record your vote one in
10 favor of the motion or two opposed to the motion.
11 Okay. Voting closes in five seconds. Voting's
12 closed. And that motion fails.
13 Thank you, Mr. Fischler.
14 MR. FISCHLER: Thank you.
15 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
16 Before proceeding to the next document,
17 which is 1951, I have a couple of announcements to
18 make. First off, we'll take a ten-minute morning
19 break at this point before we move on to the next
20 document. And the other announcement for planning
21 purposes is at 12 noon, we'll take a 30-minute
22 lunch break so you can plan accordingly.
23 Next document up is 1951 after break.
24 (Recess taken.)
25 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: All right.

123

♀

1 We're going to get started back up, and the next
2 document is out of the Technical Committee on
3 Special Operations Protective Clothing and
4 Equipment. Here to present the committee report is
5 structural and proximity firefighting protective
6 clothing and equipment committee chair, Steven King
7 of Babylon, New York. The committee report can be

8 found in the white 2011 fall revision cycle ROP and
9 ROC. The certified amending motions are contained
10 in the motions committee report and behind me on
11 the screen. We'll proceed in the order of the
12 motion sequence number presented.
13 Mr. King.
14 MR. KING: Good morning. Mr. Chair,
15 ladies and gentlemen, the report of the Technical
16 Committee on Special Operations Protective Clothing
17 and Equipment is presented for adoptioning. It can
18 be found under ROP and the ROC for the fall 2011
19 meeting revision cycle.
20 The technical committee and technical
21 correlating committee has published a report
22 consisting of a partial revision of NFPA 1951, the
23 standard on protective ensemble protective of
24 rescue incidence.
25 The report was submitted to letter ballot

124

♀

1 of the technical committee that consists of 19
2 voting members. The ballot results can be found on
3 pages 1951-7 to 1951-67 of the ROP and pages 1951-7
4 to 1951-46 of the ROC.
5 The presiding officer will now proceed
6 with the certified amending motions.
7 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you,
8 Mr. King.
9 So we will now proceed with the discussion
10 on the certified amending motion on NFPA 1951.
11 Microphone 7.
12 MR. STULL: My name is Jefrey Stull with
13 International Personal Protection. I'd like to
14 make an amending motion to return a portion of a
15 report in the form of Proposal 1951-44 and related
16 Comment 1951-27, motion sequence 1951-1.
17 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Is there a
18 second? Do I have a second?
19 SPEAKER: Second.
20 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: We do have
21 a second?
22 You may proceed.
23 MR. STULL: Thank you.
24 This is the first of several motions I
25 plan to make today, and with one exception, these

125

♀

1 motions are about test methods and related criteria
2 that made their way into NFPA standards without
3 adequate disclosure and validation.
4 NFPA prides itself on a process that's
5 open and transparent. Information should be freely
6 available and disseminated to allow committee
7 members to make informed decisions. Furthermore,
8 when changes are proposed to a standard,
9 particularly adding new test methods and criteria,
10 the essential part of a minimum product standard,
11 steps must be taken to validate those changes.
12 I will explain to you how several changes
13 were not properly disclosed and were not validated
14 and why you, as an association, should not accept
15 -- should accept these motions.
16 In this first motion, I am opposed to a
17 new flame test that's been proposed to rescue and

18 firefighter footwear. This particular motion
19 covers rescue footwear. There will be another
20 motion later on for structural footwear that will
21 be similar, but my criticisms are the same for
22 both. The new test methods are intended to replace
23 our existing test methods that have been in
24 NFPA 1951 and the other 1971 since their inception.
25 Like many other flame tests, the existing
126
♀
1 tests involved using a specified burner and
2 contacting it, the sample in this case footwear,
3 for a specified period of time.
4 The test has worked well for years.
5 There's been very few problems with this
6 application. Rescue personnel and firefighters are
7 now suffering burns to their feet because somehow
8 footwear have flammability problems.
9 Now, the new test. Imagine, if you will,
10 a 12-inch by 18-inch pan filled with water for
11 which heptane is put in, that's lit on fire. The
12 footwear is dangled above --
13 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: You have
14 one minute remaining.
15 MR. STULL: Thank you.
16 It's dangled above that flame and exposes
17 control through some kind of manual shutter. This
18 is the test that replaces this new method. So when
19 I start asking questions like how is this test
20 calibrated, other specifications, other data that
21 shows how this test compares with existing tests
22 its intended to replace, I didn't get any answers.
23 There is no calibration procedures. There is no
24 way of establishing the reliability of this method.
25 There's been no interlaboratory testing whatsoever.
127
♀
1 This caused the technical correlating
2 committee to point out to the technical committee
3 that validation steps were needed in the form of
4 interlaboratory testing and with field validation
5 to show that the test does compare.
6 For the good of the association --
7 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Ten seconds
8 remaining.
9 MR. STULL: -- I urge you to accept this
10 motion.
11 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
12 Mr. King, would you like to give the
13 Committee's position?
14 MR. KING: Yes. I would I like to start
15 off by saying that this test for 1951 is something
16 that they looked at, work that the 1971 committee
17 had done on this. I am the chairman of the 1971
18 committee.
19 Early on in the revision process for this
20 cycle of the 1971 document and the 1951 document,
21 we realized that there's been many, many ongoing
22 issues related to either global footwear. One of
23 the big challenges that the committee took on was
24 to look at the various tests related to gloves and,
25 in this case, specifically the footwear issues.
128
♀

1 Some of the tests were felt not to really
2 do their job. They were not reliable, possibly
3 discernible, issues like that. So early on, a task
4 group was formed to look at these many issues. If
5 you can imagine, the committee had many, many
6 issues to look at.
7 The task group was at work for over three
8 years. They reported at every meeting of the
9 technical committee their ongoing work, which was
10 discussed at length with the full technical
11 committee; and they were looking to give them
12 either more guidance or to learn what data they
13 have gotten so far, et cetera.
14 There were many meetings also of the
15 technical task group on their own, which we
16 reported back to the technical committee. So it
17 was a tremendous amount of work done. There
18 certainly was a lot of data to get out, et cetera.
19 Mr. Stull was actually a member of the task group
20 also.
21 As a result of that, we -- the technical
22 committee decided to incorporate a new test. This
23 test was felt to be more severe than the current
24 test. They -- we felt it would be a benefit to
25 firefighters, and that's the reason this test was
129

1 incorporated.
2 There was ongoing tests. I know that
3 Mr. Stull feels that it was a dragged out, long
4 process. There was tremendous work done on this
5 and many other issues. However, when all was said
6 and done, the technical committee as a whole did
7 look at this and voted on this, and to give you an
8 idea, the votes were 32 voting members. There were
9 27 members who voted in the affirmative, and there
10 was one in the negative on the issue.
11 Thank you.
12 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you,
13 Mr. King.
14 So at this point, we're going to open up
15 on the floor for debate on the motion. As a
16 reminder, please provide your name and affiliation
17 and whether you're speaking in support or against
18 the motion.
19 Microphone 7.
20 MR. STULL: Jeffrey Stull, International
21 Personal Protection, speaking for the motion.
22 I just want to point out to you this test
23 doesn't really solve any particular problem. It's
24 a test that is, in fact, used for life preservers
25 by the U.S. Coast Guard. But if you saw a video of
130

1 this test, as I did, you would be appalled. It's a
2 test that lacks any degree of control. It's a test
3 that has no calibration. It's a test that hasn't
4 been validated in any way or form by the committee.
5 And as Steve King pointed out, Chief King,
6 there's been a lot of work done by this committee.
7 I think the committee just overstepped. They tried
8 to do too much in one addition, and this is an
9 example of a test that actually fits into that
10 category.

11 For this specific standard, 1951, I don't
12 think even rescue footwear was ever tested at all.
13 And so I get concerned when we start putting new
14 test methods into standards.
15 Let me give you another example.
16 NFPA 1971, that we'll speak about next, is having a
17 TIA go forward right now because we thought we were
18 making an innocent change in a test method to
19 change TPP, thermal protective performance, a
20 fundamental test of firefighters protective
21 clothing. We thought by changing from an ISO test
22 method to an ASTM test method we were getting a
23 better test method. Well, guess what? We're not.
24 We found that the method had unanticipated
25 consequences on products that were doing validly in

131

♀

1 the industry that we were going to have issues with
2 products that normally would conform and now no
3 longer conform. So I -- I want to suggest to this
4 association, as I've suggested to the technical
5 correlating committee, that we have policies in
6 place that advocate as much valuation efforts that
7 can occur before we put new things into test
8 methods or standards. And this is certainly a case
9 where I think we can have unanticipated
10 consequences, and the effects in the fire services
11 is nothing more than --
12 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: One minute
13 remaining.
14 MR. STULL: Thank you.
15 -- to increase the cost when manufacturers
16 scramble through trying to find out the problems
17 that exist with test methods because they haven't
18 been properly vetted.
19 NFPA has the best standards in world, and
20 I can say that because I've been a member of this
21 process and I've been able to participate in other
22 forms such as ASTM, ISO, ICA, and other forms. And
23 the reason we do is because we try to do this job
24 right. Let's keep doing that job right. I'm not
25 against this method going forward in the future,

132

♀

1 but it needs to be validated, and we need to see
2 the information before we even put a new test in
3 the standard.
4 Thank you.
5 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
6 Is there any further discussion to be had?
7 Okay. Seeing none, do you have any final -- excuse
8 me. Sorry about that.
9 Microphone 7.
10 MR. MARCH: Yeah, Charles March. I'm
11 speaking for myself.
12 I believe I am in favor of the motion, but
13 I really just have a question on what's in the
14 report. What does a technical committee action do
15 to what's being published here in the report on
16 comments? Are they directing the committee to go
17 back and revise this text? I'm just not clear what
18 that means.
19 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Yeah, well
20 the motion on the floor is to return a portion in

21 the form of Proposal 1951-44 and Comment 27.
22 And if you have your salmon-colored sheet,
23 in the far column it talks about what the outcome
24 would be.
25 It says, "If successful, the proposed

133

♀
1 motion seeks to return the criteria end test method
2 for footwear flame resistance to previous edition
3 text."
4 So it's basically going to back its
5 previous text.
6 MR. MARCH: Okay. I understand. I have a
7 question. If this here motion does not pass --
8 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Sorry.
9 That's the level of the interpretation that we'll
10 provide you.
11 MR. MARCH: Thank you.
12 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
13 Microphone 4.
14 MR. McKENNA: Michael McKenna,
15 Michael McKenna & Associates speaking against the
16 motion.
17 I was the chairman of the task group on
18 boots, and the task group was made up of a balance
19 group that contained the manufacturer -- virtually
20 all the manufacturers that provide boots to the --
21 structural boots to the fire service, and they were
22 all part of a well-balanced task group.
23 We met several times over the course of
24 the entire document, including several meetings in
25 between meetings. And we put this together based

134

♀
1 on fire service input, wanting a better test that
2 was more representative of what was related to the
3 field.
4 The committee started with a -- with 34
5 items. By the end of the process, we had narrowed
6 those down and delivered 45 pages of documentation
7 to task group members as well as to technical
8 committee reports at every technical committee
9 meeting.
10 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: One minute
11 remaining.
12 MR. McKENNA: Okay. Thank you.
13 At the end of the day, we had 45 -- turned
14 over 45 pages of documentation.
15 I take an issue with Mr. Stull's comment
16 about the TPP test because we did extensive testing
17 at the UL laboratories with footwear from the fire
18 service, and the TPP test that he's referring to,
19 no testing was done until after the document was
20 already through ROC.
21 Thank you.
22 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
23 Microphone 4.
24 MR. YARLING: Christian Yarling. I work
25 for Hike's Boots. We're a boot manufacturer. I

135

♀
1 participated in the task group.
2 I wanted to speak out here --
3 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Speaking

4 for or against?
5 MR. YARLING: Against the motion.
6 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
7 MR. YARLING: One of the reasons being, I
8 was part of the task group. Most of the boot
9 manufacturers participated in this, participated in
10 the testing, in the sampling, which was done at UL,
11 with an established test method from marine
12 equipment that we felt and actually the fire
13 service felt was a better test than what's being
14 done right now.
15 If we revert back to the test method
16 that's in the standard currently, not only are we
17 going back to the old test method but, if you look
18 at it, there is also some amendments that are
19 proposed by Mr. Stall, which no tests have been
20 done on these amendments that he's proposing to the
21 old test method.
22 So as far as I'm concerned, this was a
23 drive that came by the users. The users wanted
24 something different done. We obliged. Everybody
25 was privy to the data that participated in the task



1 group and was at the technical committee meetings.
2 So, for me, I can clearly say that I'm against this
3 motion.
4 Thank you.
5 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
6 Microphone 8.
7 MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH
8 International. I'm opposed to the motion.
9 I'm looking at proposed 1951-44, looking
10 at the old test and the new test. And I see
11 nothing that shows the new test to be less
12 clearly -- identified less clear explanation of
13 procedure, and I see a couple of things that are
14 really a good idea to describe in detail after
15 flame time observation of melting and dripping and
16 burning through. So I don't -- I don't see any
17 particular problem with a new test. I think it's
18 really important to follow visually for melting and
19 dripping.
20 I also see the major comment that I heard
21 from Mr. Stull was that some products that passed
22 before won't pass. That's what happens when you
23 change tests. The products that passed before
24 don't pass now.
25 And I think the substantiation that was



1 provided by the committee seems to indicate that,
2 in the old test, not -- not everything is -- not
3 all parts of the boot are tested. The new test
4 tests all parts of the boot.
5 So I think this is a move in the right
6 direction, and I urge the committee to -- I urge
7 the membership to disapprove the motion.
8 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
9 Microphone Number 4.
10 MR. CURTIS: Hello. My name is
11 Nicholas Curtis. I'm with Lion Apparel. We're in
12 the boot business, the glove business, turnouts,
13 station uniforms, chemical protection, all that

14 stuff.
15 My company was represented --
16 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: And you're
17 speaking for or against?
18 MR. CURTIS: Okay. I'm speaking against
19 the motion.
20 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay.
21 Thank you.
22 MR. CURTIS: My company was represented on
23 the technical committee and the technical
24 correlated committee. In fact, a colleague is the
25 secretary of the technical committee that processed



1 this.
2 The data about everything that went in
3 that standard was available to every member of the
4 committee. My company also, we have a thermal
5 laboratory, what we use for research and
6 development. We're not afraid to do this test, and
7 that seems to be the most significant point that
8 Mr. Stull's made is the test may be dangerous
9 because, you know, imagine this and with a hexane
10 burning for 15 or 20 seconds. We're not afraid of
11 that. We believe that, in terms of safety, the
12 most important thing about the NFPA standard is
13 that they further the safety of firefighters, and
14 there is no indication that this test will not do
15 that.
16 Thank you.
17 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
18 Microphone 7.
19 MR. STULL: Jeffrey Stull, International
20 Personal Protection speaking for the motion.
21 I need to make a couple of corrections for
22 the group. First of all, task groups are not
23 balanced, never have been balanced. There's a
24 predominance of manufacturers that participate.
25 They serve at the pleasure of the technical



1 committee chairperson. In fact, their
2 participation in those committees -- in those tasks
3 groups have always been heavily dominant by
4 manufacturers, not all which, of course, agree with
5 this test method.
6 And there's been some other misstatements.
7 Let me point out some of the other things that I
8 think is more important.
9 First of all, what I'm saying is this
10 method simply hasn't been validated. It may seem
11 like a good idea, and it may purport to address
12 some of the issues that have been identified, which
13 incidentally weren't brought up by endusers but by
14 the laboratory itself. There was a concern about
15 being able to test all portions of the footwear,
16 but the amendment that was put in was to address
17 that issue to allow that testing.
18 The testing that's now done in footwear is
19 probably the existing testing that's no different
20 than what's done or gloves or helmets or garments.
21 So now we're creating an entirely brand new test
22 for footwear, which hasn't been validated by
23 what -- and data was not available to the

24 committee, just anecdotal statement; and we're
25 hoping to accept that.

140

♀

1 And I don't accept that because I've seen
2 what poorly designed test methods can do. I've had
3 the experience of putting some poorly designed test
4 methods and had to go back to correct them.
5 So I want to urge the association to
6 carefully consider your role ensuring the standards
7 for the best possible, even if it means being a
8 little bit conservative in making sure that our
9 testing methods and our criteria have been properly
10 vetted. I think it's the best thing for the fire
11 service and for the endusers to depend on their
12 health and safety for this equipment.
13 Thank you.
14 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
15 Is there any further discussion on
16 Motion 1951-1?
17 Mr. Chair, would you like to make any
18 final remarks?
19 MR. KING: Yes, I would. First I'd like
20 to thank the support from the floor on this issue.
21 I have a couple of issues with what Mr. Stull just
22 said.
23 First off, the committee is absolutely in
24 balance. For him to say there's an excess of
25 manufacturers is ridiculous. As you know, if I

141

♀

1 were -- if my committee would have more of one than
2 the other, I would quickly hear from headquarters.
3 So there is certainly not an excess of
4 manufacturers.
5 With that being said, there are the most
6 recognized testing labs in the country on my
7 committee; there are many government entities that
8 do their own testing on the committee; there are
9 many manufacturers on the committee that have their
10 own test labs and do these tests.
11 Once again, when you look at the ballot
12 results, it's quite clear that the only person that
13 has a problem with this process and the way it's
14 ran is Mr. Stull.
15 Thank you.
16 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you,
17 Mr. Chair.
18 Microphone 7.
19 MR. STULL: Jeffrey Stull, International
20 Personal Protection. I have to make one --
21 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Speaking
22 for or against?
23 MR. STULL: Speaking for the motion.
24 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
25 MR. STULL: I have to make one very clear

142

♀

1 distinction here. I'm not at all accusing the
2 committee of being out of balance. The task groups
3 which serves at the pleasure of the committee are
4 not in balance and never have been. I'm sorry
5 that's the case. That allows various entities that
6 normally wouldn't be able to participate in the

7 committee process to be involved in the formation
8 of these test methods.
9 And I'm not denigrating the process at
10 all. I'm just saying that sometimes this committee
11 bites off more than it can chew, and it had a lot
12 of activity to go through. The committee had many
13 comments, and it did good deliberation on many of
14 those parts.
15 I'm not a member of NFPA 1951 -- the
16 committee responsible for 1951, but I do follow
17 that through my participation in the technical
18 correlating committee, and I can tell you, just
19 this last week, we met here in Las Vegas; and we
20 are in the process of putting together a task group
21 to examine the fact that we need to do better
22 validation of test methods and to ensure that the
23 criteria that we develop for our standards is
24 properly vetted and shows the consistency and
25 intended application as they're put forward.



♀
1 So I want to make that clarification. I'm
2 not working against the committee. I'm trying to
3 help the committee do its job in a better fashion.
4 Thank you.
5 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
6 Anything further, Mr. Chair?
7 MR. KING: Yes. I'm sorry for that,
8 Mr. Stull. I understand now that you're saying
9 that the task group had a lot of manufacturers.
10 And that's terrific. I deliberately tried
11 to get as much input on this issue as I could. So,
12 yes, there were a lot of manufacturers. They were
13 an important part of our committee and the process,
14 but keep in mind that that task group reported to
15 the technical committee at every technical
16 committee meeting and that the technical committee
17 is in balance.
18 Once again, I would like to say that -- I
19 think part of what Mr. Stull might be alluding to
20 is, in a perfect world, I think we would always
21 like to have more data than we have, regardless of
22 how much we have. If that were to happen, I think
23 in a lot of cases this NFPA process would not be
24 able to proceed the way it does.
25 But we have a committee made up of experts



♀
1 from the various fields, and every committee
2 member, with the exception of Mr. Stall, was very
3 comfortable with the changes that we made to this
4 document.
5 Thank you.
6 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
7 Okay.
8 So at this point, we're going to vote.
9 Before we vote, let me restate the motion.
10 The motion on the floor is to return a
11 portion of the report in the form of Proposal
12 1951-44 and related Comment 1951-27.
13 So please record your vote one, if you're
14 in favor of the motion, and two if you're opposed
15 to the motion.
16 Okay. Voting closes in five seconds.

17 Voting's closed. And the motion fails.
18 Thank you.
19 Any further discussion on NFPA 1951?
20 Seeing none, we'll move on to the next document.
21 Thank you, Mr. King. I know you're with
22 us here for the next document as well.
23 So the next report under consideration
24 this afternoon is that of the Technical Committee
25 on Structural and Proximity Firefighting Protective
145
♀
1 Clothing and Equipment.
2 Here to present the committee report is
3 Committee Chair Steven King of Babylon, New York.
4 The committee report can be found in the
5 white 2011 fall revision cycle ROP and ROC. The
6 certified amending motions are contained in the
7 motions committee report and behind me on the
8 screen.
9 We'll proceed in the order of the motion's
10 sequence number presented.
11 Mr. King.
12 MR. KING: Good morning once again.
13 Mr. Chair, ladies and gentlemen, the
14 report of the Technical Committee on Structural and
15 Proximity Firefighting Protective Clothing and
16 Equipment is presented for adoption and can be
17 found in the ROP and the ROC for the fall -- the
18 2011 fall meeting revision cycle.
19 The technical committee and technical
20 correlating committee has published a report
21 consisting of a partial revision of NFPA 1971
22 standard on protected ensemble for structural
23 firefighting and proximity firefighting.
24 The report was submitted to letter ballot
25 of the technical committee. That consists of 32
146
♀
1 voting members. The ballot results can be found on
2 pages 1971-72 to 1971-82 of the ROP and pages
3 1971-7 to 1971-82 of the ROC.
4 The presiding officer will now proceed
5 with the certified amending motions.
6 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you,
7 Mr. King.
8 So we will now proceed with discussion on
9 certified amending motion for NFPA 1971.
10 Microphone 7.
11 MR. STULL: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, as I
12 get to the right page.
13 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Take your
14 time. That's fine.
15 MR. STULL: Jeffrey Stull, International
16 Personal Protection. I'd like to make a motion to
17 accept Comment 1971-65, which is part of motion
18 sequence 1971-1.
19 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay.
20 Thank you.
21 Do we have a second?
22 SPEAKER: Second.
23 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: You have a
24 second. You may proceed.
25 MR. STULL: Thank you.
147

1 Firefighters need better gloves, and
2 perhaps one way to accomplish this is to provide
3 better test methods and criteria that foster the
4 development of new materials and designs.
5 This has been an ambition of the Technical
6 Committee for Structural Firefighters and
7 Protective Clothing for some time. But in this
8 case, I think the process moving towards its end
9 again lacks disclosure and validation.
10 A new dexterity test method was introduced
11 during ROP. The test method was accepted by the
12 committee as promising, but a better understanding
13 of the test and the data were needed to support its
14 ultimate decision in this process.
15 But what was not known at the time was
16 there was an $830,000 contract awarded to a
17 university to essentially promote new test methods,
18 and those test methods came from the university,
19 but at a critical juncture, right before ROC, where
20 the data were to be made available to the task
21 group, a teleconference was held. Not all of us
22 could participate in this teleconference; so we
23 have asked the obvious question. Could you provide
24 us the data? The answer was "Mo, we can't provide
25 the data to you at this time." In fact, that data

148

1 was never provided -- it was never provided to the
2 technical committee.
3 We were -- the only opportunity that
4 existed was for the task group to have seen it
5 during one teleconference.
6 Now, with the task -- what the data showed
7 was that the task method provided better
8 discrimination in a existing test method.
9 Now, I asked the question, "Well, that's
10 okay. But is it better discrimination consistent
11 with field observations of gloves? After all, if
12 you're including a new dexterity test methods,
13 shouldn't it provide ratings" -- "or
14 measurements" --
15 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: One minute
16 remaining.
17 MR. STULL: -- "with firefighters'
18 experience?" And that question has not been
19 answered. Again, this has been an issue that was
20 brought forward to the technical correlating
21 committee. And the technical correlating committee
22 responded by putting a note back to the technical
23 committee, "Please run a laboratory test. Please
24 undertake the validation effort to ensure that the
25 criteria that you have are meaningful and providing

149

1 the intended effect."
2 I urge you -- this is a similar type of
3 issue, but it is important in this case. There is
4 a clear lack of disclosure during a critical part
5 of the standards development process. That data
6 has never yet been made available to the technical
7 committee.
8 Thank you.
9 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.

10 Mr. King, would you like to give the
11 Committee's --
12 MR. KING: Yes, I would.
13 As Mr. Stull said, there is lot of
14 similarities, I think, to all of these issues that
15 you're about to hear this afternoon. Once again,
16 this test was incorporated into the new standard
17 because dexterity of firefighting gloves has always
18 been a tremendous problem for the firefighters
19 through the years. Every time we asked
20 firefighters about their gloves, they want a glove
21 that's certainly going to protect them and allow
22 them to do their job. But at the same time, they
23 want a glove that's going to let them turn a knob
24 on a handy-talkie, maybe even pick up a dime if
25 they have to. But dexterity has certainly been an

150

♀
1 issue.
2 A lot of time, again, was devoted to
3 looking at the specifics of the dexterity of
4 firefighter's gloves. And keep in mind that the
5 current test really has not shown or done a very
6 good job in that area. What happened here with
7 this particular area of the test, we added some
8 more tests to the current peg test that's in there.
9 These tests allow for better testing of dexterity
10 and find dexterity. And as a result of that, these
11 two new tests give a very good picture of overall
12 functionality of the gloves.
13 Mr. Stull alluded a little bit about field
14 testing. Field testing is a terrific concept, and
15 I have to tell you that I've been part of this
16 process for 15 years, and a lot of the people on my
17 committee have been part of the process way before
18 me. And none of us are aware of any tests that
19 ever went into the standard that had field testing.
20 We try to do as much, you know, interlab testing as
21 we can and get the data out there that we need.
22 But like it or not, a lot of the field testing
23 results come -- once those gloves, which, again,
24 all of these tests have been approved by the vast
25 majority of the technical committee that -- that

151

♀
1 allows those gloves to get out there. And we learn
2 that they're out in the field.
3 But certainly the job of ensuring that
4 adequate testing was done and that it has the full
5 support of the committee, that was premier in all
6 of our minds; and it certainly -- again, looking at
7 the ballot results for this, this issue, the 32
8 voting members, 28 in favor, none against, and four
9 not returned.
10 Thank you.
11 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you,
12 Mr. King.
13 So with that, we'll now open the floor for
14 debate on this motion. As a reminder, please
15 provide your name and affiliation and whether
16 you're speaking in support of or against the
17 motion.
18 Microphone 7.
19 MR. STULL: Thank you. Jeffrey Stull,

20 International Personal Protection speaking for the
21 motion. I just want to point out to you a couple
22 of things that Chief King said.
23 First of all, this is not a method that
24 measures fine dexterity ability to handle a radio.
25 It actually involves large bolts being put into

152

♀

1 holes and washers being put on those bolts and
2 timing an individual for doing that test.
3 This is not a test that has been shown to
4 discriminate. I think it has merit. Do not get me
5 wrong. I think this could be a great test, but
6 what I'm saying is we put the test into the
7 standard prematurely.
8 The criteria that were put forward with
9 this test were based on accommodating everything in
10 the marketplace. So if the fire service is
11 expecting better gloves as a result of adopting
12 this test, then they're going to be mistaken.
13 They're going to have to wait a while longer.
14 Now, there's some that may suggest that,
15 if we put a testbed in the standard, then we'll
16 just see what happens. And there may be some merit
17 to that, but I don't believe that NFPA standards
18 should be testbeds. I think validation work should
19 be carried out in advance, and let me just tell you
20 a little bit more about this process and where I
21 feel that there was failed disclosure.
22 This particular grant that I described
23 earlier had the benefit of the NFPA research
24 foundation -- our fire protection research
25 foundation, and this group, I put forward to them

153

♀

1 my concerns. I said, "Hey, let's try to get some
2 interlaboratory testing done. Let's do the field
3 validation work while the grant was still going
4 on."
5 The response I got was "Outside the scope
6 of our activity."
7 And I was just awestruck by that. I just
8 couldn't believe that they would push back and say,
9 "Hey, let's try to do this job right."
10 In contrast to what Chairman King says, we
11 have done some validation efforts. The most
12 notable is when --
13 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: One minute
14 remaining.
15 MR. STULL: -- the International
16 Association of Firefighters, the IFF, has promoted
17 more instrumental changes in improving firefighter
18 health and safety than any other organization by
19 funding and promoting and pushing forward field
20 studies. The most notable, which was a field study
21 conducted in 1998, an Indianapolis Fire Department
22 to put it in (inaudible) departments to provide
23 stress relief to firefighters. These same kinds of
24 practices could be undertaken. And again, I think
25 it's important to realize that test methods have to

154

♀

1 be vetted out because we encounter all the time
2 instances where we have to go back, put a TIA in,

3 and then correct the problem that we created in the
4 first place.
5 Thank you.
6 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
7 Microphone 4.
8 MR. McKENNA: Michael McKenna, Michael
9 McKenna & Associates is speaking against the
10 motion.
11 I was also the task group chair on gloves.
12 What I failed to mention in that first -- my first,
13 I spent 32 years on the job in fire service. And
14 this test method, in particular, was a direct
15 result of fire service on the task group on gloves
16 wanting to create new test methods that were more
17 representative of what we actually do on the job.
18 The intent was not necessarily to raise
19 the bar at this time on gloves but to create test
20 methods that, even if they accommodated the things,
21 the gloves that were still on the market would be
22 more representative of what we do on the job. We
23 built -- once again, we had extensive notes. We
24 originally started with 36 items and narrowed it
25 down to the items we could get done in a timely

155

♀

1 fashion and get them done properly. And at the
2 time of the ROC, we had 98 pages of notes that
3 started at the very first -- very first task group
4 meeting and went all the way through the ROC
5 meeting.
6 These notes were passed among the task
7 group and technical committee and were put
8 together -- and made presentation at every
9 technical committee meeting.
10 In order to help ourselves get some of the
11 expertise, we turned some of the research that we
12 were working on, these various ideas that we had,
13 the various items to make gloves better, we
14 disbursed them over to NC State; and NC State
15 assisted the task group in getting -- in getting
16 things done.
17 Once again, our task group represented
18 virtually every glove -- structural glove
19 manufacturer in the industry as well as fire
20 service. So at the end of the day, there were a
21 lot of manufacturers on the committee; but the
22 manufacturers that were on the task group were
23 comfortable with where we were taking these
24 products.
25 And they had their chance to have input,

156

♀

1 their chance to speak. And at the end of the day,
2 this is sort of a baseline agreement between a
3 consensus of all of the people that participated in
4 the task group.
5 Thank you. I think I covered everything I
6 wanted. Thank you.
7 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
8 Microphone 4.
9 MR. DEATON: My name is Anthony Shawn
10 Deaton, and I work for North Carolina State
11 University. I am voting for in support of -- or
12 against the motion.

13 To make a general comment, NC State has
14 conducted one of the most comprehensive studies on
15 test methods for structural firefighting gloves
16 dexterity and grip that has ever been conducted.
17 This scientifically-based study developed and
18 improved test methods and validated these methods
19 by testing a wide range of firefighting gloves and
20 noncompliant gloves as well.
21 It involved extensive input through
22 firefighters and with the corporation from the
23 National Fire Protection Research Foundation. For
24 the test method itself, this is not a redundant
25 test to the current pegboard test method. As

157

♀

1 Chairman King had said, the pegboard test basically
2 is a fine dexterity assessment of gloves looking at
3 the fingertips of the glove, where the tube test is
4 more of a whole hand assessment of the glove that
5 can account for the stiffness and softness of the
6 palm of the material.
7 The NC State data we presented has shown
8 that the glove dexterity test is more consistent
9 and less variable than the pegboard test and
10 basically has a lower coefficient of variation.
11 The glove test better simulates actually
12 firefighting tasks than the pegboard test, and it's
13 more responsive to real differences in glove
14 dexterity effects.
15 And Jeff Stull has indicated that the TCC
16 has asked that round-robin has occurred. NC State
17 has participated in that. And as part of that, we
18 actually used firefighters as our subject. Those
19 subjects were asked to subjectively rate these
20 gloves in terms of how they felt in terms of their
21 whole glove dexterity rated those, and the whole
22 glove dexterity where the tube test method
23 basically showed very good correlation --
24 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: One minute.
25 MR. DEATON: -- and much better than that

158

♀

1 of the pegboard.
2 In terms of data, we have presented our
3 study multiple times at the NFPA -- NFPA 1971
4 meeting. We've presented it to task group
5 chairs -- or to the task group itself. We also --
6 the teleconference that Jeff Stull had alluded to,
7 I did give that presentation, and I also -- he was
8 unable to attend, and I also made a special
9 arrangement to show him that data and explain
10 everything that we have done. To date, we have not
11 given out the data in terms of which glove
12 performed better than the others as we do not like
13 to promote or basically give results out that
14 indicate one glove may be better than the other.
15 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: You have
16 ten seconds left.
17 MR. DEATON: Thank you.
18 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay.
19 Thank you.
20 Further discussion?
21 Microphone 7.
22 MR. STULL: Yes. Jeffrey Stull,

23 International Personal Protection speaking for the
24 motion.
25 Again, we're all on the same team here;

159

♀
1 and we are trying to get the best for the fire
2 service. And my criticisms of this test have
3 nothing to do with the potential validity of the
4 test. It's the process and how we put tests into
5 standards.
6 It's important to do this validation. I
7 wish -- you know, I had to go to the TCC
8 chairperson. I had to go to the grant
9 administrator to say, "Please get this data in our
10 hands."
11 And I exhausted all of those attempts
12 before deciding to put in an enigma. If I thought
13 by putting in this enigma I was going to in any way
14 endanger firefighters by listing some improvement
15 that they possibly could have by virtue of
16 including that test. I would not have undertaken
17 it. What I'm trying to get the association to
18 understand today is that we need to have a process
19 that is respectful and mindful of what the NFPA
20 stands for and how it develops standards.
21 And just to point out just a couple of
22 things on this particular method, yes, there is a
23 laboratory test; and it's ongoing right now. It's
24 being done privately. It's on information that's
25 available to the technical committee, and I'm

160

♀
1 certainly not asking to find out whose glove is
2 doing better than any other's glove. All I want is
3 to have an understanding that the test is
4 reproducible and that it provides a consistent
5 ranking that you see in the field.
6 And we hear that from Shawn, but we didn't
7 get that information at any time during the ROC
8 process or, for that matter, when the TCC had its
9 opportunity to review the standard.
10 You know, and I will support this method
11 when I see this information, and I know that
12 information is forthcoming, but there will be
13 tentative interim amendments in this standard to
14 try to correct --
15 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: One minute
16 remaining.
17 MR. STULL: Thank you.
18 -- as this test is still evolving and
19 they're deciding to make changes specifically on
20 how this test is conducted.
21 I've been able to talk to one of the
22 laboratories that is in the process of doing this
23 testing. And while they find the test to be
24 written, they're finding questions that need to be
25 answered, that will have to be answered by some

161

♀
1 group being the technical committee to an interim
2 amendment process.
3 Thank you.
4 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
5 Microphone 4.

6 MR. CURTIS: Thank you.
7 Nicholas Curtis, Lion Apparel. I was
8 actually the secretary --
9 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Speaking
10 for or against?
11 MR. CURTIS: I'm speaking against the
12 motion.
13 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay.
14 Thank you.
15 MR. CURTIS: I was the secretary of the
16 committee that all these motions were put forth on,
17 and I guess my observation is not just specifically
18 on Comment 1971-65 but on all of these motions.
19 And that is, that it's unfortunate that things
20 don't happen from the same time frame that
21 Mr. Stull would have liked them to happen. You
22 would have -- these tests are five-year premature.
23 They should have gone in the next standard, or the
24 validation should have been done more in advance.
25 That isn't the way that it has happened in the



1 past.
2 Mr. Stull cited one well-funded --
3 well-funded study that -- that he was involved in
4 where there was some form of field evaluation, but
5 most of these tests that have created the safest
6 firefighting equipment in the world were not done
7 in that matter. They're done with firefighters and
8 manufacturers and testing laboratories and
9 enforcing agencies working together to come with
10 their best possible standards they can.
11 There was one test that comes to mind.
12 It's a conductive compressive heat resistance test.
13 There was no -- even laboratory testing done on
14 that because only one mechanism for doing that test
15 existed at the time.
16 That was put into the standard. There's
17 been revisions on it since then. It's been harsher
18 and harsher and sterner and sterner, but the end
19 result is that firefighter's injuries because of
20 conductive compressive heat it to the shoulders and
21 the --
22 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: You have
23 one minute remaining.
24 MR. STULL: Thank you.
25 -- are greatly reduced because of that



1 test. I know of no test that's been put into the
2 standard with or without validation advance -- that
3 has -- that has not made a positive contribution to
4 firefighter safety.
5 Yes, it's hard as a manufacturer to keep
6 up with these tests; but that's what we do. That's
7 what we get paid for, and we're proud to do it.
8 Thank you.
9 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
10 Microphone 4.
11 MR. DEATON: Anthony Shawn Deaton,
12 North Carolina State. I will be speaking against
13 the motion again. I just wanted to clarify one
14 thing.
15 Jeff had said that the test method is

16 currently still evolving around this particular
17 test method, and I'm unaware of this test method
18 evolving. It's undergoing a round-robin as we
19 speak between various tests.
20 Thank you.
21 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
22 Is there any further discussion on the
23 motion?
24 Mr. Chair, any final remarks?
25 MR. KING: Yes. Mr. Stull said that he's

164

♀
1 a very firm believer of the NFPA process, and he's
2 been a member for a very long time, and I know that
3 he is. But I have to tell you that I'm a very firm
4 believer of the NFPA process myself. I think it's
5 a terrific process. Sometimes it's painful, but
6 all of that pain is directed at getting the best
7 final document that we can get out there. And
8 that's why we go through this whole process with
9 the technical committees and all the work they're
10 doing, the task groups that might be assigned and
11 the over check by the technical correlating
12 committee; and then, when that's all said and done,
13 it goes out to an ROP. And then we look at
14 everything that came from the ROP and go out to an
15 ROC process, and when all is said and done with
16 that, if somebody still isn't happy with that, they
17 can put a NITMAM as Mr. Stull has done.
18 And when the NITMAM process is done, he
19 still has the right to go on further and appeal; so
20 I believe very much in the NFPA process. It's an
21 excellent process. It's got many, many checks and
22 balances.
23 As I have to tell you -- unfortunately,
24 you're going to keep hearing this again because
25 there's several more NITMAMs to go; and I think

165

♀
1 they all relate in general to the fact that
2 Mr. Stull would like to see more data out there,
3 you know, more stuff conducted.
4 Every other member of the technical
5 committee is satisfied with the work that was done
6 here, and I don't know what else to say here. You
7 have to decide whether you believe that the work
8 that the whole technical committee agrees on is
9 that they did their job or, as Mr. Stull points
10 out, that he would have liked to have more data
11 forthcoming.
12 Thank you.
13 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you,
14 Mr. Chair.
15 Before we go to voting, let me restate
16 what the motion is that you're going to vote on.
17 The motion on the floor is to accept
18 Comment 1971-65. So please record your vote with
19 one in favor of the motion or two opposed to the
20 motion. Voting closes in five seconds. Voting's
21 closed. And that motion fails.
22 We will now move on to the next motion on
23 this document, which is Certified Amending Motion
24 1971-3.
25 Microphone 7.

♀

1 MR. STULL: Jeffrey Stull International
2 Personal Protection. Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure
3 exactly how to do this; but I want to do this
4 correctly. There are several other motion
5 sequences which is involving -- next one being
6 1973-2 and then 3.
7 I'd like to withdraw all these motions, if
8 that's possible for me to do at this time, with the
9 exception of one motion; and this is, of course,
10 all just respectively on NFPA 1971. And that is
11 the exception of NFPA 1971-6.
12 So I don't know if I need to let you catch
13 up in your paperwork or how would be the best way
14 to handle this. But I think we've had adequate
15 debate on the one topic on what I'm describing as
16 disclosure and due process, but I do want to bring
17 up NFPA 1971-6 for a very specific reason.
18 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: So just to
19 be clear -- Mr. Stull, just to be clear, so we have
20 it straight up here, you're not going to pursue
21 1971-2? We actually dealt with that as a related
22 motion with 1971 dash anyway. So that took care of
23 1971-2.
24 You do not want to pursue 7133, 71-4,
25 71-5, and 71-7, which leaves only 1971-6 for this



♀

1 document that you want to pursue; is that correct?
2 MR. STULL: That's correct, sir.
3 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay. So
4 we will move ahead with 1971-6, and you can state
5 that motion.
6 MR. STULL: Jeffrey Stull, International
7 Personal Protection, making a motion to return a
8 portion of the report in the form of an
9 identifiable part of a proposal, 1971-138 and
10 related comment 1971-99.
11 The identifiable part of this proposal in
12 comment is Section 87.7.2. This is motion sequence
13 1971-6.
14 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
15 Do I have a second before we proceed?
16 SPEAKER: Second.
17 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: We have a
18 second. So you may proceed.
19 MR. STULL: Jeffrey Stull, International
20 Personal Protection, speaking in favor of the
21 motion.
22 As part of this large glove study that
23 was, one, funded by the federal government, there
24 was a proposal to move to a whole hand based
25 thermal protection test, a test which had sensors



♀

1 in this mannequin's hand, which would promote a way
2 of doing a whole glove test. And this is
3 purportedly a very good thing to do, but there are
4 imitations with this type of approach. The sensors
5 can't be everywhere. In fact, only eight sensors
6 in a given one hand, only one of which instruments
7 a finger.
8 And so the committee, I think, correctly

9 came to the conclusion that that test method would
10 not be appropriate for this edition.
11 What they did rely on was an existing test
12 method, a conductive heat test method, which is
13 used to measure the insulation of gloves; and it
14 turns out that this particular test method of all
15 the test methods in this standard does the best job
16 of showing that performance.
17 How can I say that? I can say that
18 because I've worked with the fire department of
19 New York to investigate hand burns, and they had a
20 glove that they had purchased that was certified
21 through NFPA 1971 current edition, but
22 unfortunately, they start -- as they went to a new
23 glove, found out that a lot of their firefighters
24 were getting burned.
25 When the investigation was continued, it



♀
1 was discovered that there was a modification to the
2 glove that was different than the glove that was
3 piloted an ultimately selected by this department.
4 That change was picked up in this test
5 during annual fall line testing, and so it turned
6 out that this particular test, already the
7 standard, was a great discriminator of performance,
8 at least in the field study of real life in the
9 New York Fire Department.
10 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: You have
11 one minute.
12 MR. STULL: Thank you.
13 The reason that I'm putting forth this
14 specific change is that the committee recognizes
15 that, but unfortunately, because it's a complicated
16 standard and there are a lot of changes on top of
17 changes on top of changes, they neglected to take
18 out two areas, one of which I'm trying to address
19 with this NITMAM; and it has to do with how the
20 samples are laid up and evaluated.
21 So what we're going to discover, as this
22 method moves forward, as intended to be the same
23 but not really the same because we made other
24 changes, is that that discriminating test that we
25 now have in the standard isn't going to work the



♀
1 same way it had before; and there's going to have
2 to be an amendment on top of this amendment --
3 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Ten
4 seconds.
5 MR. STULL: -- to correct it.
6 Thank you.
7 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
8 Mr. Chair, would you like to give the
9 Committee's position?
10 MR. KING: Yes, while the Committee's
11 position -- I'm reiterating things that I said
12 before. Once again, this issue was discussed at
13 length at the TC meetings. I could only tell
14 you -- and once again, the vote on this, 30 voting
15 members related to this. It was actually voted at
16 in the ROP stage and the ROC stage.
17 There was 30 voting members, 26 in favor
18 of this change, one against, Mr. Stull. Three did

19 not return the ballot. And then at the comment
20 stage, there was a vote, 32 members on the
21 committee. 28 voted in favor of this. Nobody,
22 including Mr. Stull, voted against this; and there
23 were four not returned.
24 Thank you.
25 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you,

171

♀
1 Mr. Chair.
2 So we will now open up the floor for
3 debate on this motion. Again, as a reminder,
4 please provide your name, affiliation, and whether
5 you're speaking in support of or against the
6 motion.
7 Microphone 7.
8 MR. STULL: Jeffrey Stull, International
9 Personal Protection, speaking in favor of the
10 motion.
11 I'm sparing you, obviously, these other
12 motions because the issues are the same. But
13 here's the one case where it is not.
14 These test methods are complicated, and
15 I'd like to agree with Chairman King -- Chief King,
16 that this particular issue was discussed; but it
17 wasn't. Otherwise, someone would have caught it.
18 I happened to catch it, and the reason that it's
19 important to bring up now is because what we're
20 going to end up with are gloves that are going to
21 be countered to what we originally have.
22 We know from what happened at FDNY, this
23 particular test was able to discriminate from four
24 men consist it was field activity. Now how great
25 is that? I mean, it's unfortunate that the

172

♀
1 firefighters got burned; but the fact is we have a
2 situation where we have data in front of us, and
3 that's why the committee attempted to do the right
4 thing. What I'm saying is the committee erred, and
5 in fact, there will be a tentative interim
6 amendment on this issue to correct it because the
7 committee missed this because of all of the other
8 stuff they were doing, and this one slipped through
9 the cracks.
10 It was not their intention to create a new
11 test method, but by changing the conditions in how
12 the test is run, effectively they have done that;
13 and this is what's happened with the committee.
14 Again, going back to the first time I spoke about
15 the thermal protective performance test and how
16 that test has created this now reaction on the part
17 of the committee having to make a correction,
18 trying to correct a problem before the standard
19 issues. And that will not be availed because the
20 next opportunity to put it in an amendment won't
21 occur until several months after the standard has
22 already issued.
23 So please, whatever your sentiments might
24 have been for some of the other --
25 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: One minute

173

♀
1 remaining.

MR. STULL: -- arguments that I was making, please try uphold, at least this particular motion, so that we can at least, until we have new information, stay with a test that has properly discriminated performance and done its job.

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.

Is there any further discussion on Motion 197-6? I don't see any.

Any final remarks from the Chair?

MR. KING: Well, I just like to reiterate that, once again, Mr. Stull seems to be alone on this issue that all the other technical committee members were comfortable with this change. If a TIA does come forward on it, I welcome that. That is an additional chance to look at this and to make doubly sure that the work that the committee did was done correctly.

But once again, at this point in time, the overwhelming technical committee was happy with the change made to this document.

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.



So at this point, we'll move on to 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 identifiable part of Proposal 1971-138 and related Comment 1971-99.

So now please record your vote one, if you're in favor of the motion, two if you're in opposition to the motion. Voting closes in five seconds. Voting closed. And that motion fails.

Is there any further discussion on NFPA 1971? Seeing none, we will move on to the next document.

Thank you, Mr. King.

MR. KING: Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: The next report under consideration this morning is that of Technical Committee on Hazard Materials Protective Clothing and Equipment.

Here to present the committee report is Committee chair Christina Baxter of the United States Department of Defense, Arlington, Virginia.

The committee report could be found in the white 2011 fall revision cycle ROP and ROC. The



certified amending motions are contained in the motions committee report and behind me on the screen.

We'll proceed in the order of the motion's sequence number presented.

Ms. Baxter.

MS. BAXTER: Mr. Chair, ladies and gentlemen, the report of the Technical Committee on Hazardous Materials Protective Clothing and Equipment is presented for adoption and can be found in the report on proposals and report on

12 comments for the 2011 fall meeting revision cycle.
13 The technical committee and technical
14 correlating committee has published a report
15 consisting of a partial revision of NFPA 1991,
16 standard on vapor protective ensembles for hazard
17 material emergencies.
18 The report was submitted to letter ballot
19 to the technical committee that consist of 31
20 voting members. The ballot results can be found on
21 pages 1991-7 to 1991-47 of the report on proposal
22 and pages 1919-7 to 1919-43 of the report on
23 comments.
24 The presiding officer will now proceed
25 with the certified amending motions.

176

♀

1 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you,
2 Ms. Baxter.
3 So we will now proceed with discussion on
4 the certified amending motion on NFPA 1991.
5 Microphone 7.
6 MR. STULL: Jeffrey Stull, International
7 Personal Protection.
8 I'm making a motion to return the entire
9 report to committee, Motion Sequence 1991-1.
10 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
11 There's a motion on the floor -- there's a motion
12 on the floor for 1991-1, which is to return the
13 entire report.
14 Do I have a second?
15 SPEAKER: Second.
16 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: I have a
17 second. Please proceed.
18 MR. STULL: Jeffrey Stull, International
19 Personal Protection speaking in favor of the
20 motion.
21 This particular document covers
22 encapsulating suits, which I've been involved in
23 for 35 years since I was in the Coast Guard in
24 managing its research and development program for
25 providing safety and health equipment for Coast

177

♀

1 Guardsmen.
2 This document has gone through a
3 considerable -- I was the first chair of the
4 committee or subcommittee, actually, at that time
5 and have been involved since it was put together in
6 1983.
7 The committee is now at a juncture in its
8 development of this particular standard where it is
9 looking to look -- make some very considerable
10 large changes. But I agree -- I think
11 Chairman Baxter will also point out -- that we're
12 not ready to make those changes; and so we're
13 asking to hold this document back. You're going to
14 hear a little bit later that this is not just me
15 being a lone wolf as it might have been pointed out
16 in some of the earlier debate but rather a
17 consensus by the entire committee recognizing that
18 sometimes things just aren't ready to move forward.
19 So without getting into specific issues, I
20 just want to let you know that I would very much
21 appreciate, as with the committee, in allowing this

22 document to be returned so they could better work
23 on this and develop criteria that could be properly
24 validated as well as justified for moving this type
25 of product into the next generation of technology

178

♀

1 where it belongs.
2 Thank you.
3 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
4 Ms. Baxter, would you like to give the
5 committee report on that?
6 MS. BAXTER: Yes, please.
7 Following a conference call on February 20
8 of 2012, we were able to re-poll the committee and
9 the technical correlating committee, and both
10 committees were overwhelmingly in support to
11 returning to the document to the committee as
12 Mr. Stull stated.
13 Thank you.
14 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Thank you.
15 Thank you, Ms. Baxter.
16 So with that, we will open up the floor
17 for debate on the motion. Again, as a reminder,
18 please provide your name and affiliation whether
19 you're speaking in support of or against the
20 motion.
21 Is there any further discussion that
22 anyone would like to have on 1991-1? Okay.
23 Do you have any additional remarks you'd
24 like to make, Ms. Chair?
25 MS. BAXTER: No, sir.

179

♀

1 PRESIDING OFFICER HARRINGTON: Okay. So
2 seeing none, we'll just move on to a vote. Before
3 we vote, let me state the motion we have.
4 The motion on the floor is to return the
5 entire report. So please record your vote one in
6 favor of the motion or two opposed to the motion.
7 Okay. Voting is going to close in five seconds.
8 Voting's closed. And that motion passes.
9 Is there any further discussion on
10 NFPA 1991?
11 Microphone 5? You don't have any further
12 discussion on that document? Okay.
13 Thank you, Ms. Baxter.
14 So at this point, before we move on to the
15 next document, we're going to take our lunch break
16 that we talked about, 30-minute lunch break. We're
17 starting a little earlier than the 12 noon that we
18 had planned. So right now, it's about ten minutes
19 to 12:00. We're going to take a 30-minute lunch
20 break till about 12:20. When we come back after
21 lunch, at this point I'll introduce Kerry Bell
22 because Kerry is a member of the standards council.
23 He will be starting with the documents after the
24 lunch break, and he'll be the presiding officer for
25 the remainder of today's documents.

180

♀

1 Thank you.
2 (Lunch recess taken.)
3
4 (TIME NOTED: 11:49 a.m.)

5
6
181
♀
1 I, the undersigned, a Certified Court
2 Reporter of the State of Nevada, do hereby certify,
3 That the foregoing proceedings were taken
4 before me at the time and place herein set forth;
5 That any witnesses in the foregoing
6 proceedings, prior to testifying, were duly sworn;
7 That a record of the proceedings was made
8 by me using machine shorthand which was thereafter
9 transcribed under my direction;
10 That the foregoing transcript is a true
11 record of the testimony given.
12 Further, that before completion of the
13 proceedings, review of the transcript [ ] was [X]
14 was not requested.
15 I further certify I am neither financially
16 interested in the action nor a relative or employee
17 of any attorney or party to this action.
18 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date
19 subscribed my name:
20
21 Dated: 6/26/12
22
_____
Kimberly M. Lowe
23 CCR No. 849
24
25 1
2
3
4
17
18
19 Reported by:
20 Christy I. Phelps,
21 CCR #683
22 Job No. 139550
23
24
25 Pages 1 - 99
1
♀
1 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Good afternoon,
2 ladies and gentlemen. My name is Kerry Bell and it's
3 certainly my pleasure to serve as presiding officer for
4 the remaining portion of today's session.
5 The next report under consideration is that
6 of the technical committee on pyrotechnics. Here to
7 present the two parts of the committee report is the
8 committee chair, Rachel Robbins of Natural Resources
9 Canada located in Ottowa, Ontario, Canada.
10 The committee report can be found in the
11 blue 2012 Annual Revision Cycle ROP and ROC. The
12 certified amending motions are contained in the motions
13 committee report and behind me here on the screen.
14 We will proceed in the order of the motion
15 screens number presented.
16 Miss Robbins.
17 COMMITTEE CHAIR ROBBINS: Thank you, Mr.
18 Chair.
19 Mr. Chair, ladies and gentlemen, the
20 technical committee on pyrotechnics is presenting two

21 reports for adoptions and can be found in the report on
22 proposals and report on comments for the 2012 Annual
23 Revision Cycle.
24 The first report is consisting of a partial
25 revision of NFPA 1124 code for the manufacture,

2

♀

1 transportation, storage and retail sales of fireworks
2 and pyrotechnic articles.
3 The report was submitted into letter ballot
4 of the technical committee consisting of 32 voting
5 members. The ballot results can be found on Pages
6 1124-2 to 1124-23 of the report on proposals and Pages
7 1124-2 to 1124-4 of the report on comments.
8 The presiding officer will now proceed with
9 the certified amending motions.
10 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you, Miss
11 Robbins.
12 Now we'll proceed with the discussion on the
13 certified amending motion on NFPA 1124.
14 Microphone 5.
15 MARCELO HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH
16 International, I hereby move certified amending motion
17 one which includes the certified amending motion one 1
18 or 2, whatever, includes two comments, two motions in
19 one.
20 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: So your motion is
21 to accept Comment 1124-2 and Comment 1124-3; is that
22 correct?
23 MARCELO HIRSCHLER: Yes.
24 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Is there a second?
25 I hear a second.

3

♀

1 Please proceed.
2 MARCELO HIRSCHLER: Thank you. Let me
3 clarify for the record and for the audience so we know
4 what we're talking about. This is something that as
5 I've explained yesterday this was done by all the major
6 NFPA codes, NFPA 101, 5001, bu a number of other
7 documents.
8 What it is, NFPA has requirements that the
9 definition shall not contain requirements. So all these
10 codes have done, which is what I'm asking 1124 to do as
11 well, is to take all the information about what a
12 limited combustible material or what a noncombustible
13 material is and put it into the body of the standard and
14 extract that in this case from NFPA 101.
15 And the only reference in the definition
16 section would be just see that particular section. That
17 would create consistent definition with all the other
18 major NFPA codes and standards.
19 The committee got very close to accepting
20 that, but it still didn't quite do it because the
21 conditions found in something or other and that is not
22 in compliance with our NFPA code because that is
23 including a requirement. So it's much better to just
24 say see whatever and then do that.
25 I hope you support this motion so we get

4

♀

1 consistency in definition which was the request of the
2 NFPA standards council that we in general try to
3 maintain this throughout the NFPA system. Thank you

very much.
PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
Ms. Robbins, would you like to offer the committee's position?
MS. ROBBINS: Sure. The committee did accept Mr. Hirschler's proposal to extract the text from NFPA 101 so that the concept and the requirements for the limited combustible materials noncombustible materials are consistent between NFPA 1124 and 101.
But instead of just a reference to see another section, we added the wording, as Mr. Hirschler said, that the material that meets the conditions found the referred section.
It was not the intent of the committee that by adding the sentence it would be construed as a requirement which is not allowed in the definition. And this particular wording was accepted by the committee 29 to 0.
PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you, Ms. Robbins.
Any further discussion on this motion?
Microphone 5.



MARCELO HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH International speaking in support of the motion.
I don't want belabor the issue, but when it says it shall meet the requirements -- let me read it correctly so I don't want to misread. But it says the material meets the conditions found in a certain section, that is a requirement.
And that's why I would prefer that we try to maintain the uniformity of NFPA codes and standards which would be achieved if this motion were passed. Thank you very much.
PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
Any further discussion?
Ms. Robbins, any further final comments?
MS. ROBBINS: The committee stands on their explanation.
PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Okay. We'll move to the vote on the motion to accept Comment 1124-2 and Comment 1124-3.
Please record your vote. One if you're in favor of the motion and two if you're opposed to the motion reject.
You've got five seconds. Voting is now closed. Motion fails.
Any further discussion on NFPA 1124? If



not, we'll move on to the next document part two of the pyrotechnical committee is found if the blue 2012 Annual Revision Cycle ROP and ROC. The certified amending motions are contained in the motions committee report behind me here on the screen and we will proceed in the order of the motion sequence number presented.
Ms. Robbins.
COMMITTEE CHAIR ROBBINS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
The second report is consisting of a partial revision of an NFPA 1127 code for high power rocketry. The report was submitted to letter ballot to the technical committee consisting of 32.

The ballots results can be found on Pages 1127-2 to 1127-5 of the report on proposals and Pages 1127-2 to 1127-5 of the report on comments.

PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you, Ms. Robbins.

Okay. We'll now proceed with the discussion on the certified amending motion on NFPA 1127.

Microphone 9.

GARY ROSENFIELD: Yes. Gary Rosenfield representing RCS Rocket Motor Components, Incorporated.

I move to revise my amending motion to just rejecting Comments 1127-8, 1127-9 and 1127-10.



PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: So the motion that you're suggesting, and this has been discussed and I'm going to rule this motion is in order even though it's a revised motion as shown in your amending motions report. And the reason I'm ruling this motion is in order because there is a path to get back to where you would like to go. As I understand, you want to go back to the ROP text; is that right?

GARY ROSENFIELD: That is correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Okay. And that could be achieved by pursuing this motion. And if that's successful, then pursuing a followup motion to accept that proposal.

So in the interest of saving time, I will allow this single revised motion, which is, as I understand, to return Comments 1127-8, -9 and, -10; is that correct?

GARY ROSENFIELD: That's correct. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Is there a second? Does everybody understand the motion? And the intent of the motion is to get back to the ROP text.

Seeing no one, please proceed.

GARY ROSENFIELD: Thank you. My comments are that the comments are letters proposals attempt to



insert manufacturer related code into a consumer code. A rocketry consumer will not know what documentation a motor manufacturer submitted to the certifying agency regarding any motor alterations and whether these alterations met certification requirements. Thus, no way to enforce the provisions of this manufacturer code language in a consumer code.

The proposals are also redundant in that there are already sufficient code language existing in NFPA 1125 code for the manufacturer model rocket and high power rocket motor that cover certification standards and any changes made to a motor.

So therefore, the language of the proposal which was in 4.5.3, the components of reloadable high powered rocket motor shall not be altered except as allowed by the manufacturer is sufficient language. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.

Ms. Robbins?

MS. ROBBINS: Just to provide a bit of background, the technical committee on pyrotechnics said adding the testing standards for adjustable delays in NFPA 1125 which is the code for the manufacturer of

24 model rocket and high power rocket motor.
25 But the NFPA 1125 code for high power

9

♀

1 rocketry which covers the safe operation of high power
2 rockets to protect the user and the public did not allow
3 any alteration of the high power model rocket by users
4 in the field. So there was a conflict.
5 The initial wording of the proposal, which
6 could be found in 1127-8, was accepted by the committee
7 28 to 1. But this is the proposal phase, this wording
8 was revised during the comment phase to discuss three
9 public comments regarding certification and approval of
10 these alterations to ensure that any alteration that is
11 permitted by the manufacturer requires certification by
12 a recognized testing organization in accordance with
13 NFPA 1125. And this wording in the comment phase was
14 accepted by the committee 29 to 1.
15 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
16 Is there any further discussion on this
17 motion?
18 Microphone 6.
19 TED COCHORAN: I'm Ted Cochoran representing
20 myself. I'm a member of the technical committee and the
21 rocketry work group.
22 Just to provide some additional background,
23 several years ago, rocket motor vendors introduced
24 methods for modifying motor components in the field to
25 alter the timing of ejection event. Those methods are

10

♀

1 safety enhancing because they permit users to more
2 precisely adjust their parachute deployment given
3 weather conditions at the time of flight and the
4 characteristics of the rocket.
5 And those methods have been nearly
6 universally embraced by users. But the user
7 modification of motors is currently prohibited in the
8 1127 code and there are concerns that insurance may be
9 voided by using this illegal, technically illegal motor
10 technology.
11 So we set about to enable users to legally
12 take advantage of these development in the current rule
13 making cycle.
14 So we fixed 1125 by adopting test standards
15 for adjustable delays and 1127 we created the proposal
16 to allow users to make motors changes when allowed by
17 the manufacturer. We didn't restrict it to just
18 ejection technologies because there's possibility that
19 other kinds of user changes in the field may also be
20 safety enhancing and may come out in the future and want
21 to be broader than that.
22 Three separate commentators, however,
23 objected to the original wording of the change as being
24 too broad, potentially permitting manufacturers to
25 introduce field modifications to motors that have not

11

♀

1 been tested and verified by outside agencies. They
2 probably didn't realize that 1125 would prohibit that,
3 but because they are users and using the user code, they
4 wanted to be reassured that the kinds of changes that
5 manufacturers may recommend would be permitted and be
6 testified testing by an independent organization.

7 So when the committee took those comments
8 into consideration, we accepted those, combining them
9 into the final action that you see here.
10 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you. Any
11 further discussion?
12 Microphone 9.
13 GARY ROSENFIELD: Yes. I just wanted to add
14 that --
15 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Can you state your
16 name?
17 GARY ROSENFIELD: I'm sorry. Gary
18 Rosenfield representing RCS, Rocket Motor Components.
19 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Speaking for the
20 motion?
21 GARY ROSENFIELD: Yes, for the motion. Just
22 wanted to add that accepting the proposal as I mentioned
23 it satisfies Mr. Cochoran's concern about the adjustable
24 delays. So they would be allowed to solve that problem.
25 Thank you.



♀
1 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
2 Any other discussion?
3 Seeing no one at the microphone, Ms.
4 Robbins, final comments.
5 MS. ROBBINS: No, thank you.
6 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: We'll move to the
7 vote on the motion which is to return Comments 1127-8,
8 -9 and -10.
9 Please record your vote one if you're in
10 favor of the motion and two if you're opposed to the
11 motion.
12 Voting closes in five seconds. Voting is
13 closed. Motion fails.
14 Any further discussion on NFPA 1127?
15 If not, we'll move on to the last report
16 under consideration this afternoon is that of the
17 technical correlating committee on signaling systems for
18 the protection of life and property.
19 Here to present the committee report is
20 correlating committee Chair Robert Schifiliti of RP
21 Schifiliti Associates, located in Reading,
22 Massachusetts.
23 The committee report can be found in the
24 blue 2012 Annual Revision Cycle ROP and ROC.
25 The certifying amending motions are



♀
1 contained in the motions committee report and behind me
2 here on the screen.
3 We ill proceed in the order of the motion
4 sequence number presented.
5 Mr. Schifiliti.
6 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: Thank you, sir.
7 Mr. Chair, ladies and gentlemen, the report
8 of the technical correlating committee on signaling
9 systems for the protection of life and property is
10 presented for adoption and can be found in the report on
11 proposals and the report on comments for the 2012
12 revision cycle.
13 The technical correlating committee has
14 published a report consisting of a partial revision of
15 NFPA 72, national fire alarm and signaling code.
16 The report was submitted to letter ballot of

17 the technical correlating committee and the respective
18 technical committees.
19 The ballot results can be found on Pages
20 72-7 to 72-367 of the report on proposals and 72-7 to
21 72-269 of the report on comments.
22 The presiding officer will now proceed with
23 the certified amending motions.
24 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you,
25 Mr. Schifiliti.

14

♀
1 I will now proceed with discussion on the
2 certifying amending motions on NFPA 72.
3 Microphone 5.
4 SHANE CLARY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My name
5 is Dr. Shane M. Clary and I move to accept Comment 72-6
6 which is seen in sequence 72-1.
7 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: The motion is to
8 Comment 72-6. Is there a second?
9 Please proceed.
10 SHANE CLARY: Thank you very much,
11 Mr. Chairman.
12 What this does is basically return us to the
13 former text, which is found in the 2010 edition of 72,
14 which does not have a requirement per se for risk
15 analysis within the administrative section. This does
16 nothing to affect a risk analysis as required for ECS
17 systems. That is not being challenged in this
18 certifying amending motion.
19 This particular, both the proposal and the
20 comment which I had submitted to basically remove this
21 from the administrative chapter, was again over the past
22 nine years, our discussions on CIG fund, which is the
23 technical committee for fundamentals of fire protection
24 systems, fire alarm systems, is to in lieu of installing
25 a smoke detector to protect the panel or power supply,

15

♀
1 that a risk analysis would be allowed.
2 And I'm not opposed to being that if it was
3 your wishes to do that, the perform based analysis.
4 However this is not, as the committee clearly stated,
5 this is not the same as doing performance based analysis
6 for a system. This is just a risk analysis.
7 But sort of vague. The administrative
8 chapter could be perceived by some that risk analysis is
9 then required for every single system that's installed.
10 And so I'm asking for support of my motion
11 to remove this from the administrative Chapter 72.
12 Thank you.
13 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
14 Mr. Schifiliti.
15 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: The technical
16 correlating committee has no comment on this certifying
17 amending motion. And as Mr. Clary is the chair of the
18 committee, I have asked Manny David, a member of the
19 fundamentals committee, to comment on the technical
20 committee's position.
21 MANNY DAVID: The technical committee
22 contends that a fire analysis, fire risk analysis could
23 be separate from a perform based design. That's why we
24 provided the additional text to allow fire risk analysis
25 as an alternative means to support a design.

16

♀
1 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
2 We'll proceed with further discussion.
3 Microphone 5.
4 ROBERT BAIRD: Yes. Robert Baird,
5 Independent Electrical Contractors Association, chairman
6 of the electrical section.
7 At our meeting on Tuesday, the electrical
8 section voted to support motion 72-1.
9 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
10 Microphone 4.
11 JACK BEBE: Jack Bebe, American Society for
12 Health Care Engineering, representing the health care
13 section and voting opposition of the motion in front of
14 you.
15 At business meeting on Tuesday, we voted as
16 a section to oppose the current certifying amending
17 motion. We believe that the fire risk analysis gives
18 us, as was previously mentioned, an alternative way of
19 analyzing this and gives us better criteria and more
20 consistency for both AHJ and for users of the document.
21 So I urge you to oppose this certifying amending motion.
22 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
23 Microphone 5.
24 BRUCE FRASER: Bruce Fraser of Fraser Fire
25 Protection and I speak in support of the motion.

17

♀
1 My concern is that the fire risk analysis
2 the requirements are not clearly defined in 72 now if
3 this goes ahead. It would be very difficult to be
4 enforced. For instance, who is permitted to perform a
5 fire risk analysis? Who would that be? Are there
6 qualifications that you have to have? It's real really
7 not spelled out.
8 This would open the doors also for virtually
9 all of the requirements in NFPA 72 to be challenged by a
10 fire risk analysis. I believe this would cause
11 nightmare for the enforcing authorities.
12 Although we've heard it before, there is a
13 process that's already defined and in place to allow
14 departures from prescriptive requirements and that being
15 the performance based design. It's documented.
16 And by the way, when you're doing a
17 performance based design, there is a risk assessment
18 involved with it. So I think the pathway is already
19 there.
20 Again, I would urge support of the motion on
21 the floor.
22 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
23 Any other discussion on this motion?
24 I'm sorry. Microphone 3. Sorry about that.
25 TOM HAMMERBERG: Thank you. I'm the one

18

♀
1 kind of tucked over here on the side. I'm Tom
2 Hammerberg with the Automatic Fire Alarm Association and
3 the AFA's codes and standards committee is in favor of
4 this motion. I'm not going to go through and repeat.
5 Pretty much agreement with what Bruce Fraser just
6 stated. Thank you.
7 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
8 Any additional discussion?
9 Seeing no one at the microphone,

10 Mr. Schifiliti, any final comments?
11 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: Correlating
12 committee has no additional comments. I would defer to
13 Manny David if there's any followup from the committee.
14 MANNY DAVID: No.
15 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Okay. We'll move
16 to the vote on the motion on the floor which is to
17 accept Comment 72-6.
18 Please record your vote, one in favor of the
19 motion or two opposed to the motion.
20 Voting closes in five seconds. Voting is
21 closed. Motion passes.
22 Next sequence is 72-2.
23 Microphone 3.
24 FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: Frank Van Overmeiren,
25 FP&C Consultants and I choose not to pursue CAM 72-2 at



1 this time.
2 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Okay. So motion
3 sequence number 72-2 will not be pursued so we'll move
4 on to motion sequence 72-3.
5 Microphone 3.
6 FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: Frank Van Overmeiren
7 with FP&C Consultants and member of the inspecting
8 testing maintenance technical committee. I move to
9 accept Comment 72-182.
10 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: The motion on the
11 floor is to accept 72-182, my understanding is accept
12 comment 72-182; is that correct, which is motion
13 sequence number three?
14 FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: Yes, sir.
15 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Okay. And I heard
16 a second.
17 Please proceed.
18 FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: I apologize for the
19 complexity of this CAM as it affects the technical
20 committee's actions on one proposal and four comments
21 and will require a followup motion at the end of this
22 session.
23 I recommend approval of the CAM and the
24 followup motion that will be made at the end of NFPA 72
25 portion of this session. The CAM recognizes the errors



1 and the recommendation of Comment 72-182 as being
2 incorrect text.
3 Also, the committee's statement for Comment
4 72-181 is incorrect as noted in my negative technical
5 committee ballot.
6 It should be noted that the intent of
7 Comment 72-182 is essentially met by returning the
8 provisions of the 2010 code. In returning the language
9 of the text method for water flow devices to that of the
10 2010 codes as it has been for 26 years since the 1986
11 edition of NFPA 72, this will allow the correlation task
12 group of NFPA 72 and NFPA 25 the opportunity to discuss
13 this issue of the verification of small orifice for
14 sprinkler system.
15 The technical issues to be resolved that the
16 older sprinkler system still in service that were
17 installed before the installation requirements for an
18 inspector's test connection currently in NFPA 13.
19 My intent is through the correlation of NFPA

20 72 and NFPA 25 to move sprinkler system component
21 inspection tasks to NFPA 25 where they can be better
22 addressed by sprinkler technician than by a fire alarm
23 system technician.
24 I speak in favor of the motion.
25 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.

21

♀
1 Mr. Schifiliti?
2 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: The technical
3 correlating committee is in favor of this motion because
4 it resolves a correlation issue with the requirements in
5 Chapter 17 which address the performance of sprinkler
6 water flow switches.
7 Specifically the requirement to verify
8 activation of the device when flow occurs that equal to
9 or greater than that of a single sprinkler of the
10 smallest orifice size in the system.
11 The requirement which has existed as Frank
12 said for 26 years in NFPA 72 was removed in the ROP and
13 ROC as part of in part the standard council directive to
14 not require testing of systems outside the scope of NFPA
15 72.
16 However, since Chapter 17 of NFPA 72
17 requires a specific performance, including a 90 second
18 response time, a test that flows water is necessary. As
19 it stands, the text would allow testing by manually
20 operating the switch or shorting the contacts.
21 Unfortunately, there have been losses where
22 an improperly calibrated flow switch retard have
23 resulted in no response, no fire department call when
24 one or more sprinklers is operated and the system
25 controlled the fire, but caused large water damage.

22

♀
1 Passage of this CAM will allow a followup
2 motion as this CAM will not by itself accomplish the
3 intent of the submitter or the TCC.
4 In addition, the TCC, technical committee
5 chair, and several members that have submitted proposals
6 and comments on this matter have agreed to form a task
7 group to work with NFPA 13 and NFPA 25 technical
8 committees to work on language and possible TIAs that
9 will separate and differentiate requirements for
10 acceptance testing and inspections from that of periodic
11 testing and inspections.
12 In addition, the task group will try to work
13 on common language that might redundant tests required
14 by NFPA 72 and NFPA 25 which result in unwanted oxygen
15 being introduced into sprinkler systems.
16 For these reasons, we seek your support of
17 this CAM.
18 And I also ask that the inspection testings
19 and maintenance chair, Jeff Moore, be permitted to
20 comment on this motion.
21 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Microphone 3.
22 JEFF MOORE: My name is Jeff More. I'm with
23 Hughes Associates. I'm the chair of the technical
24 committee on inspection, testing and maintenance.
25 Just basically to explain the committee

23

♀
1 action. The committee's position was actually based on
2 our interpretation of direction we received from the

3 standards council to eliminate tests that crossed the
4 bounds of fire alarm systems and crossed into other
5 systems service like sprinkler systems.
6 I don't think that the final, what we ended
7 up with was what was the final intent necessarily. So
8 neither for nor against, just trying to explain the
9 committee's position. And also as Mr. Schifiliti and
10 Mr. Van Overmeiren explained, if we accept this
11 proposal, then we'll need a followup proposal or a
12 follow on motion to reject ROP 72187A and ROC 181.
13 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you,
14 gentlemen.
15 Microphone 5.
16 ROGER RISLEY: Thank you. Roger Risley with
17 Symplex Bernal Tico International speaking in favor
18 support of the motion on the floor.
19 Basically what happened is on the automatic
20 fire alarm association submitted a proposal to eliminate
21 the requirement for the fire alarm inspector to verify
22 the orifice size of the inspector's test valve.
23 What we tried to do was eliminate that. And
24 we still want to believe that the free flow water,
25 however, it's not for the electronic fire alarm person



♀

1 to go out and verify the orifice is the right size.
2 Based on that, that was approved in the
3 comment stage it was put in. And basically it now just
4 states that the operation of the switch, operating the
5 switch and verify receipt of the signal.
6 So just as Mr. Schifiliti had said,
7 basically now a fire alarm technician can go out, take
8 the cover off the flow switch, push a button, put the
9 cover back on and walk away. Nobody every verified that
10 water did flow and activate the switch.
11 Based on that, Symplex Bernal Tico
12 International is in favor of supporting this motion.
13 Thank you.
14 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
15 Microphone 5.
16 SHANE CLARY: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
17 Shane M. Clary, Bay Alarm Company. We're a large
18 regional company within the state of California, about
19 5,000.
20 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Speaking for the
21 motion?
22 SHANE CLARY: Speaking for it. Oh, my God.
23 I missed that. I would hear about that later on.
24 Anyway, you got me.
25 Anyway, we have about 25,000 fire alarm



♀

1 accounts throughout the state. When I'm not here
2 debating code issues here in Nevada, I have about 45
3 fire inspectors beneath me that perform inspections in
4 accordance with NFPA 72.
5 And the biggest item to which we have
6 reasons for failing the inspection is the vein flow
7 switches. And they get gummed up or stuff like that,
8 they need adjustments and the only true way to make
9 certain that the vein flow switch is operating is to do
10 the flow from the inspector's test valve for the
11 90 seconds to see if the flow switch is working.
12 So I'm in support of the CAM and also in the

13 pursuit hopefully the followup motion which will be
14 following. Thank you.
15 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
16 Any further discussion? Microphone 3. I
17 saw you this time.
18 TOM HAMMERBERG: Thank you. Tom Hammerberg,
19 Automatic Fire Alarm Association speaking in favor of
20 the motion.
21 The Automatic Fire Alarm Association
22 originally put in the proposal as Roger Risley said
23 before, that our intent was just to not have the 72
24 requirements more restrictive than NFPA 25. It was
25 never our intent to get rid of flowing due to the flow

26

1 tests of water and just making an electrical test.
2 So we are in favor of this motion. Thank
3 you.
4 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
5 Further discussion? Seeing no one known at
6 the microphone, Mr. Schifiliti.
7 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: Correlating
8 committee has no further comment. I would defer to the
9 chair if he has any comments for the committee. None.
10 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: We'll move to the
11 vote. And the motion on the floor is to accept Comment
12 72-182.
13 Please record your vote, one in favor of the
14 motion or two opposed to the motion.
15 Voting closes in five seconds. Voting is
16 closed. Motion passes.
17 The next sequence is 72-4.
18 Microphone looks like it's 7.
19 JOE SCIBETTA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My
20 name is Joe Scibetta, technical member of the NFPA 72
21 technical committee for testing maintenance. And I rise
22 to call for the accepting amending motion 72-4.
23 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: So I understand
24 your motion is to actually accept Comment 72-186; is
25 that correct?

27

1 JOE SCIBETTA: Correct, Mr. Chair.
2 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Okay. Thank you.
3 Is there a second?
4 Please proceed.
5 JOE SCIBETTA: A proposal was submitted and
6 accepted to eliminate the use of sound level meters on
7 periodic testing of audible notification appliances.
8 The thinking behind that proposal was that
9 the use of a sound level meter to designate low sound
10 areas was essentially allowing a technician to make
11 observations on system design.
12 Such designation would be equivalent to
13 stating the design changes had taken place and a fire
14 alarm technician should not be ensuring compliance with
15 any particular design.
16 I commented on that proposal and in doing so
17 did not take issue with the submitter's concern about
18 the use of a sound level meter to ensure design
19 compliance.
20 As such, in my comment, I agreed with some
21 of the rewording of Items 15A and 15B of the testing
22 methods table. In my rewording of those two items, I,

23 too, deleted the sentence which reads, quote:
24 Sound pressure levels shall be measured in
25 conformity to Chapter 18 where building systems or

28

♀
1 occupancy changes have occurred, end quote.
2 I agreed that sentence should be removed.
3 However, to remove the sound level meter altogether from
4 periodic testing is not a wise decision. There are too
5 many real world scenarios that make the sound level
6 meter indispensable on a periodic test.
7 It's been argued that one can simply use
8 their hearing to tell whether an appliance is emitting
9 sound or not. However, one's own hearing is a highly
10 subjective and unreliable tool.
11 Furthermore, if the sound test is being done
12 correctly and safely, the technician is wearing hearing
13 protection, further undermining subjectivity of one's
14 own hearing and underscoring the vital need for a sound
15 level meter to do the hearing for the technician.
16 How does a technician, with hearing
17 protection in place, no sound level meter, know if the
18 average ambient level within an industrial occupancy has
19 exceeded 105 dba since the last test. He doesn't. And
20 therefore, he will not include in his report what the
21 code requires in that case, the installation of the
22 physical notification appliance.
23 Mr. Chair, I'll pause for the one minute
24 warning.
25 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: That's fine. I'll

29

♀
1 probably give you a 30 second warning, too.
2 JOE SCIBETTA: How does a technician with
3 hearing protection in place and no sound level meter
4 know if the combined alarm and ambient dba in an area
5 within industrial occupancy is now greater than 110,
6 exceeding the maximum limit allowed by the code? He
7 doesn't. And will therefore allow a violation of NFPA
8 72 to go undocumented.
9 Remove the statement about using sound level
10 meters where building system or occupancy changes have
11 taken place. I agree. But do not remove altogether
12 from the periodic test of audible appliances the use of
13 such an essential piece of a equipment as a sound level
14 meter.
15 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: 30 seconds.
16 JOE SCIBETTA: Verifying that alarm sound
17 levels can still be heard above ambient levels from one
18 year to the next, helps to ensure the life safety of
19 building occupants.
20 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
21 Mr. Schifiliti.
22 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: The technical
23 correlating committee has no position on this particular
24 certifying amending motion. I would defer to the
25 chairman of the testing and maintenance committee, Jeff

30

♀
1 Moore.
2 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Microphone 6.
3 JEFF MOORE: My name is Jeff Moore. I'm
4 with Hughes Associates. I'm the chair of the technical
5 committee on inspection, testing and maintenance. I'm

6 speaking against the motion.
7 The committee position was that the code
8 already does require that we do the audibility testing
9 at the original acceptance test to confirm compliance
10 with the design criteria that was in place for the
11 original design.
12 The purpose of a periodic test as explained
13 in the code, now we have specific explanation of what's
14 required for each type of test acceptance test,
15 reacceptance, test periodic test, the purpose as
16 explained in the code for periodic testing is to confirm
17 operation and it's not to intended to ensure compliance
18 with any particular design criteria.
19 And I point out that the committee voting to
20 reject this, the vote was 23 for rejection, two against
21 and three ballots not returned.
22 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you,
23 gentlemen.
24 Any further discussion? Microphone 3.
25 TOM HAMMERBERG: Tom Hammerberg representing



♀
1 the Automatic Fire Alarm Association. The AFAA speaks
2 in favor --
3 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Are you speaking
4 for?
5 TOM HAMMERBERG: I'm speaking for the
6 motion.
7 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
8 TOM HAMMERBERG: Removing the requirement
9 for periodic sound level testing in our opinion is a
10 step backwards since the most important feature of a
11 fire alarm system, in my opinion, is notification of the
12 occupants, it's important to assure the system is loud
13 enough to be heard.
14 We all know that conditions in buildings
15 change after that the original acceptance test.
16 Conducting a sound level test provides documentation of
17 the state of the system and provides a means to correct
18 any deficiencies.
19 Thank you for supporting this motion.
20 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
21 Any further discussion? Microphone 6.
22 FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: Frank Van Overmeiren,
23 FP&C Consultants, member of the NFPA 72 technical
24 committee on inspection, testing, maintenance, chairman
25 of the task group for the tables, which this requirement



♀
1 resides in.
2 I'm speaking against the motion. As part of
3 our current code cycle activity, we have put great
4 effort into redefining our tables to eliminate
5 duplicated requirements and to differentiate the
6 requirements between initial acceptance testing and
7 periodic testing.
8 We also combine the frequency table with the
9 test methods table as part of that action. As part of
10 that, we had great discussion on this particular issue
11 to try and differentiate the requirements of when
12 audible testing is done and how it's to be done in
13 different situations of acceptance testing versus
14 periodic testing.
15 The task group did not feel it was warranted

16 to require a sound meter on every one of those tests and
17 recordings of those readings to be done only in the
18 situations where the inspector or tester noted
19 differences in construction or where there was potential
20 differences in the application of the sound or the
21 production of the sound. In those cases the meter would
22 then be used. So we felt that was sufficient with the
23 use of the periodic testing.
24 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
25 Microphone 5.

33

♀
1 JOHN CAPUS: John Capus with Ralph Jenson &
2 Associates speaking in favor of the motion.
3 The basis that experience has demonstrated
4 that notification appliances, especially speakers, can
5 degrade over a period of time as well as the settings of
6 amplifiers. It is imperative that the initial
7 acceptance testing measurements be validated during
8 periodic testing of the systems. And therefore, to do
9 so the use of the sound pressure level meters are
10 essential to perform that task.
11 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
12 Microphone 8.
13 PETE LARIMER: Thank you. Pete Larimer with
14 the Department of Veterans Affairs. I'm also a member
15 of the TMS committee and it was actually my proposal
16 that originally put this in the way it is as part of the
17 task group. The main issue --
18 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: You're speaking
19 against?
20 PETE LARIMER: I'm speaking against the
21 motion.
22 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
23 PETE LARIMER: The main issue relative to
24 periodic testing, the initial testing will have the test
25 performed based on the design to measure the decibel

34

♀
1 readings as necessary. But in many, many cases there
2 are no baseline levels for which to test for on a
3 periodic basis.
4 If an inspector goes into a facility and
5 uses a decibel meter and gets a reading, he doesn't
6 actually have a basis by which to apply that because
7 there may not be documentation to establish what that
8 ambient level was or whatever level above which he needs
9 to show this measurement that he's testing for so that
10 the system passes.
11 So the periodic testing was removed that
12 meter so we would still know that the device was
13 operating, but we would no try the measure something
14 when we didn't have a pass fill criteria in many cases.
15 Thank you.
16 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
17 Any further discussion? Seeing nobody at
18 the microphone, Mr. Schifiliti any final comments?
19 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: No comments
20 from the correlating committee. I would defer to the
21 committee chair for any followup.
22 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Microphone 6.
23 JEFF MOORE: Jeff Moore, Hughes &
24 Associates, chair of the inspection testing and
25 maintenance technical committee.

I urge you to support the committee and vote against this. As Mr. Larimer pointed out, that was the basic discussions within the committee is that you can go out and you can take the readings, but what are you comparing them to? The technician in the field doesn't have anything to say whether it's good, bad or whatever. So we're spending time doing something that doesn't seem to have any real effect on the reliability and adequacy of the fire alarm system. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.

Microphone 7.

JOE SCIBETTA: Joe Scibetta, principal on the technical committee for testing and maintenance. I'm speaking in favor of the motion.

Just a real world, another real world scenario I was personally involved in, walking through a tenant space, early morning, limited lighting. I got my sound meter. And I noticed I'm not getting 15 dba above ambient in a certain area.

Sure enough there's clear tape over a horn that the tenant put in there because the horn was causing irritation during fire drills. The sound meter was the indication to me there was a problem in the area.

I could see the horn was emitting sound, or



I could tell that the horn was emitting sound, but when I went up, sure enough, there was the clear tape. So it's not design change, it's a tampering of the horn.

I agree with the Automatic Fire Alarm Association, this is a startling step backwards. The technician through the course of the inspection is taking ambient readings. That's what he compares the alarm readings to, the ambient readings he has taken during the course of the inspection. And when it comes time for the alarm tests, he's got the ambient readings taken that day to measure against.

I would urge my fellow members please pass this motion, keep sound level meters in the code as an indispensable tool during periodic testing of audible notification appliances. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.

Microphone 5.

JOHN CAPUS: John Capus, Ralph Jensen & Associates speaking in favor of the motion. To add into the discussion that there was no baseline criteria, therefore, no need for periodic testing to include a meter that we have added language into the 2013 edition that supports that documentation contain those baseline requirements. And therefore, taking this out of the code would invalidate even the ability to utilize that



baseline document in the measurements created during the initial acceptance test for the inspectors to perform the baseline periodic testing.

So again, in favor of support of keeping the sound pressure level in there, we will have those baseline requirements. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.

Microphone 6.

JEFF MOORE: Jeff Moore, Hughes Associates, chair of the technical committee on inspection, testing and maintenance speaking against the motion.

Just to clarify something, the problem with tampering with notification appliance, audible notification appliances that could decrease the sound pressure level is recognized by the technical committee. That's why we already have requirements in the code that require visual inspections of the notification appliances to detect any tampering like that.

PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.

Microphone 6 again.

KENT WEISS: Kent Weiss, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints speaking against the motion.

This is a difficult thing when you have facilities that may be operating for extended periods of time and being able to go in and do these types of



audible testing, you need to be able to do this very quickly, sometimes employing more than one inspector at once.

This presents resource problem to be able to go throughout a facility taking sound pressure readings all throughout to be able to accomplish this task. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you. Any further discussion?

Microphone 7.

JOE SCIBETTA: Joe Scibetta, principal member of the technical meeting on testing and maintenance speaking in favor of the motion on the floor.

I would just like to remind fellow NFPA members what we're all very much well aware of, this is life safety issue. We just talked about in the last motion that was considered on the floor that what was inadvertently removed from the code had been in the code for many, many years.

Well, same instance in this case. Why are we removing the use of a sound level meter for periodic testing? This is a very important tool for the fire alarm technician to ensure life safety to building occupants. This is a good thing.



Again, I encourage my fellow NFPA members to please support this motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.

Microphone 8.

PETE LARIMER: Pete Larimer, Department of Veterans Affairs speaking against the motion.

I just wanted to bring one additional point that in health care facilities, we often use what they call the private operating mode. And the sound pressure level requirements even for a new system will be different and dictated by the designer and where those ambient levels or what those sound levels are needed, what thresholds are need in what particular area.

So for a general evacuation system, you might be able to justify some sound pressure level readings. But in a hospital where private operating mode is often used, somebody has to stipulate what sound levels are necessary in what areas for a sound pressure

19 measurement to be worthwhile doing after the fact.
20 So it's not a one size fits all for this
21 situation. Thank you.
22 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
23 Any further discussion?
24 Mr. Schifiliti, any additional comments --
25 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: I have none and

40

1 would defer the committee chair. He has none.
2 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Okay. We'll move
3 to vote on the motion.
4 The motion on the floor is to accept Comment
5 72-186.
6 Please record your vote now. One if you're
7 in favor of the motion and two if you're against the
8 motion.
9 Voting closes in five seconds. Voting is
10 closed. Motion fails.
11 Move on to motion sequence 72-5. Microphone
12 5.
13 SHANE CLARY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
14 Shane M. Clary, Bay Alarm Company. And I move, my
15 motion sequence 72-4, which is to reject identifiable
16 part in Comment 72-169C, the identifiable part are the
17 TCC actions listed under quote, council action, close
18 quote.
19 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: The motion on the
20 floor is to reject an identifiable part of Comment
21 72-169C as noted in the motions committee report. Is
22 there a second?
23 Thank you, proceed.
24 SHANE CLARY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
25 It's kind of a unique motion I have here.

41

1 What this motion is attempting to do is to revert back
2 to the language that the technical committee on testing
3 and inspection and maintenance did prior to the TCC who
4 were following the direction of the standards council in
5 relation to integrated testing for a new document, NFPA
6 4, the standard for the testing of integrated fire
7 protection systems.
8 However, NFPA 4 does not yet exist. It is
9 still in a draft mode. The technical committee for this
10 document still has three more meetings to go through,
11 another preliminary meeting. And later on this year a
12 first draft meeting. Next year a second draft meeting.
13 And it will not be up for adoption until NFPA gathers
14 the next time on the shores of Lake Mead here in Las
15 Vegas.
16 All states right now adopt NFPA 72 which has
17 right now some direction for the testing of integrated
18 systems. No one yet has adopted NFPA 4. Again, it does
19 exist.
20 And so I think that in deference to the
21 standards council that the directive was a little
22 premature. Let's wait until NFPA 4 is published and
23 then at that time get the directive out there to
24 segregate between what NFPA 72 does and NFPA 4 does. We
25 still need to get states to adopt NFPA 4. So at that, I

42

1 will step away from the mike.

PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
Mr. Schifiliti.
COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: The technical correlating committee is opposed to this motion. This CAM seeks to overturn changes put in place to comply with the standards council directive limiting the testing scope of NFPA 72.
The language resulting from the TCC action includes additional annex language addressing integrating testing and comments on a new requirement to establish a test plan that clearly addresses the scope of testing and what is tested and what is not being tested.
The language resulting from the TCC action also addresses a test method for emergency control function interface devices to assure that interface device connections are properly restored at the end of testing.
Further, the language resulting from the TCC action includes significant explanatory annex material discussing the importance of assuring the functionality of interconnected systems while making it clear that NFPA 72 does not require the testing of these interconnected systems, nor does it define the

43

performance of those integrated systems.
The resulting explanatory annex material makes references to other codes and standards responsible for these interconnected systems as well as reference to the new NFPA 3 recommended practice for commissioning and integrated testing of fire protection and life safety systems.
It should be noted this CAM will reintroduce required testing of interconnected systems outside the scope of NFPA 72 with little or no guidance as to the extent of the testing or recognition of the jurisdiction of the other responsible codes and standards.
Acceptance of this CAM would undo the refinements put in place by the TCC action, including the clarified annex guidance, as well as the use of new standard terminology developed by one of the other technical committees, protected premises, and that is now used throughout the Chapter 21 on emergency control function interfaces.
If this CAM was accepted, the resulting language would be contrary to the standards council action of September 20, 2011, limiting the scope of testing requirements addressed in NFPA 72 to those addressed -- to those systems addressed in NFPA 72.
For this reason, the technical correlating

44

committee is opposed to the motion.
And I also ask that Jeff Moore, chair of the inspection, testing and maintenance committee, be permitted to comment on this.
PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Microphone 6.
JEFF MOORE: Jeff Moore, Hughes Associates. I'm the chair of the inspection, testing and maintenance technical committee speaking basically just to explain the position of the technical committee.
The ITM technical committee made a number of changes during this cycle to comply with the standards

12 council direction to not include inspection, testing and
13 maintenance requirements for systems that were outside
14 the scope of NFPA 72.
15 Comment 72-169C was a technical correlating
16 committee comment that kind of expanded on our work to
17 further clarify the intent of the standards council
18 direction again to not include inspection, testing and
19 maintenance requirements for interconnected systems
20 which were outside the scope of NFPA 72.
21 But there was significant annex material
22 added both by the technical committee and the
23 correlating committee to explain that while these
24 interconnected systems are not under the jurisdiction of
25 NFPA 72, the best methods for testing are still an



♀
1 integrated testing approach.
2 So this is strictly to comply with the
3 technical correlating committee -- excuse me -- the
4 standards council instructions to not mess with the
5 systems that are not the under NFPA 72.
6 Just as a bit of history the whole thing
7 arose with the standards council and a summit between a
8 number of technical committees affected by inspection
9 testing and maintenance over the issue of testing smoke
10 dampers.
11 The way the code was written, if you had a
12 smoke damper that was actuated by a smoke detector, as
13 most smoke dampers are, you had to test the smoke damper
14 on the same frequency as the fire alarm code said you
15 had to test smoke detectors. Whereas, the standard
16 covering the smoke damper would allow a testing
17 frequency of two to five years depending on the
18 application. Thank you.
19 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you,
20 gentlemen.
21 Further discussion. Microphone 5.
22 BOB BAIRD: Bob Baird, Independent
23 Electrical Contractors Association, chairman of the
24 electrical section. At our meeting on Tuesday, the
25 electrical section --



♀
1 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: You're speaking for
2 the motion?
3 BOB BAIRD: Speaking for the motion.
4 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
5 BOB BAIRD: On Tuesday the electrical
6 section discussed this matter. Mr. Clary explained his
7 position. The electrical section voted to support this
8 CAM.
9 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
10 Microphone 3.
11 TOM HAMMERBERG: Tom Hammerberg representing
12 the Automatic Fire Alarm Association.
13 While we're not opposed to the suggestions
14 by the standards council to get rid of the testing of
15 equipment that is outside of the scope of 72, we feel
16 that it's very premature.
17 This leaves a major loophole out there for
18 the next code cycle. NFPA 4 is not going to be
19 available for a couple of years. Even the reference to
20 NFPA 3, which is wills available now, is simply a
21 recommended practice. It's not going to be a standard.

22 And we feel that from the safety point, it's
23 much better off to leave it in 72 for one more cycle. I
24 have no problem with taking it out next cycle after we
25 had something to replace it, but there's nothing to
47
♀
1 replace it right now.
2 To me it makes absolutely no sense to take
3 these requirements out at this particular point because
4 it's going to do is reduce life safety. Thank you very
5 much.
6 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
7 Microphone 6.
8 FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: Frank Van Overmeiren,
9 FP&C Consultants, member of the NFPA 72 technical
10 committee and now the long term historian of the group
11 speaking against the motion.
12 While I personally am not in favor of the
13 direction that we have chosen, and as Mr. Hammerberg
14 just mentioned, we're going to end up with a gap in the
15 sequence of the code and the adoption of NFPA 4 when it
16 does become available, I've long term believed this is a
17 consensus process and we need to work towards acceptance
18 of the direction we're given by the standards council
19 and what we receive as instructions by the technical
20 correlating committee.
21 We will have an integrated testing approach.
22 The technical committee has adopted a test plan to try
23 and address those gaps in that time point in time.
24 Both Mr. Schifiliti and I are on the NFPA 4
25 technical committee to try and ensure we'll end up with
48
♀
1 the right configuration for performance when that new
2 document is adopted.
3 So I think while we do have a gap in the
4 time, following direction of the standards council at
5 this point in time is the reasonable way to go.
6 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
7 Any further discussion?
8 Mr. Schifiliti, any additional comments?
9 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: The only
10 comment I have is that technical correlating committee
11 feels that the other standards do have test requirements
12 in place. So the only gap is having it in one location,
13 which eventually NFPA 4 will have.
14 So I would seek that you ask that you
15 support the technical committee and the technical
16 correlating committee by voting against this motion.
17 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
18 With that, we'll move to the vote on the
19 motion which is to reject an identifiable part of
20 Comment 72-169C as noted in the motions committee
21 report.
22 Please record your vote now, one if you're
23 in favor of the motion and two if you're opposed to the
24 motion.
25 Voting closes in five seconds. Voting is
49
♀
1 closed. Motion passes.
2 Next motion is sequence number 72-6.
3 Microphone 5.
4 BRUCE FRASER: I'm Bruce Fraser, Fraser Fire

5 Protection, and I move to reject an identifiable part of
6 Comment 72-251.
7 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: The motion on the
8 floor is to reject an identifiable part of Comment
9 72-251 as noted in the motions committee report and I
10 heard a second.
11 Please proceed.
12 BRUCE FRASER: This should be a fairly quick
13 one and a no brainer, but the identifiable part is the
14 TCC action which modified the TC's action on the main
15 paragraph of 21.3.3.
16 And in an effort to maintain consistency
17 throughout NFPA 72, the technical committees were
18 instructed to use the phrase, where other governing
19 laws, code, standards or other parts of this code
20 require, et cetera, et cetera, and replace the term
21 where required. So universal changes were made in that
22 regard.
23 In attempting to use this terminology in
24 21.3.3 there was an unintended consequence that occurred
25 and effectively it changed the intent of the paragraph.



1 I can get into it.
2 Effectively elevator recall can only now be
3 initiated by devices in elevator lobbies, machine rooms
4 and hoistways and other devices would not be permitted
5 to initiate elevator recall.
6 For years it's been in the code to allow
7 other devices to the jurisdiction requires it. And we
8 inadvertently took that out unfortunately. The intent
9 of 21.3.3 has always been to permit other devices.
10 Now, if this motion is successful, it would
11 restore the original intent as shown on the salmon
12 colored sheet, Page 32 in the right-hand column. So I
13 would recommend highly that the motion on the floor be
14 supported.
15 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
16 Mr. Schifiliti.
17 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: The technical
18 correlating committee agrees with the submitter and is
19 in favor of the motion because it restores an important
20 provision that allows the authority having jurisdiction
21 to permit or require the use of initiating devices for
22 elevator recall different from the default of those that
23 are specified in the code provisions.
24 This provision was inadvertently removed but
25 is important in order to maintain the flexibility that



1 is currently needed by enforcing authorities.
2 The motion retains the language accepted by
3 the technical committee in Proposal 72-279 which was
4 their main intent at adjusting that particular section.
5 And it also includes the exception that was
6 added by Comment 72-251 which was in the comment phase
7 some additional work they wanted to do on that section.
8 So the TCC asks that you support this CAM.
9 And I also ask that Burton Bunker, chair of the
10 protected premises committee be permitted to address the
11 committee's position.
12 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
13 Microphone 2.
14 BURTON BUNKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

15 Burton Bunker, U.S. Department of State. I'm the
16 chairman of the protected premises signaling committee.
17 The intent of the committee, as both
18 Mr. Schifiliti and Mr. Fraser have stated, was to create
19 consistency within the document on the terminology
20 referring to other laws, codes or standards.
21 It's always been our position on this
22 committee in the past to remit other initiating devices
23 to cause recall. Therefore, this was an unintended
24 consequence. Thank you.
25 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you,

52

♀
1 gentleman.
2 Further discussion. Microphone 5.
3 ROBERT BAIRD: Robert Baird, Independent
4 Electrical Contractors Association, chairman of the
5 electrical section. The electrical section supports
6 this action.
7 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
8 Any further discussion? Seeing none we'll
9 move to the vote, which is to reject an identifiable
10 part of the Comment 72-251 as noted in the motions
11 committee reports.
12 Please vote now, one if you're in favor of
13 the motion, two if you're opposed to the motion.
14 Voting closes in five seconds. Voting is
15 closed. Motion passes.
16 Next motion sequence is 72-7.
17 Microphone 3.
18 FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: Frank Van Overmeiren,
19 FP&C Consultants, alternate designated representative
20 for Josh Elvove.
21 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: You are authorized
22 to make the motion.
23 FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: Move to accept
24 Proposal 72-343.
25 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Motion on the floor

53

♀
1 is accept Proposal 72-343. Is there a second? I heard
2 a seconds.
3 Please proceed.
4 FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: This proposal, I move
5 to accept the motion, speak in favor of the motion.
6 This proposed motion seeks to modify Section 24.3.5.4.1
7 as follows:
8 For systems employing relocation or partial
9 evacuation, a level one, two or a level three pathway
10 survivability shall be required.
11 This is the first of three similar motions
12 to permit pathway level one as a survivability option.
13 This motion deals with in building emergency voice alarm
14 communication systems employing relocation or partial
15 evacuation.
16 The others deal with two-way in-building
17 wired ECS and the third deals with area of refuge
18 communication systems.
19 Prior to the 2010 edition, all requirements
20 pertaining to voice systems and the survivability of
21 these systems was located in Chapter 6 under the purview
22 of the technical committee for protected premises. That
23 edition listed five options.
24 During the 2010 cycle, the new ECS technical

25 committee was created which was given the responsibility

54

♀

1 for all systems that use live voice for communicating
2 various emergencies. However, the protected premises
3 committee remained responsible for defining
4 survivability introduced new defined pathway levels in
5 Chapter 12 that other chapters could use.
6 In essence, previous survivability
7 requirements became level two while other requirements
8 became level one, which was essentially the sprinkler
9 action.
10 During the 2010 ROP, the ECS took those
11 pathway levels to establish survivability requirements
12 for a number of different communication systems. For
13 in-building evac employing partial evacuation, the
14 options originally included both levels one and two.
15 However, during ROC, the TC revised the
16 requirement to level two or three. No technical
17 justification was given for the change. But as part of
18 the process, the TC also created an annex to permit a
19 performance based approach or risk analysis where other
20 pathway levels might be acceptable and included examples
21 in such instances, including buildings of construction
22 that is less than two hours, such as a one story type
23 five nursing home that would employ relocation.
24 Given there are a number of examples where
25 this would not be appropriate to use pathway level two

55

♀

1 since the wiring would outlast the building
2 construction --
3 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: 30 seconds.
4 FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: The essence is we
5 have buildings that are adopted, accepted and approved
6 that are one hour fire rated construction. And we have
7 listed cable or requirements for those systems greater
8 than the one hour construction for the building.
9 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
10 Mr. Schifiliti?
11 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: The technical
12 correlating committee has no comment on this motion and
13 I defer to the chairman of the emergency communication
14 systems chapter, Wayne Moore, to comment on the
15 committee's position.
16 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Mr. Moore.
17 Microphone 2.
18 WAYNE MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My name
19 is Wayne Moore with Hughes Associates. I'm chairman of
20 the risk communication systems chapter.
21 And the chapter committee rejected this 24
22 to 1. And basically after review of information
23 provided to the committee, they felt especially for evac
24 system was crucial for the pathways used for systems
25 employing relocation of partial evacuation be

56

♀

1 particularly robust bus for an extended period of time
2 as required by the code and possibly at the fire scene.
3 There's no assurance that the sprinklers
4 will be located the areas of the risers. Therefore, it
5 was critical that additional protection be provided to
6 those circuits. That was the reason the committee
7 rejected this particular motion. Thank you.

8 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you,
9 gentlemen.
10 We'll move to further discussion.
11 Microphone 2.
12 BRUCE FRASER: Bruce Fraser, Fraser Fire
13 Protection and I'm speaking against the motion.
14 I am a member of Chapter 24 emergency
15 communications. And the subject has been debated
16 considerably. And I feel that allowing the lessening of
17 the survivability requirements to be a detriment to the
18 overall reliability and capability to operate during a
19 fire condition.
20 And I noted in the response, the committee
21 statement, there is a way to achieve what the submitter
22 had wanted. And it allows in Section 23.10.2 of the
23 NFPA 72 2010 edition, that number might have changed,
24 but the content is still -- an evaluation is allowed to
25 lessen the requirement. So that is permitted.

57

♀
1 But I also wanted to mention something, I
2 won't repeat what Wayne had said, but the concern was
3 with the system water supply could be compromised under
4 those conditions where fires sometimes are the result of
5 arson or today we're looking at terrorism, things like
6 that, where one of the most robust wiring capability
7 wiring system.
8 So I urge to vote against the motion on the
9 floor.
10 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
11 Microphone 5.
12 RAY GRILL: Ray Grill with ARAP. I'm the
13 chair of the notification appliances technical committee
14 NFPA 72 and an alternate on the emergency communications
15 systems committee.
16 I'm speaking in favor of the motion on the
17 floor. As was stated by Frank Van Overmeiren in the
18 initial discussion of this motion, there are a lot of
19 situations where partial evacuation or relocation can be
20 implemented in buildings that are not two hour rated.
21 The standard has allowed conduit and
22 sprinklers as a method of providing survivability.
23 There has been no justification to increase the required
24 level of survivability.
25 So I would urge this body to support the

58

♀
1 motion on the floor. Thank you very much.
2 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
3 Microphone 8.
4 ED WALTON: Good afternoon. Ed Walton
5 representing DRACA talking against the motion.
6 Basically there's substantiation that was
7 submitted that brought up the point there was no
8 evidence to show that level two survivability cable
9 offered protection over level one sprinkler building.
10 We assert that this is false. We have a
11 study that was done on a building fire in Wooster,
12 Massachusetts that was performed by a fire protection
13 engineer. It was done at the request of a fire marshall
14 and also a fire chief and electrical inspector.
15 In this building, which was a fully
16 sprinklered building, there was an electrical system is
17 that went from the basement to the ceiling providing

18 emergency power to the elevator.
19 This system survived a four-story electrical
20 closet fire that took out every other cable in the
21 building. Even though the sprinkler system was
22 operational, this cable continued to work and continued
23 to provide that kind of emergency protection in the
24 building.
25 One further comment. Since I involved with

59

♀

1 the development of the pathway levels one, two and
2 three, it was recognized by that committee that level
3 one sprinklers would prevent the size of the fire
4 becoming greater and greater, whereas the cable level
5 two would protect the systems that are there to provide
6 emergency up to the survivor. Thank you.
7 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
8 Microphone 5.
9 PETE LARIMER: Thank you. Pete Larimer with
10 the Department of Veterans Affairs. I speak in favor of
11 the motion.
12 I just want to bring the membership to the
13 attention that this applies to voice communication
14 systems as it's in paragraph 243541, which addresses
15 voice communication systems used for partial evacuation.
16 I work for the Department of Veterans
17 Affairs. We have about 153 medical center campuses,
18 many of which use other than voice communication
19 systems, we use coded service that provide staff an
20 indication of where the fire is and where they need to
21 respond in order to help patients be relocated in a
22 partial evacuation mode.
23 The requirement for survivability of the
24 wiring in that system that we use throughout our medical
25 centers is not required to meet the two hour.

60

♀

1 We have had no situations that I can verify
2 in my 20 plus years with the VA that it what about a
3 problem in our sprinkler buildings. And even to this
4 day, you're still permitted to use coded systems for
5 partial evacuation without having a two hour cable
6 that's being proposed for the voice only system.
7 So inasmuch as we're indicating in here that
8 we have to increase the survivability of these systems,
9 there are many systems out there that are working in
10 sprinklered buildings and I can tell you we've had fires
11 with sprinklers that have gone off with an adequate
12 response both from the fire alarm system and the
13 building in general.
14 So I believe that this is more of a solution
15 and we're still seeking the problem. Thank you.
16 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
17 Microphone 2.
18 BRUCE FRASER: Bruce Fraser, Fraser Fire
19 Protection and I just wanted to respond to two items.
20 Number one, there was rationale during our
21 committee --
22 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: You're speaking
23 against the motion?
24 BRUCE FRASER: I'm sorry. I'm speaking
25 against the motion, yes.

61

♀

1 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
2 BRUCE FRASER: During our committee session,
3 there were -- the rationale was created, although we
4 might not have put it in the commentary, for especially
5 for the water supply. I love sprinklers. I want to be
6 a sprinkled building.
7 However, the discussion was around the arson
8 and the terrorism. And we wanted to have that as a more
9 stringent level. And there's always the ability to step
10 down via 23.10.2 which allows the evaluation to allow
11 the lessening of the system.
12 So again, I speak against the motion.
13 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
14 Microphone 3.
15 FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: Frank Van Overmeiren,
16 FP&C Consultants. I speak in favor of the motion. I
17 just want to address the issue of arson and terrorism.
18 This is a minimum standard. It is the desire in the
19 industry to install more voice communication systems in
20 buildings than it is to install standard generally
21 evacuation systems.
22 One of the reasons to accomplish this is by
23 maintaining a reasonable cost for installing voice
24 communication systems that give us greater ability to
25 utilize the systems for emergency mass notification

62

♀
1 purposes.
2 We have more and more buildings across the
3 United States that are being installed with these types
4 of systems that are only of construction classification
5 with one hour fire resistance ratings.
6 We have college campus buildings. We have
7 hospital campus buildings. We have municipal building
8 campuses. We have all kinds of configurations of
9 military facilities that are installing voice
10 communication systems as part of their configurations
11 that do not have two hour fire rated construction.
12 So making a mandatory requirement for rated
13 construction greater than that of the building just
14 doesn't make sense and increases cost. It will go
15 through and make a configuration to where building
16 owners will look at that and say, I'll just install a
17 general evacuation system and not gain the benefits that
18 these systems have.
19 I speak in favor of the notion.
20 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
21 Microphone 2.
22 TOM HAMMERBERG: Tom Hammerberg representing
23 the Automatic Fire Alarm Association. While I can agree
24 with what Frank was just saying about the building --
25 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Speaking.

63

♀
1 TOM HAMMERBERG: Speaking against the
2 motion.
3 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
4 TOM HAMMERBERG: Sorry. I agree with Frank
5 when he's talking about there are some occupancies that
6 only have one hour rating, but we have to remember that
7 NFPA 72 is not an occupancy specific requirement.
8 By making these changes, it changes it
9 globally to have any type of system to allow the use of
10 sprinklers as opposed to one of the other more robust

11 means of survivability requirements.
12 So the Automatic Fire Alarm Association
13 speaks against the motion.
14 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
15 Microphone 5.
16 DAVID DESHONAY: My name is Dave Deshonay.
17 I'm speaking on behalf of the American Society of Health
18 Care Engineers.
19 We've heard a lot of things today about
20 sprinklers not working, terrorism, arson and a variety
21 of things. Clearly this provision is intended to be a
22 minimum requirement.
23 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: You're speaking for
24 the motion?
25 DAVE DESHONAY: For the motion, thank you.



♀
1 To have a voice system that is going to function greater
2 than the building, just makes no common sense.
3 If we think about this, an individual has
4 the ability to choose the level of protection that they
5 have. To require, this a two hour system in a building
6 that only is designed to withstand one hour, visualize
7 this in your head.
8 The building is completely to the ground and
9 you have a functional voice activated system. It just
10 does not make sense. This is a common sense decision.
11 It's not necessary. We urge you to vote for this
12 motion. Thank you.
13 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
14 Microphone 1.
15 TOM JAGGER: Tom Jagger from Jagger &
16 Associates and I represent the American Health Care
17 Association leading age which represent 80 percent of
18 the long term care facilities in the United States.
19 Almost 75 percent of our buildings, new and
20 existing, are either zero or one hour rated. We have
21 never had a failure of a sprinkler system since at least
22 1970 that resulted in multiple death fire in a
23 sprinklered building.
24 I would hope we were past the stage in 2012
25 where somebody gets up at the mike and references one



♀
1 fire and we should reacting to that one fire.
2 And I agree with the gentleman who just
3 spoke. If you're in a building with zero or one hour
4 rating and the sprinkler system fails, that building is
5 not going to be tenable in two hours. I can guarantee
6 you that.
7 So I speak in favor of the motion.
8 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
9 Any further discussion? Any additional
10 comments?
11 Mr. Schifiliti.
12 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: I have no
13 comments and I would defer to the committee chair for
14 committee's position.
15 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Microphone 2.
16 WAYNE MOORE: Wayne Moore from Hughes
17 Associates, chair of the committee for enriched
18 communication systems. And I just want to clarify a
19 couple of issues that I've heard so far and I apologize
20 to ray if I misunderstood what he said.

21 But we're allowed -- we're only requiring
22 the survivability of cables where we relocate people in
23 a building. If we have -- and I've seen 12-story
24 buildings that are made of concrete that had a voice
25 system and they evacuate the entire building.

66

♀

1 Obviously, if you have a type zero or one
2 hour construction and you're evacuating the whole
3 building, then there's no need for survivability. So I
4 just want to clarify that's not the intent.
5 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you
6 gentlemen.
7 With that, we'll move to the vote. And the
8 motion on the floor is to accept Proposal 72-343.
9 Please vote now, one if you're in favor of
10 the motion and two if you're opposed.
11 Voting closes in five seconds. Voting is
12 closed. Motion fails.
13 Next motion sequence is 72-8.
14 Microphone 3.
15 FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: Frank Van Overmeiren,
16 FP&C Consultants, designated representative for Mr. Josh
17 Elvove will.
18 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you. You are
19 authorized as a representative.
20 FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: I move acceptance of
21 Proposal 72-346.
22 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: The motion on the
23 floor is to accept Proposal 72-346 is there a second?
24 Do I hear a second? I hear a second.
25 Please proceed.

67

♀

1 FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: This proposal is
2 essentially a repeat of the previous one. However, the
3 difference is this is for two-way in-building wired
4 emergency communication systems so that they can have a
5 pathway survivability of level one, level two or level
6 three. Same configuration, just a different use of the
7 cable.
8 Speak in favor of the motion.
9 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
10 Mr. Schifiliti?
11 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: Thank you. The
12 correlating committee has no position on this and I
13 would defer to the committee chair, Mr. Moore.
14 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Microphone 2.
15 WAYNE MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
16 Wayne Moore from Hughes Associates, chairman
17 of the ECS committee. The vote on this one was 23 to 2.
18 Just to give a little background, obviously
19 these firefighter telephones or these telephone circuits
20 are used by firefighters use and in some cases fire
21 warden use during the course of a fire.
22 Again, the committee felt that the
23 additional robustness was needed for the circuits. And
24 I won't go into the rest of the discussion we've had
25 already in the first proposal, but all these same

68

♀

1 reasons apply.
2 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you,
3 gentlemen.

Further discussion. Microphone 5.
JOHN CAPUS: John Capus with Ralph Jensen & Associates speaking in favor of the motion.
We talked about this being two way firefighter wired communication system. However, we also have to consider the fact that wired communications for firefighters also employs the use of their wireless radio systems and that there is not a cable on the market that is made to the two hour capability that is it for these radio repeater systems for firefighters in-building communication systems.
In addition, to use the threat of terrorism that would not consider the capability of taking out the sprinkler system, you would have to say why aren't they taking out the fire alarm system as well. The scare tactic to that is not a valid argument.
Again, I vote in favor of this motion.
PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
Microphone 2.
WAYNE MOORE: Wayne Moore from Hughes Associates, chair of the ECS committee.
Just to clarify, these are wired systems and



the reason that these systems were initially installed in buildings many years ago is the radios that the firefighters use do not work unless there's an enhancement system in the building, which is a whole different subject. This is strictly the traditional wired telephone systems.
PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
Any further discussion?
Mr. Schifiliti, any additional comments --
COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: No additional comments.
PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: With that, we'll move to the vote.
And the motion on the floor is to accept Proposal 72-346.
Please vote now, one if you're in favor of the motion or two if you're opposed to the motion.
Voting closes in five seconds. Voting is closed. Motion fails.
Next sequence is number 72-9.
Microphone 3.
FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: Frank Van Overmeiren, FP&C Consultants, designated representative of Mr. Josh Elvove.
PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: You're an



authorized designated representative.
FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: I've been authorized by Mr. Elvove that based upon the voting in the last two issues that my discretion I can go through and defer and not pursue the next motion CAM 72-9 and I choose to do so.
PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: So I understand you're not pursuing motion sequence number 72-9?
FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: That is correct.
PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Okay. So with that action, we'll be moving on to motion sequence number 72-10.
FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: Frank Van Overmeiren,

14 FP&C Consultants, designated representative to Mr. Josh
15 Elvove.
16 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Please proceed with
17 the motion.
18 FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: I move to accept
19 Comment 72-304.
20 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: The motion on the
21 to floor is to accept Comment 72-304. Is there a
22 second? I hear a second.
23 Please proceed.
24 FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: This issue is similar
25 but different in the result of what we're having as far



♀
1 as the requirements. This proposal seeks to provide a
2 provision that states pathway survivability levels for
3 systems employing relocation of partial evacuation to an
4 in-building wire emergency communication systems and
5 area of refuge, emergency communication systems shall be
6 permitted to be determined via risk analysis.
7 Essentially what we're trying to do is make
8 the possibility within the code where we can utilize a
9 risk analysis that's stated within the main body of this
10 chapter so that it can be utilized as part of a
11 substantiation of a variance or equivalency request to
12 the authorities having jurisdiction to go through and
13 utilize a change to reduce the level of survivability of
14 a particular wired system.
15 I speak in favor of the motion.
16 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
17 Mr. Schifiliti.
18 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: The correlating
19 committee has no comment on this motion and defers to
20 chair of the committee to state the committee's
21 position.
22 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Mr. Moore.
23 Microphone 2.
24 WAYNE MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Wayne
25 Moore, Hughes Associates, chair of the ECS committee.



♀
1 The risk analysis that is mentioned here is
2 already allowed for all of the other systems that make
3 up mass communication systems. But the committee still
4 feels strongly that when it comes to fire evacuation,
5 areas of refuge and two-way wired telephone systems,
6 that the robustness the system still needs to be there.
7 So that the committee voted 24 to 1 to
8 reject this comment and proposal.
9 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you,
10 gentlemen.
11 Further discussion. Microphone 1.
12 CHAD BEBE: Chad Bebe American Society of
13 Health Care Engineers representing the health care
14 section in support of the motion before you.
15 At the health care business meeting on
16 Tuesday we voted to support this as a section. I urge
17 you to support it.
18 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
19 Any additional discussion?
20 Any additional comments, Mr. Schifiliti?
21 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: I have no
22 comments.
23 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: With that, we'll

24 move to the vote on the motion on the floor which is to
25 accept Comment 72-304.

73

♀
1 Please vote now, one in favor of the motion
2 and two if you're against the motion.
3 Voting closes in five seconds. Voting is
4 now closed. Motion fails.
5 Next motion sequence is 72-11.
6 ANTHONY MUCCI: Anthony Mucci, ADT Security
7 Services, member of the supervising station technical
8 committee.
9 I make a motion to reject an identifiable
10 part of Comment 72-352.
11 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: The motion on the
12 floor is to an identifiable part of Comment 72-352 as
13 noted in the motions committee report. Is there a
14 second? I hear a second.
15 Please proceed.
16 ANTHONY MUCCI: As written, effective
17 January 1, 2014 any signal received by the supervising
18 station that has not restored to normal within 24 hours
19 of initial receipt and every 24 hours thereafter until
20 restored, shall be redisplayed to an operator as a
21 non-restored signal and shall be reported to the
22 subscriber.
23 The requirement does not consider the burden
24 placed on supervising station. The resources will be
25 used for undetermined period of time to report a

74

♀
1 non-life threatening situation to the subscriber.
2 Repeated notifications could continue for days and weeks
3 with no apparent benefit to the subscriber, but to
4 detriment to the resources of the supervising station.
5 The building could be out of service without a known
6 subscriber.
7 A limit must be placed on the subsequent
8 notifications with the number that does not distract the
9 supervising station from other events but places the
10 burden on the subscriber to take action. An open ended
11 requirement for this with situation is not appropriate.
12 A more reasonable approach would be one
13 telephone call notification within 24 hours of initial
14 receipt followed by notification of an alternate method
15 such as a letter or e-mail.
16 The code is a minimum standard. So it tell
17 us that we need to notify the subscriber, but it
18 shouldn't do so where we have to do it every 24 hours
19 thereafter.
20 I urge you to support in favor of the
21 motion. Thank you.
22 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
23 Mr. Schifiliti?
24 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: The correlating
25 committee has no comment on this and as the original

75

♀
1 preparer of the motion or proposal I have no comment and
2 defer to the committee chair.
3 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Microphone 2.
4 WARREN OLSON: Good afternoon. Warren
5 Olson, Fire Safety Consultants and chairman of
6 supervising station alarm systems.

7 The committee voted 25 affirmative to one
8 negative to accept in principal the comments that came
9 to us. And just clarify some wording, our intent entity
10 was to have the recontacting of the subscriber every
11 24 hours if signalling conditions were still present,
12 alarm trouble or supervisory.
13 We did make it rather, I don't want to use
14 the word vague, but that's what it is, we didn't specify
15 the method in which to notify the subscriber, so we did
16 leave that open.
17 But we felt it was important to constantly
18 bring to the attention of the subscriber that his alarm
19 system was not in full service.
20 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you,
21 gentlemen.
22 Any further discussion on this motion?
23 Microphone 3.
24 LOUIS FIORE: Speaking in favor of the
25 motion, this is Lou Fiore, L.T. Fiore, Inc. I just want



♀
1 to say that the Central Station Alarm Association is in
2 support of this motion.
3 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
4 Any further discussion? Seeing no one at
5 the microphone, we'll move to the vote on the motion
6 which is to reject an identifiable part of Comment
7 72-352 as noted in the motions committee report.
8 Please vote now, one if you're in favor of
9 the motion and two if you're against.
10 Voting closes in five seconds. Voting is
11 now closed. Motion passes.
12 Next motion sequence is number 72-12.
13 LOUIS FIORE: Lou Fiore, L. T. Fiore, Inc.
14 I move to accept Comment 72-367.
15 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: The motion on the
16 floor is to accept Comment 72-367. Is there a second?
17 I hear a second.
18 Please proceed.
19 LOUIS FIORE: First of all, I'd like to let
20 you know I'm a long term member of NFPA 72 back when it
21 was NFPA 71. And now Chapter 26, I chair the task group
22 of that, made some sweeping changes to Chapter 26 in the
23 areas of technology.
24 Historically, the DACT, digital alarm
25 communicator transmitter, had a 24 hour test sequence.



♀
1 But now we have evidence that backup power provided to
2 us to the PSTN and its approved the MFVN, managed
3 facilities voice networks has diminished to eight hours.
4 So therefore, I understand the spirit in
5 which this proposal was made or those changes were made.
6 However, there's a subject here of belted suspenders.
7 Fundamentally the new text requires two
8 technologies. If you have a DACT and it's connected to
9 a telephone line, the second line goes through another
10 technology, be it digital cellular, IP radio, whatever.
11 So that we've already covered the deficiency there.
12 There's no need to add suspenders when we already have
13 the belt.
14 If we don't go back to 24 hours, we'll have
15 four times the additional traffic at the supervising
16 station. This could, and I say could, it doesn't have

17 to, have the requirement for additional hardware and
18 telephone lines at the supervising situation station.
19 But the four times traffic is irrefutable.
20 Also, this will disturb trade. When you
21 have a DACT and a customer's business three times a day
22 during business hours, two or three times a day the
23 telephone will be disrupted this obviously will cause
24 complaints.
25 But most importantly, the one telephone line

78

♀
1 is supervised by the other technology. And so
2 therefore, technology is available to send alarm
3 supervisory and trouble source.
4 My motion still leaves intact the exception,
5 if you read it, there's an exception that says if you
6 must use telephone, two telephone lines because you're
7 in an area of the country you don't have an option, then
8 six hours is appropriate so.
9 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: 50 seconds.
10 LOUIS FIORE: The use of DACT is in its
11 twilight. The PSTN will sunset soon. In fact, the FCC
12 is proposing 2018. At this point there is no need to
13 make the situation worse than it is.
14 I urge you to vote in favor of my motion.
15 Thank you.
16 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
17 Mr. Schifiliti?
18 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: The correlating
19 committee has no comments and I defer to the technical
20 committee chair Warren Olson.
21 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Microphone 2.
22 WARREN OLSON: Warren Olson, Fire Safety
23 Consultants, chairman of the supervising station alarm
24 system committee.
25 The committee voted 26 to nothing to approve

79

♀
1 the language that came out of the comments section.
2 During the work of the committee, we made changes
3 regarding the available secondary path of connection for
4 DACT. And basically it eliminated, with some
5 exceptions, with one real exception, the use of two pot
6 slides. So there has been a change overall in what's
7 being accepted.
8 As a result of other committee action and
9 one we're really talking about here, we went across the
10 board with a six-hour supervised check-in for DACTs. So
11 that was generally the work of the committee.
12 I think what the proponent here is asking
13 for is not necessarily -- it's a reasonable I think
14 request. There is an issue though with the language
15 that was submitted and I'm not certain how we want to
16 deal with that.
17 But he does indicate where two DACTs are
18 used, I believe in talking with him, he meant where two
19 phone lines were used or POTS lines. So that's my
20 comment.
21 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you,
22 gentlemen.
23 Microphone 2.
24 ART BLACK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Art
25 Black. Carmel Fire Protection. I rise in opposition of

80

♀
1 the motion on the floor.
2 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Very good.
3 ART BLACK: I would like -- the only reason
4 that I agree with the chair of the committee that it's
5 really a technical issue more than anything else.
6 But I'm concerned about what is in his
7 motion, what is in the submitter's motion in the second
8 paragraph. And it does say success, if successful, this
9 proposed motion seeks to modify the section to read as
10 follows and the second paragraph is incorrect. You do
11 not have two DACTs, you have two phone lines on a DACT.
12 So for that reason alone, I urge defeat of
13 this motion. We can fix this, but adopting this
14 language is going to create the need for at least a TIA
15 to fix this later on hopefully before the book gets
16 published.
17 So I urge defeat of the motion.
18 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
19 Microphone 5.
20 SHANE CLARY: May I touch to microphone?
21 Yes, Shane M. Clary, Bay Alarm Company, standing in
22 favor of the motion.
23 Again, I don't dispute some of the stuff
24 that's being said on the opposing side. I think the
25 language, we will have to do some repair in a TIA. I

81

♀
1 would just prefer if we can get the support of those
2 that are in this hall to accept the motion, then we'll
3 get a TIA to correct the inadvertent difference between
4 two DACTs facts as opposed to two phone lines.
5 Again, as Mr. Fiore stated, POTS, plain old
6 telephone service, is being will be sunseted because of
7 the phase out of the public switch telephone network.
8 The company I work for, Bay Alarm Company,
9 we probably have 40,000 or so systems on the digital
10 dialers. Yes, occasionally we do see some issues with
11 the phone lines coming in, of course we get our 20-hour
12 test items report, to kick it over to six hours for new
13 systems that was not retroactive.
14 My one fear is, though, if it goes into the
15 code, that you could have some trying to make it
16 retroactive, though that is not a requirement. And I
17 just would prefer if possible we just maintain the
18 language that has been in the standard many for a number
19 of years. Thank you.
20 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
21 Microphone 3.
22 LOUIS FIORE: Lou Fiore again, L. T. Fiore,
23 Inc. I want to address the concern about this
24 inappropriate second paragraph.
25 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: You're speaking for

82

♀
1 the motion?
2 LOUIS FIORE: I'm speaking for the motion,
3 yes.
4 The original draft committee proposal, which
5 I actually have in my hand, that has that same error.
6 If you read the paragraph, it's clear the intent is two
7 telephone lines, one DACT, two telephone lines.
8 And I submit that that's just -- it's simply
9 an editorial change, but the word line should be added

10 after DACT. One should say lines and the other should
11 say lines.
12 And the meaning is very, very clear. It was
13 just a simple error. And I actually transposed that
14 paragraph into my CAM. Thank you.
15 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
16 Microphone 2.
17 DAN FINNEGAN: Good afternoon. My name is
18 Dan Finnegan with Seimans Building Technologies and also
19 retired firefighter and firefighter prevention officer
20 and I am speaking against the motion for really two key
21 points.
22 The fact that as we have been hearing so far
23 this afternoon, there are some technical challenges with
24 the motion as it has been presented. I think we need to
25 make sure we're crisp and we're clear in the language as

83

1 we move forward in the motion.
2 This issue of the 24-hour survivability is
3 known as a fact and I think this really confuses the
4 situation as we move forward.
5 So for the benefits of system reliability
6 for overall good life safety, we need to vote against
7 this motion and let the thing come back when it's
8 clearer and better well defined as we move forward.
9 So I am in favor of supporting the action of
10 the technical committee in voting against this motion.
11 Thank you.
12 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
13 Any further discussion?
14 Any additional comments, Mr. Schifiliti?
15 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: I have no
16 additional comments. If the committee chair? No?
17 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: With that, we'll
18 move to the vote and the motion on the floor is to
19 accept Comment 72-367.
20 Please vote now, one if you're in favor of
21 the motion and two if you're against.
22 Voting closes in five seconds. Voting is
23 now closed. Motion fails.
24 Next sequence is Comment 72-13.
25 Microphone 5.

84

1 LOUIS FIORE: Lou Fiore again. I move to
2 accept Comment 72-388.
3 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: The motion is to
4 accept Comment 72-388. Is there a second? Is there a
5 second? I hear a second.
6 Thank you. Please proceed.
7 LOUIS FIORE: Thank you. At the ROP and the
8 ROC I put in a comment to add the addition of voice
9 driver for fire enunciation. And it was rejected. And
10 the substantiation, if you will, committee statement was
11 cited the Brook report, Professor Dorothy Brook from
12 Australia, I believe.
13 She, however, has a whole different take, I
14 mean if this report was in fact read. And she has been
15 quoted many, many times in the press. And she's a
16 leading researcher.
17 She believes that house fire fatalities may
18 be the result of people not hearing their smoke alarms.
19 The parents, this is regarding children, by the way, not

20 adults, regarding children.
21 The parents were very surprised to see, gee,
22 we're wondering if there's a problem with the smoke
23 detector considering how loud it sounded.
24 Overall, not many children, this is a quote
25 from her, not many children are waking up and those are

85

♀

1 that are younger than primary school age have a
2 particularly prone to this problem.
3 She goes on to say, this is actually in the
4 report that was cited trying to defeat my motion, that
5 voice alarms are proving to be more reliable in waking
6 younger children than standard smoke alarm tones.
7 Voice alarms were designed to convey a sense
8 of urge and emotion. The mother's voice was used using
9 the children's names often. All the children, a hundred
10 percent of the children woke up when they heard that
11 versus 57.1 percent with the standard tones.
12 I urge this group to send this back to
13 committee, have the committee properly analyze the
14 report that they cited in opposition to what we put in
15 here, and then we can hopefully have a better outcome.
16 Thank you.
17 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
18 Mr. Schifiliti.
19 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: The technical
20 correlating committee has no direct position on this one
21 way or the other, but I would note that the chairman of
22 the emergency communication systems chapter has
23 indicated that they have begun the process of developing
24 a TIA to require the tones that precede voice
25 instructions when used in sleeping areas match the

86

♀

1 requirements in the household chapter that require the
2 tone to sound for a minimum of 30 seconds before the
3 voice instructions are instituted, and that that tone be
4 the new required low frequency tone, which has been
5 shown to work very effectively for both hearing abled,
6 hearing impaired and alcohol impaired.
7 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
8 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: And I would
9 defer to, I'm sorry, the committee chair LJ Laire.
10 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Microphone 2.
11 LAWRENCE LAIR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My
12 name is Lawrence Lair. I'm with Architects Capital.
13 The underlying comment was rejected in
14 committee 23 to 1. The motion seeks to permit
15 unregulated voice messages to be used in household fire
16 alarm systems after two cycles of a T3 pattern or
17 approximately six and a half seconds.
18 The household committee worked on the issue
19 of voice notification in sleeping areas for several
20 cycles and we added the allowance for some voice
21 notification in 2007 edition.
22 The code permits a short voice message
23 between individual cycles of the T3 pattern which would
24 fit within 1.5 dead space or allow a longer message to
25 interrupt the T3 pattern provided that pattern is

87

♀

1 preceded by at least eight cycles of the T3 pattern.
2 The requirement is based on research

3 indicating that sleeping occupants require 30 seconds of
4 temporal pattern to awaken.
5 The committee carefully considered the
6 reference comment during the ROC phase and again the
7 comment was objected 23 to 1. Neither the comment or
8 the underlying proposal provided any data to support the
9 change.
10 The rejection was based not only on the
11 Brook's report, but also working in the 2005 National
12 Institute of Health Phase 2 Report. Thank you.
13 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you,
14 gentlemen.
15 Further discussion? Microphone 3.
16 PETER LOITT: My name is Peter Loitt,
17 Central Station Alarm Association and I stand in support
18 of the proposal. I can cite Mr. Fiore's remarks
19 regarding the study done in New Zealand and Australia
20 which was 100 percent accurate in terms of children
21 waking up when a mother's voice is heard.
22 And as a parent and a grandparent, I can
23 tell you emphatically that hearing a parent's voice
24 instructing a child will get a child up from a dead
25 sleep. An alarm that I have seen many times children do

88

♀
1 not react to. Thank you.
2 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
3 Microphone 6.
4 STEVE OLENIK: Thank you very much. My name
5 is Steve Olenik. I'm with Combustion Science and
6 Engineering and I also represent Safe Awake on this
7 issue.
8 I'm a principal with the chapter 29
9 residential technical committee and I'm speaking against
10 the motion.
11 Dr. Brooks basically starting in 1995 did
12 several studies and found that he would get a lot of the
13 people to awaken if you kept the signal going for at
14 least 30 seconds. That was a good number of awakenings.
15 She did 41 tests with 22 subjects.
16 My primary reason for being here is that
17 Combustion Science and Engineering, as the chairman
18 indicated, did a lot of work on this back about five to
19 six years ago, we did approximately test included over
20 400 different individual tests. And again found you
21 needed 30 seconds to T3 signal to awaken people.
22 If we go to voice and put that in there
23 before having the eight cycles, Dr. Brook in 2008 has
24 indicated they had some problems with the voice
25 awakening the older adults. So what we may ending up

89

♀
1 doing is possibly being more somewhat effective for
2 kids, but being less effective for the older adults.
3 So it's a complex issue and given that, I
4 mean I think that it's probably not the right thing to
5 do to favor this motion, but at worst it's premature and
6 I think the data needs to be highly scrutinize before we
7 put this motion through. Thank you.
8 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
9 Microphone 2.
10 ROGER RISLEY: Roger Risley with Symplex
11 Bernal Tico International standing against the motion on
12 the floor. The gentleman before me was exactly right

13 what he was saying.
14 The project that everyone is talking about
15 is the Fire Protection Research Foundation project for
16 awakening a sleeping people, a decade of research by Ian
17 Thomas and Dorothy Brook from the Center of
18 Environmental Safety and Risk Engineering from Victoria
19 University in Melborne, Australia.
20 In their report they address voice alarms
21 used for smoke alarms. And I quote, this is right out
22 of their report, a voice alarm was quite effective for
23 younger age groups, but not for older adults.
24 The voice alarm is also found to have real
25 problems in waking participants with limited English,

90

♀
1 i.e., what kind of message, how long should the message
2 be, how do I play it? It is recommended that the 520
3 hertz be adopted as a replacement for the smoke alarm
4 sound.
5 Again, as many people have said before, 72
6 is not an occupancy document. It doesn't say
7 specifically if you're going to awaken children. It
8 just says all people.
9 Therefore, I would urge you to vote against
10 this motion.
11 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
12 Microphone 3.
13 LOUIS FIORE: Hundred percent in agreement
14 were Roger.
15 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: State your name.
16 LOUIS FIORE: Lou Fiore speaking in favor of
17 the motion.
18 What Roger said is true, but he also said
19 the children, and the Dorothy Brook says children, I
20 believe was 5 to 10 years old, are a hundred percent
21 awakened by their parents' or mother's voice, and not at
22 all or only 57 percent by the conventional tone.
23 What we sought to do here was give the
24 option. And again, Dorothy Brook said the way a lot of
25 homes are configured, you've got the sleeping quarters

91

♀
1 for the children on one end and the parents on the other
2 end. That creates a need for the option of having two
3 different kinds of sounders.
4 These are not sounders that are
5 manufactured. These are actually recorded with a human
6 voice of the mother. It's not a language issue, it's
7 not a name issue.
8 So the option is what we're after here. Not
9 one or the other. Thank you.
10 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
11 Any further discussion?
12 Seeing no one at the microphone, any
13 additional comments, Mr. Schifiliti?
14 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: Correlating
15 committee has no comments. How about the chair? No.
16 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: With that, we'll
17 move to the motion on the floor which is to accept
18 Comment 72-388.
19 Please vote now, one if you're in favor of
20 the motion and two if you're opposed to the motion.
21 Voting closes in five seconds. Voting is
22 now closed. Motion fails.

23 Ladies and gentlemen, the authorized maker
24 of the motion on 72-14 has notified NFPA that they are
25 not pursuing this motion and so we're going to move to

92

♀

1 motion sequence number 72-15.
2 Microphone three.
3 TOM HAMMERBERG: Thank you. Tom Hammerberg
4 representing the Automatic Fire Alarm Association and I
5 move to accept Comment 72-441.
6 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: The motion on the
7 floor is to accept Comment 72-441. Is there a second?
8 I hear a second.
9 Please proceed.
10 TOM HAMMERBERG: Thank you. I'm going to
11 make this short and sweet because I know I'm the last
12 thing between everybody in this room and the door. And
13 this should be fairly straightforward.
14 I had put in a Comment 72-441 that was
15 rejected by the committee saying that if it was
16 accepted, it would have been in conflict with Comment
17 72-259.
18 Well, in 72-259, the technical correlating
19 committee overturned the committee's action and rejected
20 that. So the committee's response to mine no longer
21 matter. So those comments should have been accepted.
22 Thank you.
23 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
24 Mr. Schifiliti?
25 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: Correlating

93

♀

1 committee has no comment on this motion and I defer to
2 the chair of protected premises committee Burton Bunker.
3 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Microphone 2.
4 BURTON BUNKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
5 Burton Bunker, U.S. Department of State, chairman of
6 protected premises signalling committee.
7 This one got a little bit messy, but
8 essentially Mr. Hammerberg is correct. The original
9 proposal, which was 72-587, was accepted in principal.
10 And it essentially did what Mr. Hammerberg is proposing.
11 Then along comes Comment 259 which was
12 accepted in principal and modified the text. And the
13 correlating committee rejected that based on the fact
14 that the technical committee had created a problem with
15 scope with respect to A 17.1, elevator and escalator
16 safety codes. So that was rejected.
17 And then as Mr. Hammerberg correctly points
18 out, we at that point in time during the ROC thought
19 that the proposal -- I'm sorry -- Comment 259 was
20 accepted and said that accepting 441 would create a
21 contradiction or a problem, a conflict with accepting
22 259. So 259 was rejected by the TCC and Mr. Hammerberg
23 is correct.
24 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you,
25 gentlemen.

94

♀

1 Further discussion? Microphone 5.
2 BRUCE FRASER: Bruce Fraser, Fraser Fire
3 Protection, and I'm speaking in favor of the motion.
4 I'm a liaison between NFPA 72 and the ASMEA
5 A17.1 emergency operations committee. And if this

6 motion is not approved, it will leave erroneous and
7 confusing information as a result of reverting back to
8 the TC action on Proposal 72-587.
9 So accepting Comment 72-441 would now more
10 clearly explain the intent of the delay of power shut
11 down which is to allow completion of elevator recall.
12 And also now there will be no conflict with A17.1.
13 So I strongly urge acceptance of Comment
14 72-441 is and ask support of the motion on the floor.
15 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
16 Microphone 5 again.
17 BOB BAIRD: Bob Baird, Independent
18 Electrical Contractors Association, chair of the
19 electrical section. On Tuesday the electrical section
20 voted to support this action.
21 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Thank you.
22 Any further discussion?
23 Any additional comments, Mr. Schifiliti?
24 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: No, sir.
25 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: With that we'll



♀
1 move to the motion on the floor which is to accept
2 Comment 72-441.
3 Please vote now, one if you're in favor of
4 the motion and two if you're opposed.
5 Voting closes in five seconds. Voting is
6 now closed. Motion passes.
7 Is there any further discussion?
8 Microphone 3.
9 FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: Frank VAn Overmeiren,
10 FP&C Consultants. I wish to make a followup motion to
11 CAM 72-3.
12 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: That was a
13 successful motion, so please tell us what your motion
14 is.
15 FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: Wish to return a
16 portion of the report in the form Proposal 72-187A and
17 related Comment -- I'm sorry -- related Comments 72-179
18 through 72-182.
19 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Can you explain why
20 that's necessary?
21 FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: This essentially
22 takes the partial accepting comments -- I'm sorry,
23 accept principal, accept in part, technical committee
24 actions that we did to the water flow switch testing
25 issue, that the technical committee did to the water



♀
1 flow switch testing issue, and reverts it back to the
2 2010 existing code text.
3 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: I'm going to rule
4 that motion is in order. So the motion on the floor is
5 to return a portion of the report in the form of a
6 Proposal 72-187A and related Comments 72-179 through
7 182. Is there a second? Is there a second second?
8 Please proceed.
9 FRANK VAN OVERMEIREN: I have no additional
10 comments other than to process that motion and speak in
11 favor of the motion.
12 PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Mr. Schifiliti.
13 COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: I have reviewed
14 the necessary information with staff and we agree that
15 this is the correct procedure to return to the 2010

language and that's what we're seeking support for.
PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Any further discussion?
Seeing no one at the microphone, we'll move to the vote on the motion on the floor which is to return a portion of the report in the form of Proposal 72-187 and related Comments 72-179 through 182.
Please vote now. Voting closes in five seconds. Voting is now closed. Motion passes.
Any further discussion on NFPA 72?



Seeing no one at the microphone, I want to thank Mr. Schifiliti and the TC Chairs. You did a wonderful job. Greatly appreciate everything you've done.
COMMITTEE CHAIR SCHIFILITI: Thank you, Mr. Bell. And I would like to thank the members for your patience and your participation.
PRESIDING OFFICER BELL: Ladies and gentlemen, this officially concludes this portion of the 2012 Annual Association Technical Meeting. I want to thank each of you for your participation and interest and support and I now declare this part of the meeting officially closed. Thank you.



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 26, 2012

_____
CHRISTY I. PHELPS
CCR NO. 683

25

99

♀

182