



Amy Beasley Cronin
Secretary, Standards Council

17 August 2011

To: Interested Parties

Subject:

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Standards Council Decision (Final): | D#11-24 |
| Standards Council Agenda Item: | SC#11-8-10-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> | |

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): | D#11-24 |
| Standards Council Agenda Item: | SC#11-8-10-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 664-3, which sought to accept Comment 664-6.*

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) 664-3. This motion sought the acceptance of Comment 664-6, which proposed replacing the term “deflagrable” with the term “explosible” throughout NFPA 664.

As background, the Technical Committee on Wood and Cellulosic Materials Processing (TC) accepted Committee Proposal 664-8 adding the new definitions and annex material for the terms “Deflagrable Wood Dust” and “Dry Nondeflagrable Wood Dust.” Subsequently, the TC rejected Comment 664-6 that sought to replace the term “deflagrable” with the term “explosible” throughout NFPA 664. A Certified Amending Motion (CAM) 664-3 that sought to accept Comment 664-6 was made at the 2011 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). The motion failed.

The appeal requests 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 word “deflagrable” will not be replaced with “explosible” throughout the new edition of NFPA 664.

The Council noted the appellant’s request for the Council to direct the use of common terminology for NFPA dust standards. The Council believes that, with the recent creation of the Technical Committee on Fundamentals, and the recent approval for a single Technical Correlating Committee to oversee the dust documents (see Minute Item 11-3-24), appellants can submit issues of correlation and common terminology for the consideration of these committees as appropriate.