



National Fire Protection Association

1 Batterymarch Park, Quincy, MA 02169-7471
Phone: 617-770-3000 • Fax: 617-770-0700 • www.nfpa.org

High Rise Building Safety Advisory Committee

MEMORANDUM

TO: High Rise Building Safety Advisory Committee (HRB-SAC)
FROM: Kristin Bigda, Staff Liaison
DATE: April 7, 2016
SUBJ: Ballots on NFPA 101 and NFPA 5000 Draft Public Comments

Attached you will find ballots on the draft public comments for NFPA 101 and NFPA 5000 prepared at the March 14, 2016 meeting.

The ballots are for formally voting on whether or not you concur with the comments. If you do not concur, or you abstain you **must** provide your reasons for doing so. As with previous ballots you can vote and comment on individual items if you choose.

Please do not vote negatively because of editorial errors. However, please bring such errors to my attention for correction.

Please complete and return your ballots as soon as possible, but not later than **Wednesday, April 20, 2016**. Your cooperation in meeting this deadline is appreciated. You may fax your ballot to (617) 984-7110 or email it to lmackay@nfpa.org.

Attachments: Ballot Forms
Comments

cc: R. Solomon

High Rise Building Safety Advisory Committee (HRB-SAC)

With respect to the draft public comments on NFPA 101 prepared by HRB-SAC at the March 14, 2016 meeting, I:

Agree

Disagree *

Abstain *

Provide reasons if you disagree or abstain.

Return by Wednesday, April 20, 2016.

To: Linda Mackay

Fax: (617) 984-7110

Email: lmackay@nfpa.org

Signature:

Name – Please Print:

Date:

HRBSAC Public Comments – NFPA 101

Public Comment #1: Risk Analysis for Mass Notification Systems

Comment on First Revision: FR-1006

Recommendation:

Add new text as follows -

11.8.4.3 Risk Analysis for Mass Notification Systems. For high-rise buildings with a total occupant load of 2000 or more persons, a risk analysis for mass notification systems shall be provided in accordance with Section 9.14.

Committee Statement:

Mass notification systems may be an important component to larger high-rise building safety and the new provisions of Section 9.14 should be considered for these high-rise buildings with 2000 or more occupants. It is not unusual for large scale high-rise projects to form a risk analysis addressing areas of concern for high-rise buildings. The required risk analysis will consider both fire and non-fire emergencies, which is consistent with the current all-hazard approach being implemented by many high-rise buildings today. Specific characteristics of high-rise buildings may warrant the need for a mass notification system.

High Rise Building Safety Advisory Committee (HRB-SAC)

With respect to the draft public comments on NFPA 5000 prepared by HRB-SAC at the March 14, 2016 meeting, I:

Agree

Disagree *

Abstain *

Provide reasons if you disagree or abstain.

Return by Wednesday, April 20, 2016.

To: Linda Mackay

Fax: (617) 984-7110

Email: lmackay@nfpa.org

Signature:

Name – Please Print:

Date:

HRBSAC Public Comments – NFPA 5000

Public Comment #1: Risk Analysis for Mass Notification Systems

Comment on First Revision: FR-1505

Recommendation:

Add new text as follows -

33.3.1.3 Risk Analysis for Mass Notification Systems. For high-rise buildings with a total occupant load of 2000 or more persons, a risk analysis for mass notification systems shall be provided in accordance with Section 55.13.

Committee Statement:

Mass notification systems may be an important component to larger high-rise building safety and the new provisions of Section 55.13 should be considered for these high-rise buildings with 2000 or more occupants. It is not unusual for large scale high-rise projects to form a risk analysis addressing areas of concern for high-rise buildings. The required risk analysis will consider both fire and non-fire emergencies, which is consistent with the current all-hazard approach being implemented by many high-rise buildings today. Specific characteristics of high-rise buildings may warrant the need for a mass notification system.

Public Comment #2: Mass Timber Construction

Comment on Committee Input: CI-8006

Recommendation:

Do not add proposed Section 7.4.3.6.9

~~7.4.3.6.9 Height of New Hotels and New Apartment Buildings of Mass Timber
The height limitation for New Hotels and New Apartment Buildings of Type IV construction shall be permitted to be increased to nine stories and 100 feet (30 480 mm) where the building is separated by not less than 50 feet (15 240 mm) from any other building on the lot and from adjacent lot lines or lot lines on the opposite sides of public streets, provided all of the following are met:~~

- ~~1. All load bearing structural elements shall be heavy timber complying with Sections 7.2.5.1; and of two hour fire resistance rating in accordance with Section 8.2.1.1.~~
- ~~2. The interior surfaces of all heavy timber walls and ceilings shall be covered by two layers of 5/8" Type X gypsum board, with all edges of the face layer offset 18" from those of the base layer. The base layer shall be attached with 1.75" #6 Type S drywall screws at 12" o.c. in both directions and the face layer to be attached with 2.25" #6 Type S drywall screws at 12" o.c. in both directions offset from the screws in the base layer by 6 inches in both directions. One layer of 5/8" Type X gypsum sheathing shall be attached to the outside of the exterior heavy timber walls with minimum 1 3/4" galvanized roofing nails 12" on center each way and 6" on center at all joints or ends. All panel edges shall be attached with drywall screws or roofing nails located at least 1.5 inches but no more than 2 inches from the panel edge.~~
- ~~3. Fire retardant treated wood, of light frame construction, shall not be permitted as a bearing element in any walls.~~

Committee Statement:

1. The proposed language does not include all occupancies and lacks justification for why the language was focused only on hotels and apartment occupancies and cannot be applied to other occupancies.
2. The proposed language does not require other fire engineering analyses/risk assessments, which are a common and accepted part of the practice in the industry when designing tall timber buildings. New material and new construction techniques should be justified through a detailed engineering analyses. Appropriate results cannot be accomplished with only the requirements contained in the proposed language of Section 7.4.3.6.9.
3. The proposed language is too prescriptive.
4. The 50 ft building separation requirement in 7.4.3.6.8(1) is difficult to meet and too limiting.
5. The authority having jurisdiction should be presented with a risk analysis to determine if the construction is feasible in their jurisdiction.