



Amy Beasley Cronin  
Secretary, Standards Council

17 August 2011

To: Interested Parties

Subject:

Standards Council Decision (Final):	<b>D#11-23</b>
Standards Council Agenda Item:	<b>SC#11-8-10-a</b>
Date of Decision*:	10 August 2011
NFPA 664, <i>Standard for the Prevention of Fires and Explosions in Wood Processing and Woodworking Facilities</i> , 2012 edition	

Dear Interested Parties:

At its meeting of August 9-10, 2011, the Standards Council considered an appeal on the above referenced matter.

Attached is the final decision of the Standards Council on this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Amy Beasley Cronin".

Amy Beasley Cronin  
Secretary, NFPA Standards Council

- c: D. Berry, M. Brodoff, L. Fuller, M. Curtis, J. Goyette, E. Carroll  
Members, Technical Committee on Wood and Cellulosic Materials Processing (CMD-WOO)  
Members, NFPA Standards Council (AAD-AAA)  
Individuals Providing Appeal Commentary

---

\*NOTE: Participants in NFPA's codes and standards making process should know that limited review of this decision may be sought from the NFPA Board of Directors. For the rules describing the available review and the method for petitioning the Board for review, please consult section 1-7 of the NFPA Regulations Governing Committee Projects and the NFPA Regulations Governing Petitions to the Board of Directors from Decisions of the Standards Council. Notice of the intent to file such a petition must be submitted to the Clerk of the Board of Directors within 15 calendar days of the Date of Decision noted in the subject line of this letter.



Standards Council Decision (Final):	<b>D#11-23</b>
Standards Council Agenda Item:	<b>SC#11-8-10-a</b>
Date of Decision*:	10 August 2011
<i>NFPA 664, Standard for the Prevention of Fires and Explosions in Wood Processing and Woodworking Facilities, 2012 edition</i>	

***SUMMARY OF ACTION (for convenience only; not part of official decision):*** *The Standards Council voted to deny the appeal to accept Certified Amending Motion 664-2 to reject Comment 664-5.*

***DECISION:***

At its meeting of August 9-10, 2011, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Erdem A. Ural of Loss Prevention Science & Technologies, Inc. The appeal requests that the 2012 edition of NFPA 664, *Standard for the Prevention of Fires and Explosions in Wood Processing and Woodworking Facilities*, be issued with the acceptance of Certified Amending Motion (CAM) 664-2, which sought to reject Comment 664-5. The effect of rejecting Comment 664-5 would be the return to the ROP definitions for “Deflagrable Wood Dust” and associated annex material and “Dry Nondeflagrable Wood Dust”.

As background, the Technical Committee on Wood and Cellulosic Materials Processing accepted Committee Proposal 664-8 adding the new definitions and annex material. The definitions were further modified in Committee Comment 664-5. A Certified Amending Motion (CAM) 664-2 sought to reject Comment 664-5 was made at the 2011 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). The motion failed.

The appeals request that the Council overturn the action that was recommended by the codes and standards development process. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA codes and standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results yielded by the NFPA codes and standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that the Committee-approved new definitions, “Deflagrable Wood Dust” and associated annex material and “Dry Nondeflagrable Wood Dust” shown in Comment 664-5 will be in the new edition of NFPA 664.

The Council noted that the appellant presented new information that he said was not available to the Committee during the revision process. It is not for the Council to attempt to evaluate or act on such technical information on its own. Without expressing any view on the technical merits of this information, the Council notes that, if the appellant or others believe that the information is relevant to the content of NFPA 664, they can seek to have it considered along with any proposed revisions during the next regular document revision process, or if the issues are believed to be of an emergency nature, a Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) can be submitted.