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ANNOUNCEMENT: Ladies and gentlemen, may I have your attention, please? Today's session will begin at 8:10 to allow those who are still at Registration to join us here in the ballroom. Thank you.

ANNOUNCEMENT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to the 2018 NFPA Technical Meeting. Please take a moment to familiarize yourself with the room, noting exits in the unlikely event of the need to evacuate. Let me remind you being a safety organization NFPA is always concerned for your safety. Please look around for the marked emergency exits. Keep in mind that the nearest emergency exit may be behind you.

In the event of an emergency in the convention center, dial 77911 from any house phone or 702-632-7911. Do not call 911. If there is an emergency requiring evacuation, please follow the directions of the Security staff who are dressed in black uniforms with visible Security arm patches, badges, and name tags. Additionally, an announcement will be made over the public address system, and if necessary, horns and strobe lights will also go off. The fire alarm signal is a long slow whoop along with flashing strobe lights followed by a voice announcement. If you hear the alarm, please quietly leave the room using the exit nearest you. Remember, the nearest exit may be behind you. If you are a person with disabilities who has not already made arrangements with NFPA staff for emergency evacuation, please see someone at the Registration Desk prior to the initiation of today's session. During the Technical Meeting, the use of recording devices of any type is prohibited. The regulations governing the development of NFPA Standards or the Regs primarily govern the NFPA Standards Development Process, including processing of Certifying Amending Motions at Technical Meetings. The complete Regs are available on NFPA's website and published in the NFPA 2018 Standards Directory. As a participant in the process and attendee, you should familiarize yourself with the Guide For The Conduct Of Participants In The NFPA Standards Development Process prior to the start of considerations of today's Certified Amending Motions. Additionally of importance to be familiar with are the NFPA Convention Rules. The Convention Rules establish the process for today's session. Both documents are included in the 2018 NFPA Standards Directory available on NFPA's website.

The Certified Amending Motions of today's session will be taken in the published order of the NFPA Technical Meeting Agenda. For viewing, please see the NFPA website or the NFPA CNE (phonetic) mobile app. The agenda combines all Certified Amending Motions from the Fall 2017 and Annual 2018 Motions Committee Report and identifies which motions will be considered during the Technical Meeting. Only Certified Amending Motions and subsequent Allowable Follow-Up Motions as determined by the Presiding Officer will be entertained at this meeting. An authorized person must sign in as per the convention rules to indicate presence and intention to pursue each Certified Amending Motion. By obtaining your credentials at Registration, you have electronically signed in for these purposes. Statements for the record, statements for which no Certified Amending Motions or Allowable Follow-Up Motion is available shall not be permitted. All Certified Amending Motions were reviewed by the Motions Committee for determination of certification following submission of Notices of Intent To Make A Motion.

For the NFPA Technical Meeting, a quorum is to be established prior to conducting business in consideration of Certified Amending Motions. Should the quorum be lost during proceedings, the session will terminate without further action by the membership. Any Certified Amending Motions not acted upon prior to the loss of quorum shall be forwarded directly to the Standards Council without recommendation of this Meeting for action and accordance with Section 4.7 of the Regs. Any Motions to Amend or Return that pass prior to the loss of quorum shall be processed and forwarded to the Standards Council in accordance with the Reg Sections 4.5.3, 4.6, and 4.7. Any appeals based upon NFPA Technical Meeting Actions must be filed with the Standards Council within twenty days following adjournment. An appeal for any amendment passed at this Meeting which fails Committee ballot shall be filed no later than five days after publication of the amendment ballot results in accordance with Section 4.2.6 of the Regs. Typically, results of amendment ballots are published within twenty days of the Technical Meeting's adjournment. The votes cast at the Technical Meeting, in conjunction with the debate prior to voting, are an
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To officially conduct this meeting, the Presiding Officer will allow each speaker three minutes to speak. However, the Presiding Officer may limit speaking time afforded in the event that this becomes necessary. With one minute remaining, a bell will sound and a timer will appear on the center screen. Once your time has ended, please conclude your remarks.

Following close of debate, the membership will be asked to vote on the motion. Once the vote is final, the Presiding Officer will announce the results of the membership's vote.

If the motion was successful, the Presiding Officer shall entertain follow-up motions, if any. The maker of a follow-up motion shall explain why the motion is in order before the Presiding Officer makes determination as to whether the motion is a proper follow-up motion.

If determined proper, debate on the floor follows the same order as Certified Amending Motions. As presentations and debate of each motion continues, five screens will display the text of the motion:

- Screen 1 will show the recommended text if the motion passes or, should the motion's text be
- Screen 2 will show the recommended text of the Technical Committee and if the motion fails.
- The center screen will show the actual motion and action on the floor that the IMAC (phonetic) camera captures during debate. Following close of a motion's debate and membership vote, the center screen will display the total number of votes in support and in opposition to the motion.

Together we will make the NFPA 2018 Technical Meeting a success. We thank you in advance for your participation and welcome any comments that you may share and suggested improvements for future events.

At this time, I invite you to please take your seats. The 2018 NFPA Technical Meeting will begin shortly. Your efforts to assist us in starting timely are graciously appreciated.

ANNOUNCEMENT: Ladies and gentlemen, may I have your attention please? Would Laurence Dallaire, David Fischler, Stephen Verbil please join your follow award-winners in front of Screen Number 2 at the front of the room? Thank you.

[Music.]

ANNOUNCEMENT: Ladies and gentlemen, we still have individuals checking in, so we're going to get
Start in five minutes. Thank you.

ANNOUNCEMENT: Ladies and gentlemen, we still have a rather long line, and in order to allow as many participants to be in the room as possible, we're going to delay the start until 8:30, but we will be starting at 8:30. Thank you very much.

MR. BELL: Thanks, everyone, for your patience. We now have everybody checked in and everybody is here on stage.

Good morning, and welcome, ladies and gentlemen, to the 2018 Technical Meeting. My name is Kerry Bell, and it's my distinct pleasure to serve as Chair of your Standards Council and to take part in this meeting.

Before I get started, I want to introduce the individuals here with me on stage.

Toward the end of the stage there is Sally Everett, who is NFPA's General Counsel.

To her left is Suzanne Gallagher, who is NFPA's General Counsel.

Behind me --

[Applause.]

MS. BELLIS: My mike's... Oh, my mike is on now. Thank you.

Russ is being recognized today for his active role with the NFPA 13 Restructuring Task Group for the 2019 Edition.

During the development of the 2016 Edition of NFPA 13, several Technical Committees recommended major structural and organizational changes to NFPA's Flagship Standard. This request was approved by the NFPA 13 Correlating Committee, and Russ volunteered to serve as Chair of the NFPA 13 Restructuring Task Group for the 2019 Edition. This task group met face-to-face five times and held more than a dozen conference calls in the eighteen-month window following the printing of the 2016 Edition. Reorganizing and restructuring a document of this magnitude requires both attention to detail and strong leadership skills, both of which Russ exhibited as Chair. Under Russ's direction, the task group developed a methodology for tracking changes of each section of the 2016 Edition to where they were relocated into the 2019 Edition. This effort assured that nothing was lost and that the Technical Committees who would ultimately review and act on the proposed restructured document would not be delayed, tracking changes themselves during the First Draft meeting.

In addition to the tactical approach to the restructuring, Russ educated stakeholders of the impending reorganization, presenting at several industry association conferences, answering questions, and ultimately alleviating any lingering concerns around the restructuring. This monumental effort was completed by the appointed Task Group and presented to the responsible Technical Committees for review. The Technical Committees accepted the majority of the Task Group's work at the First Draft meeting.

The daunting undertaking of this restructuring was made successful and seamless by Russ's personal investment in achieving the task assigned by the Correlating Committee.

MR. BELL: Please join me in congratulating Russ for this Special Achievement Award.

[Applause.]
MR. BELL: On behalf of the Standards Council, we thank Russ for his dedication to the NFPA Standards Development Process.

Now, the second Special Achievement Award goes to Warren Olsen of Fire Safety Consultants, Incorporated, in Elgin, Illinois.

Warren, please come up here on stage.

MS. BELLIS: Warren is being recognized today for his active role as Chair of the Technical Committee on Supervising Station Fire Alarm and Signaling Systems for NFPA 72, National Fire Alarm and Signaling Code.

Warren Olsen has been a member of the Technical Committee on Supervising Station Fire Alarm and Signaling Systems for NFPA 72 since October of 2009. Warren served as Principal and currently acts as Chair of the Technical Committee. When Warren became Chair, his persistence and desire to understand every detail of NFPA 72 led him to schedule a trip from his home in Illinois to meet with the former Chair in California to fully discuss each paragraph of the Code, the intent and reasons supporting each requirement.

During his tenure as Chair, Warren spearheaded a complete review and reorganization of the requirements and recommendations pertaining to the three types of supervising station alarm systems, thus ensuring consistency and parallel requirements leading to increased user-friendliness of the Code.

Similarly, Warren guided the Technical Committee through a number of industry technology breakthroughs, applying revolutionary Code concepts to address these changes.

Additionally to his credit, the Technical Committee on Supervising Station Fire Alarm and Signaling Systems was completely reformed and reorganized.

Through all the challenges and changes, Warren shepherded the project and Technical Committee with steadfast determination.

In addition to his remarkable Committee work, Warren also teaches seminars on the National Fire Alarm and Signaling Code and is a major contributor to the National Fire Alarm and Signaling Code Handbook.

MR. BELL: Please join me again in congratulating Warren for this Special Achievement Award.

[Applause.]

MR. BELL: On behalf of the Standards Council, we thank Warren for his dedication to the NFPA Standards Development Process.

The third and final Special Achievement Award to be presented here this morning goes to John Welling of Bristol-Meyers Squibb in Princeton, New Jersey.

John, please join me on stage.

[Applause.]

MS. BELLIS: John is being recognized today for his significant contributions to pre-incident planning resulting in the first NFPA Pre-Incident Planning Standard for the emergency responder community, community, NFPA 1620.

John has served on the Technical Committee on Pre-Incident Planning for twenty years, recently stepping down from the Chair position after thirteen years of leadership.

John was instrumental in transitioning NFPA 1620 from a Recommended Practice to a Standard. John also represents NFPA’s Industrial Fire Protection Section on the Technical Committee on Loss Prevention Procedures and Practices. He has been a member of NFPA for thirty-four years.

John has been serving on the Technical Committees on Loss Prevention Procedures and Practices since 2013, and also served as a member of the Technical Committee on Mass Evacuation and Sheltering.

MR. BELL: Please join me in congratulating John again for this Special Achievement Award.

[Applause.]

MR. BELL: On behalf of the Standards Council, we thank John for his dedicated, dedication to the NFPA Standards Development Process.

Now, this concludes the Special Achievement Awards. I’d like to move on to the Committee Service Awards, and the Committee Service Awards is given to a Technical Committee Member for their continuous and exemplary service on one or more Committees over a substantial period of time and in recognition and participation in the NFPA Standards Development Process.

I am pleased to present this award to the following very worthy individuals, and our first recipient of the Committee Service Award goes to Joseph Cox.

[Applause.]

MS. BELLIS: Joseph Cox of Chamber of Shipping of America in Washington, D.C. serves on the Technical Committees of Shipbuilding, Repair, and Lay-Up from 1983 to the present. He’s been Chair since 2008 and also served as Chair from 1988 to 1999; Marine Field Service Advisory Committee from 1983 to the present;
MR. BELL: Thank you, Laurence, for your service to the NFPA Standards Development Process. Now, our next Committee Service Award winner is Bradford Cronin. [Applause.]

MS. BELLIS: Bradford Cronin of Newport Fire Department in Newport, Rhode Island serves on the Technical Committees on Cultural Resources from 2015 until present; Building Code and Safety to Life – Residential Occupancies from 2012 to present; Marinas and Boatyard, 2012 to present, being Chair since 2017; Commissioning and Integrated Testing from 2011 to present; Fire Pumps, 2010 to present; Automatic Sprinkler Systems – Residential Sprinkler Systems, 2010 until present; Signaling Systems for the Protection of Life and Property – Carbon Monoxide Detection, 2007 to present; Moss Hazard from 2013 to present; and finally, Mark served on the Code-Making Panel 4 for the NEC from 2002 until 2008.

MR. BELL: Thank you, Brad, for your years of service to NFPA. Now, the next recipient of the Committee Service Award is Karen Lehtonen. [Applause.] MS. BELLIS: Karen Lehtonen of Lion Group, Incorporated, in Dayton, Ohio, serves on the Correlating Committee on Fire and Emergency Services Protective Clothing and Equipment from 2007 to present. He also serves on the Technical Committee on Electrical Equipment of Industrial Machinery from 2003 to the present and has Chaired that Committee since 2008.

MR. BELL: Thank you, David, for your many years of service to the NFPA Standards Development Process. Now, our next Committee Service Award Winner is Mark Hilbert. [Applause.]


MR. BELL: Thank you, Mark, for your years of service to NFPA. Now, the next recipient of the Committee Service Award is Karen Lehtonen. [Applause.] MS. BELLIS: Karen Lehtonen of Lion Group, Incorporated, in Dayton, Ohio, serves on the Correlating Committee on Fire and Emergency Services Protective Clothing and Equipment from 2007 to present. He also serves on the Technical Committee on Electrical Equipment of Industrial Machinery from 2003 to the present and has Chaired that Committee since 2008.

MR. BELL: Thank you, David, for your many years of service to the NFPA Standards Development Process. Now, our next Committee Service Award winner is Mark Hilbert. [Applause.]


MR. BELL: Thank you, David, for your many years of service to NFPA. Now, the next recipient of the Committee Service Award is Karen Lehtonen. [Applause.] MS. BELLIS: Karen Lehtonen of Lion Group, Incorporated, in Dayton, Ohio, serves on the Correlating Committee on Fire and Emergency Services Protective Clothing and Equipment from 2007 to present. He also serves on the Technical Committee on Electrical Equipment of Industrial Machinery from 2003 to the present and has Chaired that Committee since 2008. And, finally, Mark served on the Code-Making Panel 4 for the NEC from 2002 until 2008.

MR. BELL: Thank you, Karen, for your many years of service.

Congratulations now to the next worthy Committee Service Award winner, Norbert Makowka.

[Applause.]

MS. BELLIS: Norbert Makowka, National Association of Fire Equipment Distributors of Chicago, Illinois serves on the Technical Committees on: Aerosol Extinguishing Technology from 2016 to the present as Chair; Portable Fire Extinguishers from 2009 to the present; Commissioning and Integrated Testing from 1998 to the present; Venting Systems for Cooking Appliances, 2004 to the present; Dry and Wet Chemical Extinguishing Systems from 1992 to the present; Signaling Systems for the Protection of Life and Property – Initiating Devices for Fire Alarms and Signaling Systems from 1992 to the present; And Gases on Fire Extinguishing Systems from 1992 until the present.

Norbert also served on the Technical Committees on Foam, Carbon Dioxide, Water Mist Fire Suppression Systems, and Commissioning Fire Protection Systems.

MR. BELL: Okay. Thank you, Norbert, for your many years of service to NFPA.

Our next recipient is Joyce Rizzo.

Joyce, please join me on stage.

[Applause.]


He serves on Building Code Technical Committees receiving awards are:

John Bell of Marine Inspection Services, incorporated, of Channel View, Texas. He serves on the Technical Committee on Gas Hazards.


MR. BELL: Thank you very much, Tom, for your many years of service to NFPA.

MR. BELL: The next Committee Service Award winner is Stephen Verbil.

Stephen, please join me on stage here.

[Applause.]

MS. BELLIS: Stephen Verbil of the Connecticut Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection in Middletown, Connecticut, serves on the Technical Committee on Public Emergency Service Communication. He’s been on this Technical Committee from 1993 until the present and has served as Chair since 2008.

MR. BELL: Thank you, Stephen, for your years of service to NFPA.

Now, we have four Committee Service Award recipients who couldn’t be here with us today, but we want to acknowledge and thank them for the service despite their absence.

MS. BELLIS: The remaining NFPA Technical Committee Members receiving awards are:

John Bell of Marine Inspection Services, incorporated, of Channel View, Texas. He serves on the Technical Committee on Gas Hazards.

Charles Hahl of GDH, Incorporated, of Chantilly, Virginia, serves on the Signaling Systems for the Protection of Life and Property.


He serves on Building Code Technical
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Committees for Structures, Construction, and Materials and Building Construction where he served as Chair since 2006 to 2014. He also serves on Building Code and Safety to Life Technical Committees on Means of Egress and Residential Occupancies. And, finally, Joseph served on the Building Code Technical Committee on Materials from 2003 as Chair through 2006.

Mr. Bell: Again, let’s show our thanks for each of these award recipients.

[Applause.]

Thank you for your sincere appreciation with that, and now I’m going to turn the floor over here to Michael Snyder, the Presiding Officer, who is going to proceed with the order of business for today.

Mike?

Mr. Snyder: Thank you, Kerry.

As introduced, I am Michael Snyder, and as Presiding Officer, I declare that a quorum is present for the purposes of conducting business today.

Let me remind you, being a safety organization, NFPA always is concerned about your safety. Please look around for the marked emergency exits. Keep in mind that the nearest emergency exit may be behind you.

In the event of an emergency in the convention center, on a house phone dial extension 77911 or 702-632-7911. Please do not call 911.

If there is an emergency requiring evacuation, please follow the directions of the Security staff who are dressed in black uniforms in visible Security arm patches, badges, and name tags.

Additionally, an announcement will be made over the public address system, and if necessary, horns and strobe lights will also go off. The fire alarm signal is a slow whoop along with flashing lights followed by a voice announcement. If you hear the alarm, please quietly leave the room using the nearest exit. Remember, the nearest exit may be behind you.

If you are a person with disabilities who has not already made arrangements with NFPA staff for emergency evacuation, please see someone at the Registration Desk prior to the initiation of today’s session.

The votes cast at the Technical Meeting, in conjunction with the debate prior to voting, are an integral and important contribution to NFPA’s consensus process. Through motions, debate, and voting, you, our NFPA membership, make recommendations to the Standards Council. The majority vote results today are for the sole purpose of providing recommendation to the Standards Council prior to the issuance of Standards.

Any appeal based upon Technical Meeting actions must be filed with the Standards Council by July 5th, 2018; that is twenty days following the adjournment of this Meeting. An appeal for any amendment passed at this Meeting which fails Technical Committee or Correlating Committee ballot shall be filed no later than five days after publication of the Technical Committee ballot results in accordance with Section 1.6.2(b) of the Regulations. Typically, results of ballot... Oh, excuse me.

Typically, results of amendment ballots are published within twenty days of the Technical Meeting adjournment.

The Standards Council’s decision on issuance is based upon the entire record before it, including the debate and resulting votes at today’s Technical Meeting. The Standards Council will meet on August 13th through 15th, 2018, to hear appeals and make final determinations on issuing Standards.

Today’s session will include Certified amending, Amending Motions, also known as CAMs, related to NFPA 400, 241, 289, 101A, 13, 13D, 1981, 1001, 1730, 110, 7791, and 72. Please note that the submitters of the Certified Amending Motions for NFPA 51B and NFPA 260 have notified NFPA that they will not be pursuing their CAMs. The Motions Committee, having approved this withdrawal request, therefore has removed NFPA 51B and NFPA 260 from today’s Agenda. NFPA 51B and NFPA 260 have been forwarded directly to the Standards Council for issuance.

Before we move on to the business of today, let’s confirm that your voting devices are operational. You will see on the screen a sample motion that is ready for your review.

I have been informed that approximately the first twenty to thirty people who were issued a voting device today may not see at the top of your options Motion 2018-1. That can simply be remedied by hitting the Refresh button and you should have an entire list of the motions for today’s order of business. If you do not, please return your voting device to the table in which you got it and a new one will be issued to you.

I will call for a test vote in just a moment after we have had time to read the text presented. The motion on the floor is to Accept Public Comment 16. I will then ask, “Is there further...”
MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?

MR. SNYDER:  Sir?

MR. JAMES:  Yes?
MR. SNYDER:  Okay.  We have a second.

MR. SCHWEITZER:  Okay.  I move to move forward with Motion 400-1.

MR. SNYDER:  Okay.  So there is a motion on the floor to Accept Public Comment Number 4.  Is there a second?

MALE SPEAKER:  Second.

MR. SNYDER:  Thank you.  I'll get this straight eventually.

MR. SCHWEITZER:  Okay.  Our industry uses thermosetting polymer resins and glass and carbon fiber to make a wide variety of products like wind turbine blades and recreational boats.  Organic peroxide is one of the substances regulated or included in the Standard on Hazardous Materials is an important part of our process.  The organic peroxide initiators function to initiate the cross-linking reaction that transforms the liquid mix of raw materials into a solid product, and we rely on NFPA 400 to guide the safe use and storage of organic peroxides.  We... There's three ways for us to use and store these materials under the Standard: in control areas, in areas complying with protection level requirements, and in detached, single-purpose buildings.

In the 2016 Standard, tables in Chapters 5 and 14 specify the maximum quantities that are permitted in control areas, in areas complying with protection level requirements, and in detached storage.  The quantity limits for control areas are very small.  Therefore, even uses of this material take place typically in protective, areas meeting protection level.

In the 2019 Standard, however... This is difficult because as I'm speaking, my voice is coming over the speakers with about a one-second delay and it's very hard to talk here, so I'm moving very slowly, and I beg your forgiveness.

In the 2019 Standard, the tables in Chapters 5 and 14 were revised so that the maximum permitted quantities for protection levels were removed.  In other words, in the 2019 Edition, provisions are made for use and for use and storage of organic peroxides in control areas and detached storage only.  This effectively prohibits the use of organic peroxides by my industry.  At the Second Draft stage, we --

MR. SNYDER:  Mister, Mr. Schweitzer, may I ask that you please conclude your comments?

MR. SCHWEITZER:  I'm doing my best.  I misunderstood the procedure.  I am John Schweitzer with the American Composites Manufacturers Association.  Our industry uses thermosetting polymer resins and reinforcing fibers to make a variety --

MR. SNYDER:  Excuse me, sir.  Will you simply just present your motion as to move forward Motion 400-1?

MR. SCHWEITZER:  Okay.  I move to move forward with Motion 400-1.

MR. SNYDER:  Okay.  So there is a motion on the floor to Accept Public Comment Number 4.  Is there a second?

MALE SPEAKER:  Second.

MR. SNYDER:  Okay.  We have a second.  Now, Mr. Schweitzer, if you will proceed with your discussion on the motion.

MR. SCHWEITZER:  Thank you.  I'll get this straight eventually.

MR. SNYDER:  Oh, no problem.

MR. SCHWEITZER:  Our industry uses thermosetting polymer resins and glass and carbon fiber at the Second Draft stage, we submitted a report was submitted by letter ballot of the responsible Technical Committee and the report ballot results can be found in the Next Edition tab of the Document Information page for 400 at www.nfpa.org/400next.

MR. SNYDER:  Thank you, Mr. James.  Let's now proceed with the discussion on the Certified Amending Motions on NFPA 400.
MR. SNYDER: Not at this time.

MR. JAMES: Thank you, Mr. James.

Mr. Snyder, speaking for or against the motion?

MR. SCHWEITZER: Speaking for the motion.

Thank you.

I'd just like to add that the justifications given by Mr. James to my understanding have nothing to do with the safety of these materials as they are used and stored, and I have no reason to question that the language and definitions and provisions of Chapter 14 need to be brought into compliance with the general approaches in Chapter 5 and elsewhere in the Standard.

However, to achieve that, it's probably not necessary to throw my industry out of the Standard for an entire cycle, which I submit is what would happen under the current addition of 2019, the 2019 Edition as it is proposed before the, before the Standards Council. Thank you.

MR. SNYDER: Thank you, sir.

Is there any further discussion on Motion 400-1, which is to Accept Public Comment Number 4?

Mr. Chair, do you have any other final comments?

MR. JAMES: Not at this time.

MR. SNYDER: Thank you, and seeing none we will move to a vote.

Before we vote, let me restate the motion.

The motion on the floor is to Accept Public Comment Number 4. As we have in the practice session, to touch, to vote, touch the "Vote" button.

If you wish to vote in support of the motion and recommend the text on Screen Number 1, touch "Yes."

If you wish to vote against the motion and recommend the text on Screen 2, touch "No."

Please record your vote.

[Voting.]

The voting will be closed in five seconds.

[Voting continued.]

The voting is now closed.

The results of the voting are one hundred and eighty in support of the motion and to recommend the text on Screen 1 and two hundred and forty-six against the motion.

The motion has failed.

Is there any further discussion on NFPA 400?

Seeing none, we will move on to the next document.

Thank you, Mr. James.

The next report under consideration this morning is that of the Technical Committee on Construction and Demolition. Here to present the Committee Report is Committee Chair Bruce Campbell of Jensen Hughes, Georgetown, Texas. The Committee Report, that is the First and Second Draft Reports, is located on the Document Information Page for NFPA 241 on the NFPA website. All Certified Amending Motions are contained in the NFPA Technical Meeting, that is the Tech Session Agenda, and will be displayed behind me on the screen as they are under debate. We will now proceed with the motions as included in the agenda.

Mr. Campbell, will you issue the Committee Report, please?

MR. CAMPBELL: Good morning. Mr. Chair, ladies and gentlemen, the report of the Technical Committee on Construction and Demolitions presented for adoption can be found on the First Draft Report and in the Second Draft Report for the 2018 Annual Revision Cycle. The Technical Committee has published a First and Second Draft Report consisting of revisions to NFPA 241, Standard for Safeguarding Construction, Alteration, and Demolition Operations. These reports were submitted to letter ballot of the responsible Technical Committee. Reports and the ballot results can be found in, on the Next Edition tab of the Document Information page for 241, and you can see the website is www.nfpa.org/241next.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.
MR. SNYDER: Thank you, Mr. Campbell.
Now let's now proceed with the discussion on the Certified Amending Motions on NFPA 241.

Microphone Number 3, please.

MR. HUIE: Marvin Huie, Jacobs Engineering Group. I speak in favor of this motion for it to pass. I guess I'm at the right mike.

MR. SNYDER: Okay. Sir, so you're making a motion to essentially... You're making a motion to reject Second Revision Number One, is that correct?

MR. HUIE: Correct.
MR. SNYDER: Okay. Is there a second to this motion?

MALE SPEAKER: Second.
MR. SNYDER: Okay. There is a second.

Please proceed with your discussion on this motion.

MR. HUIE: I think this wording is really ill-advised. Does a cooking truck comply when it pulls onto the job site? We have a number of crews that will be on the job site throughout a large project. They might have different cooking areas. Depending on the stage of construction, it may not, may or may not be enclosed. How do we designate this? Is it one sign? The sign is inside the cooking area. How do you tell people outside the cooking area that it is, you're in the wrong area or where you need to go? Yes, it's part of training. Just overall I think this is bad wording and leaving the AHJ with a lot of additional authority that may or may not be understood by the contractor.

MR. SNYDER: Thank you, Mr. Huie.

Mr. Campbell, would you like to offer the Committee's position?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes sir.
The Committee evaluated the recommendation and voted against it. The Committee felt that the wording and the text is sufficient for most contractors to understand and that it's, with the rise in fires lately, it's important that we do control cooking. Cooking is one of the major causes of fires in new construction, and we need some sort of wording in there in order to protect against those type of fires, and clearly in the future we can massage those words and try to improve them as we, in the next cycle as we see if there's any input from the community.

Thank you, sir.

MR. SNYDER: Thank you, Mr. Campbell.

With that, we will now open up debate on the motion. I would ask again when you come to the microphone that you please state your name, affiliation, and whether you are speaking in support of or against the motion.

Microphone Number 3.
MR. HUIE: Marvin Huie, Jacobs Engineering Group. I submitted this comment earlier --

MR. SNYDER: Sir, speaking for or against the motion?

MR. HUIE: Speaking for the motion.

MR. SNYDER: Thank you.

MR. HUIE: I submitted this comment early on in the process. The Committee had plenty of time to make modifications to it. If... We just heard additional wording is necessary or additional wording may be required to better clarify. This is not the time to let that happen. A Code goes into place or a Standard goes into place, we should have thought it through, so during the process of the time that we've submitted this until the time it gets through, there is going to be a lot of confusion and a lot of heartache by everyone. I just think it's the wrong process.

MR. SNYDER: Thank you, sir.

Microphone Number 2, please.

MR. SHAPIRO: Good morning. My name is Jeff Shapiro. I'm the proponent of the Second Revision that this CAM is attempting to remove. When I submitted

1. this change, I did it on behalf of the National (unintelligible) --
2. MR. SNYDER: Sir, speaking for or against the motion.
3. MR. SHAPIRO: -- and I am speaking against the motion.
4. MR. SNYDER: Thank you.
5. MR. SHAPIRO: I no longer have any client interest in this. I'm here testifying on my own behalf. Over the past several years I've been very active in studying construction fires, and for the most part we know where construction fires come from, and our standards address those issues. We tend to have problems with enforcement. The issue of cooking on-site was an exception.

An NFPA report entitled Fires In Structures Under Construction And Undergoing Major Renovation Or Being Demolished was published in April 2017. That report showed for the period of 2010 to 2014 cooking equipment was the number one cause of fire ignitions in buildings under construction. Cooking fires were more than twice the number of fires of heating equipment, more than twice the number of fires due to arson, and more than five times the number of fires caused by smoking. Cooking was also associated with
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MR. CAMPBELL: My only final comment is I've 241-1, which is to reject Second Revision Number 1? marshals and authority having jurisdictions, I don't agree. I think the wording is fine. I've acted in the capability of an AHJ for probably twenty years or so, and from my experience, I think the wording is more than adequate, and with the quality of the fire marshals and authority having jurisdictions, I don't agree with my friend, Jeff Shapiro. The wording is unclear. For once, I will agree with my friend, Jeff Shapiro. The wording is pretty clear. Can wording ever be improved? It always can be improved, but the meaning is clear, and if we defeat, if we allow the motion to go through, this information, whether the wording might be slightly modified or not, this information will be in the Standard. Please vote against the motion. Thank you. MR. SNYDER: Thank you, sir. It always can be improved, but the meaning is clear, and if we defeat, if we allow the motion to go through, this information, whether the wording might be slightly modified or not, this information will be in the Standard. Please vote against the motion. Thank you.

MR. SNYDER: -- Mr. Campbell.

Mr. Kelly, as the maker of Certified Amending Motion 241-2, will you be moving your motion at a microphone, please? MR. SNYDER: -- Mr. Campbell.

So I would like to make a general announcement. Throughout the day we will only be taking fifteen-minute breaks and we will not be breaking formally for lunch. We encourage you to leave to get snacks or lunch at your convenience. There is a food court that is open at the bottom of the escalators and a food cart immediately out, sorry, excuse me, a food cart immediately outside this ballroom.

Before we begin debate on the next Standard, I would like to introduce Gary Keith, Member of the Standards Council, who will be the Presiding Officer for motions before the membership on the next two Standards.

MR. KEITH: Thank you. Good morning.

The next report under consideration this morning is that of the Technical Committee on Fire Tests. Here to present the Committee Report is Committee Chair Barry Badders of Intertek Testing Services, Elmendorf, Texas.

As you heard earlier, although NFPA 2, 260 appeared on the originally posted agenda, the submitters of the motion requested to withdraw the motion. Therefore, after approval of the Motions Committee and in accordance with NFPA Rules, Regulations at 4.5.3.7 and Convention Rules at
2.7, the Standard will not be considered at this meeting. NFPA 260 instead becomes a Consent Standard that will be forwarded directly to the Standards Council for issuance or other action. We would like to thank the Committee for their work on this Standard. We will now move on to the Certified Amending Motions for NFPA 289.

Mr. Badders.

MR. BADDERS: Mr. Chair, ladies and gentlemen, the report of the Technical Committee on Fire Tests as presented for adoption can be found in the First Draft Report and in the Second Draft Report for the 2018 annual revision cycle. The Technical Committee has published the First and Second Draft Report consisting of revisions to NFPA 289, Standard Method Of Fire Tests For Individual Fuel Packages. These reports were submitted to letter ballot of the responsible Technical Committee. The reports and ballot results can be found in the Next Edition tab of the Document Information page from NFPA 289 at www.nfpa.org/289next.

MR. KEITH: Thank you.

Let's now proceed with the discussion on Certified Amending Motions on NFPA 289.

Does Ms. Newman want to move Motion 289-1?

MS. NEWMAN: Yes, I do.

MR. KEITH: Sorry.

MS. NEWMAN: Yes. Over here.

MR. KEITH: Got it. Thank you. Please proceed. Thank you.

MS. NEWMAN: Thank you. My name's Kathleen Newman. I'm with Firetect, Inc., and speaking in favor of the motion. The current Code does not address Christmas trees specifically. While it is important to address Christmas trees, the new text has no substantiation. No technical data has been produced to justify these changes. ASTM 3082 may have been considered in this new language, but the impact of these changes has not been studied. NFPA 289, Section 5.5.6, requires four Christmas trees to be conditioned at fifty percent humidity and well-watered for two to four weeks.

Why four Christmas trees? The cost of inventory space and time for trees to be well-watered by lab personnel is going to be exorbitant. Why not one treated and one untreated or why not one treated tree or just several treated branches? There is no definition of what "well-watered" means.

In the new language, all four untreated Christmas trees are to be conditioned for two to four weeks. That is too broad of a range. Wouldn't there be different outcomes when a Christmas tree has been sitting for two weeks compared to four weeks before the flame retardant is applied? Why wouldn't the flame retardant be applied on the first day of conditioning as it would when the tree is installed? ASTM 3082 conditions them for two to four weeks, but that is because these trees are freshly-cut. Trees that will be tested in labs to comply with NFPA 289 have been cut and sitting a Christmas tree lot for several days or weeks. It makes no sense for them to sit another two to four weeks before applying a flame retardant. Then they have no... They... Then they have to go back into conditioning again for another fourteen to seventeen days with twenty percent humidity and no water at all.

There is no mention of cutting the base of the tree. NFPA 1-10.13.9 requires the bottom trunk to be cut off at least a half-inch prior to placing in a tree stand and the water level be maintained above the cut and checked daily to give the tree ability to absorb the water. ICC Section 806 requires the bottom of tree trunks to be cut half-inch and the water level cover the tree by at least two inches. NFPA 289 states that after the first conditioning the fire retardant treatment is applied, but by whom? The lab? What is the cost impact? What if the flame retardant needs to be applied in a different manner?
NOTE: This is the unedited transcript of the 2018 Annual Meeting Tech Session. It was scribed during the Tech Session and has not been proofed for accuracy.

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 1
June 14, 2018

1. The product is placed under the hood and the heat release is measured in the hood. Heat and smoke release and so on is measured in the hood. Like all the other products that are used and tested in this type of test, there are no pass/fail criteria because the pass/fail criteria appropriately belong in the Code. Whether it's the NFPA Code or the ICC Code, it doesn't matter. None of the tests, and there are a whole variety of single items that are tested to NFPA 289, none of them have phosphorus criteria.

2. The exact criteria, the exact details of the conditioning were developed by a Task Group that looked at all the proper, proper considerations, and if you look at the language, they're talking about four trees are conditioned, and of the four trees, two are treated and two are untreated. Typically this is the, the process that is conducted in the fire test lab like all other associations, all other procedures that precede a fire test.

3. So I urge you to vote against the motion. This was properly discussed and is ready for primetime. Thank you.

4. MR. KEITH: Thank you.

5. Microphone Number 1, please.

6. MS. NEWMAN: Kathleen Newman, Firetect, Inc., voting in favor of the motion. I just wanted to say that the five people that were on the Task Group, four of them either are lab-associated or they sell lab equipment. I do not believe that the cost studies have been done, nor was there any technical support. Simply it was mimicking the other ASTM Code, and so I think that that needs to be improved upon and that should be considered. Thank you.

7. MR. KEITH: Thank you.

8. Microphone Number 7, please.

9. MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH International, speaking (unintelligible) against the motion. Excuse me for coming again. If this Section is removed, there will be nothing on conditioning, and we're dealing with testing trees. Trees need to be conditioned so we know the exact type of humidity that is required.

10. Ms. Newman mentioned the ASDM Standard, ASDM 3082. In the ASDM Standard, the trees are also conditioned. So if you were to support this motion, then there would be no conditioning in NFPA 289 for treating Christmas trees. That is wrong. Please oppose the motion. Thank you.

11. MR. KEITH: Thank you.

12. Microphone Number 1, please.

13. MS. NEWMAN: One more time. Kathleen Newman...
I'm with Firetect, Inc., and I'm voting in favor of the motion. The motion states to reject an identifiable part of Second Revision 2 and any related portion of First Revision Number 19.

MR. KEITH: Thank you.

Do we have a second?

MALE SPEAKER: Second.

MR. KEITH: We have a second.

Mr. Badders... Mrs., Ms. Newman, please proceed.

MS. NEWMAN: There is no need to add a (unintelligible) newspaper ball. While you are watching a Christmas tree being burned, there is no reason for additional visual aids, especially when it is optional. No information about who determines the option or what the criteria would be for determining the addition of this newspaper ball. Thank you.

MR. KEITH: Thank you.

Mr. Badders, the Committee’s position?

MR. BADDERS: Yes, thank you.

The Technical Committee added language allowing a paper target to be used as an optional visual aid to provide a visual aid indicating heat flux. SR2 was balloted and passed eighteen affirmative votes, zero negative votes, and zero abstentions. The submitter of the Certified Amending Motion voted affirmative for the Second Revision.

MR. KEITH: Thank you.

We will now open up to debate on the motion. Again, please provide your name, affiliation, and whether you are speaking in support or against the motion.

Microphone 7, please.

MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH International, speaking for (unintelligible) and against the motion. This... Again, let me try to bring you up to date on what the test is. This test is a furniture calorimeter, so it's a product that's placed under the, the hood and you expose the product and then you measure heat release and smoke release and various other things in the hood, but one of the interesting things when you... If this were a room as opposed to a furniture calorimeter, you want to see whether there's flashover. Since this is open, there's no flashover. In a room test like NFPA 286, you put this type of paper target. It is a requirement to put that in as an indicator of flashover. Clearly when we have a furniture calorimeter where there is no room, there is no flashover, but the paper indicator gives you an indication of about twenty to twenty-five kilowatts per...
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Mr. Chair, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to make note of the service of Mr. Joseph Versteeg, Chair of the Committee on Automatic Sprinkler Systems. Here is what he says: “The previous cycle there was another excuse, but they didn't want to do it. This is something that will be a more effective approach. The Committee is making a positive move.”

I would like to introduce James Quiter, Member of the Correlating Committee. Mr. Quiter is a很...
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MR. LINDER: No.

See nothing further to add, Mr. Linder?

Okay, seeing no debate, I presume you have motion.

MR. QUITER: Thank you, Mr. Linder.

13-3 to make the, the Standard correct.

MR. LINDER: I think since we've passed offer the Committee's position?

Chapter 3. Thank you.

Chapter 4. Now we then have to delete the definitions from Chapter 3. Thank you.

MR. QUITER: Mr. Linder, would you like to offer the Committee's position?

MR. LINDER: I think since we've passed Motion Number 13-1, we need to pass Motions 13-2 and 13-3 to make the, the Standard correct.

MR. QUITER: Thank you, Mr. Linder.

With that we will open up debate on the motion.

Okay, seeing no debate, I presume you have nothing further to add, Mr. Linder?

MR. LINDER: No.

MR. QUITER: Okay. So before we vote, let me restate the motion. The motion on the floor is to Accept Public Comment Number 53. To vote, touch the "Vote" button.

If you wish to vote in support of the motion and recommend the text on Screen 1, touch "Yes."

If you wish to vote against the motion and, and recommend the text on Screen 2, touch "No."

Please record your vote.

[Voting.]

The voting is closed.

The voting will be closed in five seconds.

[Voting continues.]

The voting is closed.

Thank you.

The results of the vote are four hundred and sixteen in support of the motion and recommend the text on Screen 1 and sixteen against the motion and recommend the text on Screen 2. The motion has passed.

The next motion on NFPA 13-4 appeared in our agenda. However, the authorized maker of the motion has NF, has notified NFPA that he no longer wishes to pursue this motion. Therefore, in accordance with NFPA rules, the motion may not be considered by the assembly and is removed from the agenda. We will now move on to the next motion.

Let's now proceed with the discussion on Certified Amending Motion 13-3.

Microphone, please.

MR. ASP: I'm Roland, I'm Roland Asp representing the Engineering and Standards Committee of the National Fire Sprinkler Association, and I make a motion to accept 13-5 to reject Second Revision 386 and related portions of First Revision 751.

MR. QUITER: Thank you.
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| 1. There is a motion on the floor to Reject Second Revision Number 386 and any related portions of First Revision Number 751. Is there a second? MALE SPEAKER: Second. MR. QUITER: We do have a second. Please proceed with the discussion on the motion. Microphone 6. MR. ASP: Thank you. An motion has been added to NFPA 13 to require that adjustments be made with, based on information from the water authority. This CAM seeks to reject this proposed language and return to the language of the 2016 Edition including the annex language. The annex language recommends that adjustments be made where appropriate. This is the appropriate language for NFPA 13 and as such please support this CAM. Thank you. MR. QUITER: Mr. Linder, would you like to offer the Committee's position? MR. LINDER: I will defer to the Technical Committee Chair, Russ Leavitt. MR. LEAVITT: Good morning again. Russ Leavitt, Chair of the Sprinkler System Discharge Criteria Technical Committee. Water supply is a foundational issue with sprinkler systems, so this has been a discussion as was mentioned by the submittter with the, with the Technical Committee for a long time. There has been long concern expressed by many stakeholders over the validity of water flow testing and, and making sure that it is valid as we design and based our system criteria on this water supply. First Revision 751 which was referred to actually did two things: It provided a formula that was based on the lowest static pressure available. If this was not available from the water authority, then it would mandate a ten percent reduction of the, the static pressure that was read. This generated a lot of comment. It resulted in a first revision. There were a number of negative votes because there were concerns about this. The research project that was, report came out during that intervening time between the first revision and the public comment period explaining the fact that having a mandatory reduction at this time, there's just not enough data. There are too many variables.

So when the Committee came back and addressed this issue, a Task Group was formed because the Committee was grappling with this. A Task Group was formed. It was a broad range of stakeholders within the Technical Committee. They came back with a recommendation that the language be inserted that, yes, there would be a requirement to apply a reduction, but that reduction would be the result of an evaluation where you would go to the annex and look at all the different factors that could do that.

I think it's important to realize that this was a, a, a monumental effort that resulted in a unanimous vote by the Committee. Out of thirty-four members, thirty-three submitted ballots. All thirty-three were affirmative, one with comment not in regard to the comment, but in regards to some of the language and definition.

So the Committee worked on this, voted unanimously to require this reduction with the, or this evaluation in reduction with the feeling that it's important to this foundational part of fire sprinkler design. Thank you.

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

Microphone number 4.

MR. CAPUTO: My name is Bob Caputo, I'm with Fire and Life Safety America, and I rise to speak against the motion on the floor. Without guidance provided in NFPA 13, we get the Wild West of requirements, everything from designing a system right to the water supply curve that's been reported to fire departments and locations where we are seeing requirements of a ten percent up to a forty percent or a forty PSI reduction for safety margins.

It seems incredible that we do hydraulic
The NFSA was against that language, but it still passed. The second reason I'm against this is a use of water test data. Now, that's a key statistic saying that what we're doing is working, and so when you figure in that in ninety percent, ninety-seven percent of the cases fire control was achieved with five or few sprinklers, and in seventy-nine percent of the cases, one sprinkler was found to be effective. So this, doesn't really solve all of the problems. If we have a declining water supply that's related to occlusion of piping, this is only going to mask the problem. It's going to give a false sense of security. So what NFSA is in favor of is an evaluation of all water supplies. Having been a practicing fire protection engineer for a number of years, I evaluated every water supply that I looked at. We, we just take umbrage with making an adjustment to every water supply without having appropriate guidance.

The other thing is having been one of the authors of the Fire Protection Research Foundation calculations down to the tenth of a PSI and relate this to a water supply test that doesn't take into account any seasonal variation, any aging of the piping system, or future development of the area in which the facility or building is being built, not to mention piping changes that are normal under construction conditions, aging of fire pumps, sizing of fire pumps, and a host of other reasons for us to be a little bit more conservative and consider a safety margin when we look at the evaluation of the available water supply.

Without specific guidance, we continue to see very matter of fact, "let's do it this way or that way" across the country. This is needed. As mentioned by Chairman Leavitt, this is consensus, unanimous decision of the Committee, and I urge your "no" vote on this matter. Thank you.

MR. QUITER: Thank you.

Also Microphone Number 4.

MR. ISMAN: Thank you. My name is Ken Isman, and I'm with the University of Maryland, and I'm speaking against the motion. There are three reasons I'm speaking against this motion this morning:

The first is a technical reason. The way the standard is written, the way it's proposed by the NFSA, is that there will be no adjustment required to a water supply test. Boy, this is really hard. The delay is amazing. There's no adjustment required for a water supply test. So a contractor can go out at any time they want when they know the water supply is strong, run a test, and use that data all the way up to the last ounce of pressure, and not make any adjustment to that, and we all know that's wrong, and yet the authority having jurisdiction will not have any ability to point to any Section of NFPA 13 and say, "You violated this Section. I, I can't allow you to do that." NFPA 13 can't allow that kind of irresponsible use of water test data.

The second reason I'm against this is a procedural issue. The NFSA has, has been a bad participant in the consensus process. There was different language in the first draft of the Standard. The NFSA was against that language, but it still passed the Committee by a two-thirds vote, and even though we understood we had the two-thirds, we bent over backwards at the second draft to, to fix the language so that the NFSA Reps would be happy with it, and all of the NFSA Reps at the meeting said they were happy with the language we developed, and as the Chair said, the vote was unanimously in favor of this language, and then afterwards they filed the demand to take the language out. We have bent over backwards to deal with the issues they were concerned with. We've got some decent language. Quite frankly, I was more happy with the language at the first draft, but we revised it to make the NFSA folks happy, and they're still coming back here and asking you to throw that language out, and that's not being a good participant in the consensus process.

And, finally, I'm against this language or against the motion because the NFSA has represented this as returning to 2016 language, but that's not correct. What's in the 2016 Edition is at least an annex note that tells you it's a good idea to adjust the information, and that annex note is gone. If you look at the language that the NFPA has given us, it doesn't show that that annex text is coming back. So it's not a return to 2016 text. It's taking everything that's ever been in the Standard out of the document on this subject, and that's wrong. Thank you.

MR. QUITER: Can you say whether you're for or against the motion please?

MR. HOPKINS: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm, I'm in favor of the motion, and there's, there's really one key thing here is that the U.S. experience with sprinklers speaks against what Mr. Isman just stated. In terms of when sprinklers operated during fires, there has been a ninety-six percent effectiveness. Now, that's a key statistic saying that what we're doing is working, and so when you figure in that in ninety percent, ninety-seven percent of the cases fire control was achieved with five or few sprinklers, and in seventy-nine percent of the cases, one sprinkler was found to be effective.

So this, doesn't really solve all of the problems. If we have a declining water supply that's related to occlusion of piping, this is only going to mask the problem. It's going to give a false sense of security. So what NFSA is in favor of is an evaluation of all water supplies. Having been a practicing fire protection engineer for a number of years, I evaluated every water supply that I looked at. We, we just take umbrage with making an adjustment to every water supply without having appropriate guidance.

The other thing is having been one of the authors of the Fire Protection Research Foundation.
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takeaway was that this is a communication issue. We
just need to communicate with water purveyors, get the
information, figure out how to appropriately evaluate
water supplies. Thank you.

MR. QUITER: Thank you.

Microphone Number 4.

MR. CAPUTO: Yes. Once again, Bob Caputo,
Fire and Life Safety America, speaking against the
motion on the floor. I'd just like to make two points
in rebuttal to what we just heard.
The first is NFPA 13 is a design and
installation document and not every state of
jurisdiction requires an engineer of record or an
engineering review. So we have fire sprinkler
contractors who may or may not have a P.E. on staff
performing water flow tests and providing whatever
evaluation might be involved at that particular level.

Secondly, the data spoken to with regard to
the number of activated sprinklers required to control
a fire speak to past history of design where fire
sprinkler systems had a remote area that included about
fifteen hundred square feet or more. Today we have
quick response sprinklers and area reductions with a
lot of our systems being designed with only five or
perhaps even four sprinklers in the first place. So
we've reduced the number of sprinklers designed to
function in the first place which increases the need
for the reliability of the water supply and speaks to
a reasonable reduction or a reasonable safety margin
in the evaluation of that water supply to support those
five or four sprinklers that have now been included in
our area design. Thank you.

MR. QUITER: Thank you.

Microphone Number 3.

MR. BACKER (phonetic): My name's Jack Backer
(phonetic). I'm for the motion. I'm a fire sprinkler
contractor in California. I've been designing and
calculating sprinkler systems for sixty years. This
is my sixtieth year. I'm also an F.P.E. in California.
I've analyzed water supplies since 1960. Every one is
different. I would just hate to see that the "shall"
word that's in this document will force me to put fire
pumps in on projects, projects that are not in need of
it, and when I put a fire pump in, I diminish the pipe
size, I put less sprinklers in, I put smaller sprinklers
in, I reduce the volume, and now my system's based on,
on a pump working. I've always used the word "where
applicable." "Where appropriate." Every water
company's different. There shouldn't be a rule for

MR. QUITER: Also at Microphone Number 3.

MR. BOWE: My name is Timothy Bowe. I'm
voting for the motion. ABCO Peerless Sprinkler, New
York City. I'm a fire protection contractor, and I have
no problem putting in more equipment. It's going to
cost more money. We're going to reduce the reliability
of these systems because in many instances we will now
need emergency power. The emergency power requirements
will be significant, and there is going to be more
maintenance required for the fire pump, for the
emergency generator, testing, maintenance, and
increased cost for the owner, and I ask you to please
vote for the motion. Thank you.

MR. QUITER: I'm going to continue at
Microphone 3, and then go to 4, and then 6.

Microphone 3.

MR. STANLEY: My name is George Stanley,
Wiginton Fire Protection Engineering. I have over...
I'm speaking in favor of the motion. I have over
forty years of experience of designing systems,
calculating, working with water supplies. I have the
greatest respect for Mr. Isman, he has taught me quite
a bit over the last twenty years, but in this case I
feel like he's wrong.

MR. ISMAN: Thank you. Ken Isman with the
Standard. Thank you.

MR. QUITER: Thank you.

Microphone Number 4.

MR. ISMAN: Thank you. Ken Isman with the
University of Maryland, and I'm against the motion.
Just rebuttal for some of the things you've heard.
First of all, this ninety-six percent
effectiveness with sprinklers, that data has been
generated with more than a hundred years of sprinklers
and a requirement for an adjustment in the Standard. I
went back as far as I could go looking back into the
1960s of NFPA 13 additions and there's been a
requirement for an adjustment to the water flow test
data in all of those Sections, in all of those editions
of NFPA 13 all the way back to, to the 1960s and I'm
sure even before that. I just couldn't find older

MR. QUITER: Thank you.

Microphone Number 4.

MR. STANLEY: My name is George Stanley,
Wiginton Fire Protection Engineering. I have over...
I'm speaking in favor of the motion. I have over
forty years of experience of designing systems,
calculating, working with water supplies. I have the
greatest respect for Mr. Isman, he has taught me quite
a bit over the last twenty years, but in this case I
feel like he's wrong.

MR. ISMAN: Thank you. Ken Isman with the
Standard. Thank you.

MR. QUITER: Thank you.

Microphone Number 4.

MR. ISMAN: Thank you. Ken Isman with the
University of Maryland, and I'm against the motion.
Just rebuttal for some of the things you've heard.
First of all, this ninety-six percent
effectiveness with sprinklers, that data has been
generated with more than a hundred years of sprinklers
and a requirement for an adjustment in the Standard. I
went back as far as I could go looking back into the
1960s of NFPA 13 additions and there's been a
requirement for an adjustment to the water flow test
data in all of those Sections, in all of those editions
of NFPA 13 all the way back to, to the 1960s and I'm
sure even before that. I just couldn't find older
editions to look at. So it's only since 2013 that this requirement's been completely eliminated from the NFPA Standards. In 2010 it was eliminated from 13 and in 2013 it was eliminated from NFPA 24. So we've generated a whole bunch of data about how good sprinklers are and how well they work with this safety margin required, and you can't use that data as justification for eliminating the safety margin. So that's an inappropriate use of data to say that sprinklers work without this adjustment. The data that says sprinklers work was generated with this adjustment.

The statement that every system is different is absolutely true. That's why the language the Committee developed specifically speaks to appropriate adjustments, and if you really have a mature water supply that is not going to change in any way, shape, or form and you can document that, then you have applied appropriate procedures and you meet what's in the language that the NFPA Committee came up with. So there really isn't any really good reason to throw this language out. The Committee's done a really good job of taking into account all of these concerns, and I think we need to just trust the Committee now.

MR. QUITER: Okay. I did think I repeated everybody understands the motion that's being voted. If you wish to vote in support of the motion to Call The Question and one needs to scroll down to the bottom to vote that. I'm, I'm not sure if you wish to vote against it, touch "No." To vote on Calling The Question, you scroll down to the bottom of the tablet to vote. So then if you wish to vote yes in support of the motion, touch "Yes." If you wish to vote against it, touch "No." So can we re-open and... Okay.

If you, you wish to vote in support of the motion, touch "Yes." In order to vote on this motion, please scroll down to the bottom of the tablet to vote. If you wish to vote against the motion, touch "No." Please record your vote.

MR. QUITER: We do have a second.

MR. ASP: Hi, I'm Roland Asp representing the NFSA speaking for the motion. I just wanted to rebut point three that Ken made, Ken Isman made, is the annex language from the 2016 is part of this motion. I confirmed that with NFPA Staff this morning.

MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH International. I Call The Question.

MR. QUITER: Thank you.

MR. QUITER: Microphone Number 6.

MR. ASP: Hi, I'm Roland Asp representing the NFSA speaking for the motion. I just wanted to rebut point three that Ken made, Ken Isman made, is the annex language from the 2016 is part of this motion. I confirmed that with NFPA Staff this morning.

MR. QUITER: You've got to be kidding me.

MR. QUITER: Second.

MR. QUITER: -- but we'll proceed with the vote on the Call Of The Question.

MR. QUITER: Okay.

MR. QUITER: Second.

MR. QUITER: Second.

MR. QUITER: Second.
and recommend the text on Screen 1, touch "Yes."
If you wish to vote against the motion and
recommend the text on Screen 2, touch "No."
Please record your vote.
[Voting.]
The voting will close in five seconds.
[Voting continues.]
The voting is closed.
The results of the vote are two hundred and
eighty-eight in support of the motion and recommend the
text on Screen 1, two hundred and forty-four against
the motion and recommend the text on Screen 2.
Therefore, the motion has passed.

MALE SPEAKER: Point of order, Mr. Chair.
Microphone 6.

MALE SPEAKER: Yes, microphone 6.
MR. QUITER: Can we get confirmation on the
record from the NFPA of the last statement that was
made that in, since this motion passed, is the annex
language from the 2016 Edition going to appear in the
2019 Edition even though it's not in the portion of the
report that says what's going to happen if the motion
passes?
MR. QUITER: Okay.
I am told that any previous edition text will
be applicable.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you.
MR. QUITER: Okay. At this point we are
going to take a fifteen minute break. Please be back
at according to my watch 10:47.
(End of audio.)
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JAMES QUITER: Please make your way to your seats here. We are reconvening in one minute. (BACKGROUND VOICES)

JAMES QUITER: Okay. I'm going to call the meeting back to order. Let's now proceed with the discussion on Certified Amending Motion 13-6. Microphone Three, please.

SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: Okay. Good morning. My name is Sagiv Weiss-Ishai, and I'm with the San Francisco Fire Department, and I'm speaking in favor of the motion.

JAMES QUITER: Okay. You, you have to make the motion first, Sagiv.

SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: All right. The motion is to Reject the Second Correlation, Revision Number Nine, and I'm speaking in favor of the motion.

JAMES QUITER: Okay. So give me --
used for elevators are extremely non-combustible. They need a flashpoint of about 600 degrees Fahrenheit, to get ignited. There is no documented hydraulic fires in elevator pit.

Now, what is the problem? The problem - I don't care about one sprinkler in a pit, but I care about the requirement that is an NFPA 72, Section 21.3.7, that says where sprinkler are located in the bottom of the hoist way, fire detection devices shall be installed in the pit, in accordance with Chapter 710. So NFPA 72 requires fire alarm devices in the pit, to initiate recall.

The main reason for this proposal is when we remove the sprinklers, we don't need the fire alarm initiating devices. We don't need people that are doing fire alarm work be inside elevator pit. The statistics that we have today from OSHA is that every year, 31 people die inside the elevator hoist way, and 17,000 people get injured in elevator hoist ways. We're trying to prevent known elevator people from being in elevator pit. This is for life safety.

Thank you.

JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Mr. Linder, would you like to offer the Committee's position?

KENNETH LINDER: Yes, thank you. This motion actually came from the Correlating Committee, back to the Installation Criteria Committee. Sprinklers in elevators, and any associated rooms comes up every single year. There's people who want them there. There's people who don't want them there. And it bounces back and forth. And for as long as I've been on the Committee, I, I can't remember a cycle where something didn't come up, and no one ever seems to be happy.

So what the Committee has tried to do here is go back and correlate with other Standards, and try to come up with language that is consistent across multiple Standards, that's reasonable, and I would encourage people to vote against the motion on the floor.

JAMES QUITER: Thank you, Mr. Linder. With that, we will open up debate on the motion. A reminder to please provide your name, affiliation, and whether you're speaking in support of, or against the motion. Motion - Microphone Number Six, please.

JOHN KAPPLA (phonetic): Hi, I'm - oh, that is an echo. I'm John Kappla with Boehm (phonetic) International. We represent a lot of the high rise building owners in the country, and actually around the world. Initially, when --
JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Microphone Number Four, please.

GEORGE STANLEY: George Stanley, Wiginton Fire System, speaking against the motion. It just doesn't make sense to me that you would have a elevator shaft, at the bottom, unprotected, where this debris does accumulate, and there's evidence of fires. And this elevator could be, then, the means of egress before it's locked down, shut down - so speaking against the motion.

JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Microphone Number One, please.

ED KAMINSKI: This is Ed Kaminski from Clark County Building and Fire Prevention, but today, speaking for myself, not for the County. But this is - what, what, what's the --

JAMES QUITER: In favor, or against the motion?

ED KAMINSKI: My, my - I'm speaking in support of the motion. I would believe that it would be somewhat of an anomaly, if, if we would have a fire concurrent with a leak of - with the hydraulic fluid, which has a high flashpoint, somewhere in the order of 600 degrees Fahrenheit. I know some of the other speakers have talked about elevator pit fires. These were not really sorted between hydraulic versus traction elevators. But with respect to the hydraulic elevators, I, I believe it would be somewhat if an anomaly to have the ignition at the same time as the leak, and the leak would be discovered because that elevator would be taken out of service. Thank you.

JAMES QUITER: Microphone Number Six, please.

LAWRENCE TAYLOR: Yes. My, my name is Lawrence Taylor, and I represent the National Elevator Industry, Incorporated, and I am the retired Chief Elevator Inspector from the sovereign state of Texas. I am speaking in support of this motion. There - do occasionally have fires in elevator hoist ways, but there isn't - 150 years of the use of flammable...
MALE SPEAKER: Oh. I'd like to call the vote.

JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Microphone Number One, please.

MALE SPEAKER: There are lots and lots of people who have no training, no knowledge, no awareness of the hazards that they're going to encounter being in those pits. The debris that everybody seems to be focused on generally is dirt - dirt, a pack of cigarettes, some paper, gum, that if it catches fire and burns - I'm not a fire engineer, but I don't believe you could get enough heat out of some dirt, toilet paper, cigarette packages, and candy bar wrappers to ignite something that takes 600 degrees to ignite it. The hazards of being in that pit far exceed any hazard to the public from having that sprinkler removed out of there. And I would ask for your support in that regard. Thank you.

JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Microphone Number Two, please.

BOB UPSON: Bob Upson, NFSA, speaking in opposition to the motion. I - as a retired firefighter in a small town, I've had some experience with elevator pits, and I can tell you that there is a lot more debris than just dirt. And among that debris, there was occasionally (unintelligible) pads full of hydraulic fluid. So there, there is a, a qualitative difference in what kind of rubbish you find in hydraulic pits versus traction pits. And it does warrant a higher level of protection.

With regard to the life safety of people charged with servicing the, the alarm components, that needs to be addressed in NFPA 72 - not in 13. We need to protect these areas. They are sources of fires. There is a hazard above and beyond what we find in traction pits. Thank you.

JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Microphone Number Three, please.

STEVEN LEWIS: Hello. My name is Steven Lewis, and I represent Fire Life Safety Integrators. I'm based in Northern California, and I'm for the motion. And my whole purpose is, I have lost two co-workers due to working in unsafe environments. And if we can protect one life with that, I think that's very important. So I'm in favor of it.

JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Microphone Number One, please.

MALE SPEAKER: Oh. I'd like to call the vote at this time. I call for a motion, to call for a vote.

JAMES QUITER: I think you mean Call the Question?

MALE SPEAKER: How do I say it, please?

MALE SPEAKER: Call the Question.

JAMES QUITER: Call the Question. Okay. There is a motion from the floor to Call the Question. I notice that there are a number of people remaining at the microphones waiting to speak, but we'll proceed with the vote on the Call of the Question. Do we have a second?

MALE SPEAKER: Second.

MALE SPEAKER: Second.

MALE SPEAKER: Second.

JAMES QUITER: We do have a second. In order to vote on this motion, please scroll down to the bottom of the tablet to vote. If you wish to vote in support of the motion, touch Yes. If you wish to vote against the motion, touch No. Please record your vote. The voting will be closed in five seconds. The voting is closed. The results of the vote are: 437 in favor of calling the question; and 79 against the motion to Call the Question. The motion has passed.

That then brings us back to the vote. Before we vote, let me restate the motion. The motion on the floor is to Reject Second Correlating Revision Number Nine. To vote, touch the Vote button. If you wish to vote in support of the motion, and recommend the text on Screen One, touch yes. If you wish to vote against the motion, and recommend the text on Screen Two, touch No. Please record your vote. The voting will be closed in five seconds. The voting is closed. The results of the vote are 321 in support of the motion and recommend the text on Screen One. 203 against the motion, and recommend the text on Screen Two. Therefore, the motion has passed.

MALE SPEAKER: Point of privilege?

JAMES QUITER: Go ahead.

MALE SPEAKER: If the Chair would entertain a question, please?

JAMES QUITER: Go ahead.

MALE SPEAKER: Is it appropriate for the Chair to entertain that a Call to Question is out of order?

JAMES QUITER: No.

MALE SPEAKER: There are lots and lots of people who want to speak on something; it just seems that --

MALE SPEAKER: (unintelligible)

JAMES QUITER: Pardon?
### Certified Amending Motion Number Seven.

**FEMALE SPEAKER:** Question (unintelligible)

**JAMES QUITER:** Yes, a Call the Question is in order at any time. It is not debatable. Okay. Let's proceed with the discussion on Certified Amending Motion 13-7. Okay.

**SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI:** I'm --

**JAMES QUITER:** Microphone Number Three.

**SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI:** I'm Sagiv Weiss-Ishai with San Francisco Fire Department, and I withdraw Certified Amending Motion Number Seven.

**JAMES QUITER:** No?

**JAMES QUITER:** Go ahead, go ahead and state your name, and your --

**SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI:** I'm --

**JAMES QUITER:** Microphone Number Three.

### Certified Amending Motion Number 13-8. Microphone Three, please.

**JIM PETERKIN:** Jim Peterkin with TLC Engineering for Architecture. I'd like to move Motion 13-8, to Reject Second Revision 429, and any related portions of First Revision 658. Is there a second?

**MALE SPEAKER:** Second.

**MALE SPEAKER:** Second.

**MALE SPEAKER:** Second.

**JAMES QUITER:** We do have a second. Please proceed with the discussion on the motion.

**JIM PETERKIN:** Thank you. This provision that's been added to the 29 --

**JAMES QUITER:** Go ahead, go ahead and state your name, and your --

**JIM PETERKIN:** Sorry.

**JAMES QUITER:** -- position again.

**JIM PETERKIN:** Jim Peterkin of TLC Engineering for Architecture, speaking in favor of the motion.

This provision that has been added to the 2019 edition of the NFPA 13 allows for the omission of automatic sprinklers in vestibules that are less than 150 square feet of noncombustible, or limited combustible construction, and where there are no combustibles within the vestibule. The justification for this is that it can be difficult to route piping to the vestibule, and sprinklers in the vestibule are subject to freezing.

While we appreciate the Committee's desire to reduce the probability of sprinklers freezing, and the difficulty of routing the piping, we see this as a continual policing issue, to try to keep combustibles out of the vestibule. For instance, you, you have a rainy day, and they put in the walk-out mats to reduce slipping, fall hazards. Now we've got combustibles in the vestibule. So we just think it's an issue that just - that doesn't make sense, and we think - feel sprinklers should be there. We've been sprinklering these areas for many, many years. Yes, it's difficult. Yes, you have to make - take provisions to prevent freezing. But it's been being done. Why can't we continue to do that? I urge your support of NFPA 13-8.

**JAMES QUITER:** Thank you. Mr. Asp had submitted a similar CAM. However, I'm going to go to the Committee Chair, Mr. Linder, first, and then come to Microphone Six.

**KENNETH LINDER:** I'm going to defer to the Technical Committee Chair, Ray Grill.

**RAY GRILL:** Thank you.

**JAMES QUITER:** Thank you. Mr. Asp had submitted a similar CAM. However, I'm going to go to the Committee Chair, Mr. Linder, first, and then come to Microphone Six.

**ROLAND ASP:** Hi. I'm Roland Asp of the NFSA, and I'm in support of this motion. Vestibules should not be left unprotected, regardless of the size or construction type. The type - the fact that these vestibules may be part of the path of egress is a life safety concern, and sprinklers need to be installed. In an emergency, people tend to exit the same way they entered the building, and it could be through this potentially unsprinklered entrance vestibule. I believe this is dangerous, and should not be permitted.

Additionally, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to keep combustibles out of these vestibules. I've seen these vestibules with sofa, and other furniture; they're, they're often placed in these vestibules. And as we know, modern furniture is a significant fire load. Other combustibles, such as...
| James Quitter | Thank you. Microphone Number Two.  
1. I have experienced the sprinklers breaking, and taking the whole system out of service now, for a time being.  
2. It is difficult to route. I don’t see a life safety hazard. The people are mere steps away from getting out of the building. I urge - spoke against this motion.  

| Dave Dagenais | My name’s Dave Dagenais, and I’m speaking on behalf of the Healthcare Section, in favor of the motion. At our annual business meeting, the Healthcare Section voted to support this motion.  
1. From a healthcare perspective, we have challenges of preventing things from entering these locations. By eliminating this requirement, it will diminish the level of safety that exists within a healthcare facility. Healthcare is always - wants to have good codes that support the cost associated with safety, in reality, as we support this motion, and we ask that you do not diminish this level of safety.  
2. Jeff Hugo: Thank you. Jeff Hugo with the National Fire Sprinkler Association, in support of the motion. We’ve got to look at what this vestibule is.  
3. I mean, I think the intent is to have this appendage vestibule on the outside of a building. But what if the vestibule was underneath the protected building? Could we eliminate sprinklers out of there? According to this text, we could. What about if we have a - a sprinkler - parking garage, and we have an entrance into a - a mercantile occupancy? That’s a - that would be considered a vestibule. We could eliminate sprinklers out of there.  
4. Keep in mind, while every occupant in the means of egress is protected from the point of wherever they’re egressing from the building to the out, they have the means of protective, means of egress. At this point, as Mr. Asp has said, you know, more than half of the people are going to exit out of the vestibule they came in. As fire inspectors, and Code officials, where do you find deadbolts, and where do you find illegal locking devices? It’s on these vestibules. And we’re taking the sprinklers out of it. I think this is a bad idea. I think this does not correlate with the means of egress that we find in the, the Model Building Codes, and this is going in the wrong direction. Vote green.  

| Dave Lowrey | Dave Lowrey, City of Boulder Fire-Rescue, speaking against the motion. I, I guess when you, when you look at this, it’s for a very small vestibule; kind of the idea of the Committee was the, the vestibule that kind of sticks out from the rest of the building, typically made of glass, noncombustible, very little items in there. If a particular industry, maybe like it’s been pointed out, with the healthcare | Jeffrey Hugo | Thank you. Jeff Hugo with the National Fire Sprinkler Association, in support of the motion. We’ve got to look at what this vestibule is. I mean, I think the intent is to have this appendage vestibule on the outside of a building. But what if the vestibule was underneath the protected building? Could we eliminate sprinklers out of there? According to this text, we could. What about if we have a - a sprinkler - parking garage, and we have an entrance into a - a mercantile occupancy? That’s a - that would be considered a vestibule. We could eliminate sprinklers out of there. Keep in mind, while every occupant in the means of egress is protected from the point of wherever they’re egressing from the building to the out, they have the means of protective, means of egress. At this point, as Mr. Asp has said, you know, more than half of the people are going to exit out of the vestibule they came in. As fire inspectors, and Code officials, where do you find deadbolts, and where do you find illegal locking devices? It’s on these vestibules. And we’re taking the sprinklers out of it. I think this is a bad idea. I think this does not correlate with the means of egress that we find in the, the Model Building Codes, and this is going in the wrong direction. Vote green. |
industry, wants to install a sprinkler in their vestibule - install the sprinkler in the vestibule. It's not prohibiting a design that says, 'You shall not install that.' It's just saying that for very small vestibules that are noncombustible, and don't contain combustibles, it's not needed. That was the intent that we were looking at.

JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Microphone Number Three.

MARTY HUIE: Marty Hui, Jacobs Engineering, representing myself. If that was the intent, let's write it in there.

JAMES QUITER: Are you for or against the motion?

MARTY HUIE: Speaking for the motion. If that was the intent, for a 150 square foot appendage to the building that's glass - should have been written into the Code. As it was spoken earlier, Energy Code requires vestibules for anything greater than 4,000 square feet. So we'll have many, many vestibules within the building throughout many of our healthcare entrances and exits. So all these vestibules could be removed, much of them, much of them greater or less than 150 square feet, following you in the requirement. If it was an appendage, glass, let's write it. The other argument that we heard earlier was having a parking garage with a vestibule. There was a - somebody reported recently in, in a discussion about this, where a car ran into the vestibule, and the extinguisher inside the vestibule actually helped put out the fire. So I, I urge you not to - I urge you to support this document.

JAMES QUITER: Okay. And also Microphone Number Three.

MATTHEW MERTENS: Matthew Mertens, North Shore Fire, speaking in favor of the motion; also a Fire Marshal who does deal with this issue quite a bit. When you start placing combustibles and other things in a path of egress, that's a daily occurrence for us, a daily policing. And I guess that - if people want to have flexibility to move forward, and do construction and design methods, those are things that need to be handled at the point of construction. But the majority of our life in the Fire Service is dealing with buildings after they have their C of O - how you maintain that. No one's going to remember that they're not supposed to put combustibles in that, after they're gone, after the general contractor is gone, and the documents are put in the file. All right?

The other piece that I have in contrast is, the way the language is written, it - should this motion be defeated, is it specifically prohibits me as the AHJ from requiring them to put it in there, because the language does say, 'Shall not be required within the entrance.' It doesn't give me the flexibility to say, 'You know, I think you need to put it in there.' It's telling me, 'No, you can't put it in there.' Thank you.

JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Is there any further discussion on Section, on Motion 13-8? If not, Mr. Linder, do you have any further comment?

KENNETH LINDER: My only comment is - we debated this long and hard. It is a small space, 150 square foot maximum, or less, no combustibles. It's there. People inspect their sprinklers. They inspect their buildings. I don't think it's that big a deal to, to make sure that there aren't combustibles in these areas. And I think I would ask you to support the Committee, and vote No.

JAMES QUITER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Before we vote, let me restate the motion. The motion on the floor is to Reject Second Revision Number 429, and any related portions of First Revision Number 658. To vote, touch the Vote button. If you wish to vote in support of the motion and recommend the text on Screen One, touch Yes. If you wish to vote against the motion and recommend the text on Screen Two, touch No. Please record your vote. The voting will be closed in five seconds. The voting is closed. Thank you. The results of the vote are 427 in support of the motion, and recommend the text on Screen One; 96 against the motion, and recommend the text on Screen Two. The motion has passed. Is there any further discussion on NFPA 13? Seeing none, we will move on to the next document.

Here to present Part Two of the Committee Report is Correlating Committee Chair Kenneth Linder, Swiss Re, of Stafford Springs, Connecticut. The Committee Report, that is the First and Second Draft Reports, is located on the Document Information Page for NFPA 13D, on the NFPA website. All Certified Amending Motions are contained in the NFPA Technical Meeting (Tech Session) Agenda, and will be displayed behind me on the screen as they are under debate. We will now proceed with the motion as included in the Agenda. Mr. Linder.

KENNETH LINDER: The second part of the Committee's Report is on NFPA 13D. The Technical Committee has published a First, and a Second Draft
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 34</th>
<th>Page 36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>living area. This would make the pool area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>indistinguishable from the living area. As SR-7 would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>allow this area to be, you know, have - to have no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>protection, you would have half the living area with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>sprinklers and half without this - without it. So I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td>urge everybody to vote in support of this CAM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td>JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Mr. Linder, would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td>you like to offer the Committee's position?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td>KENNETH LINDER: I will defer the - to Ken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td>Isman, Chair of the Technical Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td>JAMES QUITER: Go ahead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td>KEN ISMAN: Thank you. My name is Ken Isman,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td>and I'm with the University of Maryland, and I'm the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td>Chair of the Committee on Residential Sprinkler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td>Systems. So the Committee considered this carefully,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td>and we looked at the, the situation with the pool, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td>the situation with the tennis courts a little bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td>differently. In the case of the swimming pool, you've</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td>got the difficult problem of the corrosion issues in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td>the chlorine environment, and the concern that a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td>homeowner is not going to be able to really recognize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td>the corrosion concerns involved with maintaining a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td>sprinkler in that environment. And when you look at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td>that environment, and you think about just what the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td>fire load really is in the pool, the Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 35</th>
<th>Page 36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>Report consisting of revisions to NFPA 13D, Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>for the Installation of Sprinkler Systems in One and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>Two Family Dwellings, and Manufactured Homes. These</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>reports were submitted to letter ballots of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>responsible Correlating and Technical Committee. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td>reports and ballot results can be found on the Next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td>Edition tab of the Document Information Page for NFPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td>13D at <a href="http://www.NFPA.org/13Dnext">www.NFPA.org/13Dnext</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td>JAMES QUITER: Thank you, Mr. Linder. Let's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td>now proceed with the discussion on the Certified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td>Amending Motions on NFPA 13D. Microphone Six, please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td>ROLAND ASP: My name is Roland Asp,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td>representing the National Fire Sprinkler Association,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td>and I'm - and I would like to move Motion 13D-1 to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td>Reject Second Revision Number Seven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td>MALE SPEAKER: Second.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td>MALE SPEAKER: Second.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td>JAMES QUITER: There, there is a motion, and a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td>second on the floor to Reject Second Revision Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td>Seven. Please proceed with discussion on the motion,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td>and identify yourself again, please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td>ROLAND ASP: Hi. My name is Roland Asp. I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td>represent the NFSA, and this - this motion seeks to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td>Reject Second Revision Number Seven which would permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td>sprinklers to be omitted from attached, enclosed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 36</th>
<th>Page 37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>swimming pools and tennis courts, provided there is at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>least one exit door to the exterior. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>substantiation for omitting sprinklers in these areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>includes the assertion that these areas have no, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>limited fire loading. Providing a blanket exemption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td>for sprinklers in this area is not a good idea for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td>several reasons. There's nothing in this section that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td>would specifically prohibit living spaces above this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td>pool or tennis court, and the cited lack of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td>combustibles is certainly not assured. These areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td>tend to be used to store all sorts of combustibles and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td>pool furniture; and pool furniture, just like any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td>other modern furniture, is a significant fire load.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td>These spaces also tend to be used for entertainment,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td>and this could lead to a source of ignition, such as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td>heaters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td>Additionally, the possibility exists that a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td>floor can be installed over the pool, which would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td>allow an increased occupant load. This is actually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td>quite common. There's many, many websites - you can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td>buy these pool covers that you can, you know, walk on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td>I've worked on - I have also worked on 13D systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td>with attached, enclosed pools, and have seen these</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td>equipped with disappearing walls. The entire wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td>just folds up, and it becomes, in effect, part of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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facilities in our area in the winter. The other thing
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Also, pool houses often become large storage
most areas the ability to even regulate any of that.

There's nothing in a residential situation that gives
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filled with kids, combustibles, and materials.

20

the tennis courts, which I've seen filled with bouncy

mats on the floor of what, what is normally a tennis
court, and they are highly flammable. Thank you.
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JAMES QUITER: Microphone Number Three, please.

MATTHEW MERTENS: Matthew Mertens, North Shore
Fire, speaking for the motion. Again, this is a
situation where the use of the space is really coming
into play. There's a lot of things that I don't think
are being addressed as part of this very simple text
that's being provided. It's not addressing, again,
the tennis courts, which I've seen filled with bouncy
houses and everything else for a winter's - a party,
filled with kids, combustibles, and materials.

There's nothing in a residential situation that gives
most areas the ability to even regulate any of that.
Also, pool houses often become large storage
facilities in our area in the winter. The other thing
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that's not addressed is 13D is also used in some cases
for small healthcare, residential CBRF uses, depending
on what your health authority and your state will
allow you to do. And you may have people that are
incapable of self-preservation. The exiting does not
have anything to do in the language, with being to
grade. A lot of these are up on platforms with
retaining walls. They have stairs going to the
outside. They may have access, but there's nothing in
the language about that access needing to be at grade
for people who are incapable of self-preservation, due
to disability or age, to move forward out of the
space. I encourage you to support the motion.

JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Microphone Number
Three, please.

JACK THACKER: My name is Jack Thacker. I'm a
contractor, and I'm for the motion. I've got two
homes going in California right now, and I don't
understand the, the verbiage here. It says enclosed
and attached. My swimming pool is below the bedrooms,
so I guess that's enclosed, but I'm not sure I should
eliminate sprinklers there. Well, I'm not sure what
this thing says. And I'm, I, I issue - or I would
suggest you vote green, as (unintelligible).

JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Is there any further
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and tenability in the room of origin for the occupants
of the home. As indicated by Mr. Isman, residential
sprinklers are inappropriate for these to begin with,
for these spaces to begin with. But we talked earlier
about the cost and impact of sprinklers in mudrooms or
vestibules, and the benefit thereof. So how in the
world are we going to protect against freezing of
these particular attached and enclosed structures that
are probably not very well insulated, not constructed
the way the home is constructed. And I think this is
going to add significant cost - although if you have a
home with an indoor tennis court and swimming pool, I
probably don't care what it costs you to protect it; I
just don't think this is aligned with the intent of,
and, and the purpose of NFPA 13D, Fire Sprinkler
Systems. So I urge to vote against the motion, and I
thank you.

JAMES QUITER: Okay. Seeing no further comment
- Mr. Linder.

KENNETH LINDBERG: I, I think I'd like to remind
everybody that - as many people have - these are for
one and two family dwellings. They're, they're small
places. We have tried to keep the protection
economical, so that we can continue to get them
supported and, and put in more homes, and more places
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afiliation, and whether you are speaking in support
of, or against the motion. Microphone Eight, please.

WILLIAM FISKE: Thank you, Chairman. My name
is William Fiske, and I'm speaking for myself, in
support of the motion. Now, a swimming pool really
can't be very much multi-use. But it's awfully easy
to make a tennis court multi-use. And one of the
things that comes to mind, for example, would be a
wrestling room. Now, you've got, you know, these foam
mats on the floor of what, what is normally a tennis
court, and they are highly flammable. Thank you.

BOB CAPUTO: Thank you. Bob Caputo, Fire and
Life Safety America, speaking against the motion. I'm
not privileged enough to live in a home that has an
indoor pool or tennis court, but one of the basic
tenets of NFPA 13 is affordable fire and life safety,
NOTE: This is the unedited transcript of the 2018 Annual Meeting Tech Session. It was scribed during the Tech Session and has not been proofed for accuracy.
the proposed Standard, as interpreted by the Committee Chairman, creates and actually makes worse is the very situation it was intended to correct. It does not provide a universal EBSS, but rather provides a universal connector, and will create a safety issue on the fire ground. The standardized connector will only allow new, 2018 compliant SCBAs to interconnect. By implementing this change, it will immediately render older SCBA from previous Standards incompatible.

So in essence, the universal EBSS requirement as proposed will provide a universal connection for all SCBA moving forward, but it fails to consider those SCBA that are already in the service. For departments that need to replace damaged SCBA, or perhaps acquire a new fire truck equipped with SCBA, those new SCBA, specifically the EBSS connection, will be incompatible with their fleet of SCBA. To put it more simply, they will no longer be compatible within their own department. In addition, from neighboring departments that supply mutual aid services to one another, and currently have the same manufacturer SBCA, which is typical in many cities and counties, there are compatibility issues that arise, as well.

If one of those departments buys a new 2018 compliant SCBA, even from the same manufacturer, they will have lost compatibility with their neighboring department for mutual aid. For these reasons, 3M Scott filed the NITMAM to prevent this unintended safety issue from being propagated into the new 2018 Standard. It is on these ground of unintended safety issues that Scott recommends that the paragraph 6.6 of the proposed Standard be modified to revert to the original language of the 2013 edition. Thank you.

DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you. Mr. Rossos, would you like to offer the Committee's position?

DANIEL ROSSOS: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. You know, this is a critical, a critical issue. As a firefighter and a fire officer, I've been with the Fire Service over 30 years. We've seen in, in real live situations, the, the, the difficulty we face in rescuing our self. We're, we're trained in rescuing citizens. But unfortunately, sometimes we're put in positions of rescuing our self. We have two means of doing that now. One is through the RIC fitting that we established in 2002, the RIC UAC that delivers air to the breather. The other is through the EBSS. And the EBSS was just approved for 2013.

One of the primary issues that we deal with as firefighters, especially with fittings, trying to deliver air to each other, is, is the complexity of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 50</th>
<th>Page 51</th>
<th>Page 52</th>
<th>Page 53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>support this Technical Committee with the performance and design requirements for a universal EBSS fitted.</td>
<td>compatibility with those SCBA that they may have, either within their department or within the departments that they run mutual aid for. So I would encourage a vote in favor of the motion.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In our subsequent Correlating Committee letter ballot, the membership voted overwhelmingly affirmative to forward and process the 1981 document, as developed under the NFPA process by the Technical Committee. I want to note, on that Correlating Committee ballot, there were no negative votes, including by the member of the Technical Committee that made the motion.</td>
<td>DANIEL O’CONNOR: Thank you. I would like to go to Microphone Number Four next.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a matter of firefighter safety, and speaking for the Correlating Committee, I’m voting against the motion.</td>
<td>ROBIN GAINEY: My name’s Robin Gainey. I’m representing the International Association of Firefighters.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL O’CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. Let’s go to Microphone Number Eight again.</td>
<td>DANIEL O’CONNOR: Are you for --</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL PARSON: Bill Parson, with 3M Scott, and I’m speaking for the motion. I would make the point that the concept of the universal EBSS is a solid concept, and I think the Chairman’s points around that were very well made. The concern is around the tens and hundreds of thousands of SCBA that are in the, in the marketplace right now. The reality is, the - for departments that run mutual aid, or active aid and support each other, they’ve been able to address the concerns and the issues that the Chairman pointed out, by having similar manufacturer - similar manufacturers, and addressing the EBSS issue.</td>
<td>ROBIN GAINEY: I am definitely against the motion, without a question.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What the new Standard and the verbiage, as interpreted, provides is really no compatibility back to those tens and hundreds of thousands of SCBA that are already in the marketplace. A solution for this is really to allow the manufacturers to include an option for the AHJ to choose to have a third fitting, in addition to the universal fittings, that would allow backwards compatibility if that department needed that for either departments that they ran mutual aid, or for compatibility within the department itself.</td>
<td>DANIEL O’CONNOR: Thank you.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the 3M Scott representatives on the Committee voted in favor for this, that was exactly what we expected. When we discussed with our certifying agency this as our proposal for the, the SCBA that we would put forward for the new Standard, the certifying agency engaged the Chairman, and was provided an interpretation that that would not be allowed. That’s the reason for the NITMAM that we filed, to make the motion to remove this. Our, our choice would be to have the universal fitting so that going forward we would have the compatibility for all manufacturers, but also allow the AHJ the latitude to be able to add a fitting that would allow</td>
<td>MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long past, with zero opportunity to do what is needed. I understand the value of this proposed Standard change first hand. The entire Committee debated this, and I will add my affirmation to the fact that the debate was thorough, and insightful, and very overwhelming. I stand here representing over 300,000 professional firefighters that have long awaited this proposed Standard - what it affords us - the opportunity for us to save our brothers and sisters by ensuring that one connection in the dark, in the heat, is there, that you can give lifesaving air to those in need.</td>
<td>ROBIN GAINEY: I’m on the Committee with Dan, and some other gentlemen in here. I’m also a frontline firefighter. I work in a city that we respond 12,000 times last year with potential SCBA use. I started in the Fire Service 40 years ago, when we were using low pressure hoses, and the elephant trunks, and the stuff that we have fortunately gone</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of us began our Fire Service in the last century. We remember wishing for something like this for so many decades. NIOSH has approved this technology, making it able - safe, reliable, and easy to use. And the only issue became the selection of one single type connection. That selection was made, debated, and identified as being acceptable to all manufacturers. It - the question of mutual aid is critical, and that, that occurs - but I will tell you in the dark and the heat, multiple types of connections are not the answer. One single connection is always the answer. It’s not a matter of if, but when you need to</td>
<td>ROBIN GAINEY: I’m a voting member of the Committee.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBIN GAINEY: Are you for --</td>
<td>DANIEL O’CONNOR: Are you for, or against the motion, Sir?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBIN GAINEY: Are you for --</td>
<td>DANIEL O’CONNOR: Are you for, or against the motion, Sir?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBIN GAINEY: I’m definitely against the motion, without a question.</td>
<td>MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBIN GAINEY: I’m on the Committee with Dan, and some other gentlemen in here. I’m also a frontline firefighter. I work in a city that we respond 12,000 times last year with potential SCBA use. I started in the Fire Service 40 years ago, when we were using low pressure hoses, and the elephant trunks, and the stuff that we have fortunately gone</td>
<td>ROBIN GAINEY: I’m on the Committee with Dan, and some other gentlemen in here. I’m also a frontline firefighter. I work in a city that we respond 12,000 times last year with potential SCBA use. I started in the Fire Service 40 years ago, when we were using low pressure hoses, and the elephant trunks, and the stuff that we have fortunately gone</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support this Technical Committee with the performance and design requirements for a universal EBSS fitted.</td>
<td>compatibility with those SCBA that they may have, either within their department or within the departments that they run mutual aid for. So I would encourage a vote in favor of the motion.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In our subsequent Correlating Committee letter ballot, the membership voted overwhelmingly affirmative to forward and process the 1981 document, as developed under the NFPA process by the Technical Committee. I want to note, on that Correlating Committee ballot, there were no negative votes, including by the member of the Technical Committee that made the motion.</td>
<td>DANIEL O’CONNOR: Thank you. I would like to go to Microphone Number Four next.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a matter of firefighter safety, and speaking for the Correlating Committee, I’m voting against the motion.</td>
<td>ROBIN GAINEY: My name’s Robin Gainey. I’m representing the International Association of Firefighters.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL O’CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. Let’s go to Microphone Number Eight again.</td>
<td>DANIEL O’CONNOR: Are you for --</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL PARSON: Bill Parson, with 3M Scott, and I’m speaking for the motion. I would make the point that the concept of the universal EBSS is a solid concept, and I think the Chairman’s points around that were very well made. The concern is around the tens and hundreds of thousands of SCBA that are in the, in the marketplace right now. The reality is, the - for departments that run mutual aid, or active aid and support each other, they’ve been able to address the concerns and the issues that the Chairman pointed out, by having similar manufacturer - similar manufacturers, and addressing the EBSS issue.</td>
<td>ROBIN GAINEY: I am definitely against the motion, without a question.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What the new Standard and the verbiage, as interpreted, provides is really no compatibility back to those tens and hundreds of thousands of SCBA that are already in the marketplace. A solution for this is really to allow the manufacturers to include an option for the AHJ to choose to have a third fitting, in addition to the universal fittings, that would allow backwards compatibility if that department needed that for either departments that they ran mutual aid, or for compatibility within the department itself.</td>
<td>DANIEL O’CONNOR: Thank you.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the 3M Scott representatives on the Committee voted in favor for this, that was exactly what we expected. When we discussed with our certifying agency this as our proposal for the, the SCBA that we would put forward for the new Standard, the certifying agency engaged the Chairman, and was provided an interpretation that that would not be allowed. That’s the reason for the NITMAM that we filed, to make the motion to remove this. Our, our choice would be to have the universal fitting so that going forward we would have the compatibility for all manufacturers, but also allow the AHJ the latitude to be able to add a fitting that would allow</td>
<td>MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long past, with zero opportunity to do what is needed. I understand the value of this proposed Standard change first hand. The entire Committee debated this, and I will add my affirmation to the fact that the debate was thorough, and insightful, and very overwhelming. I stand here representing over 300,000 professional firefighters that have long awaited this proposed Standard - what it affords us - the opportunity for us to save our brothers and sisters by ensuring that one connection in the dark, in the heat, is there, that you can give lifesaving air to those in need.</td>
<td>ROBIN GAINEY: I’m on the Committee with Dan, and some other gentlemen in here. I’m also a frontline firefighter. I work in a city that we respond 12,000 times last year with potential SCBA use. I started in the Fire Service 40 years ago, when we were using low pressure hoses, and the elephant trunks, and the stuff that we have fortunately gone</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of us began our Fire Service in the last century. We remember wishing for something like this for so many decades. NIOSH has approved this technology, making it able - safe, reliable, and easy to use. And the only issue became the selection of one single type connection. That selection was made, debated, and identified as being acceptable to all manufacturers. It - the question of mutual aid is critical, and that, that occurs - but I will tell you in the dark and the heat, multiple types of connections are not the answer. One single connection is always the answer. It’s not a matter of if, but when you need to</td>
<td>ROBIN GAINEY: I’m on the Committee with Dan, and some other gentlemen in here. I’m also a frontline firefighter. I work in a city that we respond 12,000 times last year with potential SCBA use. I started in the Fire Service 40 years ago, when we were using low pressure hoses, and the elephant trunks, and the stuff that we have fortunately gone</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support this Technical Committee with the performance and design requirements for a universal EBSS fitted.</td>
<td>compatibility with those SCBA that they may have, either within their department or within the departments that they run mutual aid for. So I would encourage a vote in favor of the motion.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In our subsequent Correlating Committee letter ballot, the membership voted overwhelmingly affirmative to forward and process the 1981 document, as developed under the NFPA process by the Technical Committee. I want to note, on that Correlating Committee ballot, there were no negative votes, including by the member of the Technical Committee that made the motion.</td>
<td>DANIEL O’CONNOR: Thank you. I would like to go to Microphone Number Four next.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a matter of firefighter safety, and speaking for the Correlating Committee, I’m voting against the motion.</td>
<td>ROBIN GAINEY: My name’s Robin Gainey. I’m representing the International Association of Firefighters.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each edition of our SCBA Standards takes years to overcome, and if we vote yes to this, it’ll be 10 to 15 years before general use of this connection is found in the Fire Service for us, the firefighters that are crawling up and down the hallways, in the dark and in the heat. Let’s not let that occur. Short term drawbacks to this is, is, is short term, and easily overcome by technology and moving forward. I stand very strongly, very strongly against this motion. Let’s move forward, and save firefighters in the future, starting today.

DANIEL O’CONNOR: Thank you, Sir - with three seconds to spare. Very good. Microphone Number Seven, please.

STEVE WEINSTEIN: My name is Steve Weinstein, with Honeywell. I’m speaking against the motion. I’m the Secretary of the NFPA Technical Committee on Respiratory Protection Equipment. I’ve been a member of the Committee since 1985. Scott’s motion states that without being able to retain the pre-2018 fittings, along with the new 2018 fitting, logistical and safety issues could arise if new SCBAs with 2018 fittings are added to a fleet of SCBAs with pre-2018 fittings, creating incompatibility within the fire department itself, and with neighboring jurisdictions. There’s a simple answer to that - upgrade. Change the pre-2018 fittings on the older SCBAs to the 2018 fittings. SCBA manufacturers can submit upgrade kits for certification, to allow a 2013 NFPA compliant SCBA to be upgraded to 2018 certification. They don’t even have to wait for upgrade kits to be certified. Scott has had almost 10 months since they filed their NITMAM to submit the 2018 fittings as an extension of approval to their 2013 SCBA. There’s nothing preventing them, or any other SCBA manufacturer from doing that. The fittings would be listed on their 2013 NIOSH and NFPA approval matrices, as alternate fittings. Then, when their 2018 NFPA compliant SCBA is certified, a department with 2013 compliant SCBAs that has changed over to the new fittings would be immediately compatible.

Scott’s motion essentially challenges the idea of standardization. They’re saying that because full, industry-wide standardization cannot be achieved immediately, it shouldn’t happen at all. If you - if you vote in favor of Scott’s motion, you’re saying that NFPA Standards should never be changed because the new product will be different from the old product, and a fire department could face incompatibility, either with neighboring departments, or internally, if they add new units to old units without upgrading the old units. But that has always been the case, and the industry not only accepts it, they demand it.

The Fire Service always has driven, and always will drive changes to NFPA 1981, because equipment continually has to improve to keep up with changes, and firefighting conditions, and techniques. Firefighter safety is not threatened by standardization, as Scott’s motion would have you believe; it is enhanced. I urge you to vote against the amendment.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you.

DANIEL O’CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. I’m going to go to Microphone Number Eight, and then we will come back to the gentlemen at Two. Number Eight, please.

BOB HINALL (phonetic): My name is Bob Hinall. I’m with 3M Scott Safety, and I’m in favor of the amendment.

STEVE WEINSTEIN: My name is Steve Weinstein, with Honeywell. I’m speaking against the motion. I’m the Secretary of the NFPA Technical Committee on Respiratory Protection Equipment. I’ve been a member of the Committee since 1985. Scott’s motion states that without being able to retain the pre-2018 fittings, along with the new 2018 fitting, logistical and safety issues could arise if new SCBAs with 2018 fittings are added to a fleet of SCBAs with pre-2018 fittings, creating incompatibility within the fire department itself, and with neighboring jurisdictions. There’s a simple answer to that - upgrade. Change the pre-2018 fittings on the older SCBAs to the 2018 fittings. SCBA manufacturers can submit upgrade kits for certification, to allow a 2013 NFPA compliant SCBA to be upgraded to 2018 certification. They don’t even have to wait for upgrade kits to be certified. Scott has had almost 10 months since they filed their NITMAM to submit the 2018 fittings as an extension of approval to their 2013 SCBA. There’s nothing preventing them, or any other SCBA manufacturer from doing that. The fittings would be listed on their 2013 NIOSH and NFPA approval matrices, as alternate fittings. Then, when their 2018 NFPA compliant SCBA is certified, a department with 2013 compliant SCBAs that has changed over to the new fittings would be immediately compatible.

Scott’s motion essentially challenges the idea of standardization. They’re saying that because full, industry-wide standardization cannot be achieved immediately, it shouldn’t happen at all. If you - if you vote in favor of Scott’s motion, you’re saying that NFPA Standards should never be changed because the new product will be different from the old product, and a fire department could face incompatibility, either with neighboring departments, or internally, if they add new units to old units without upgrading the old units. But that has always been the case, and the industry not only accepts it, they demand it.

The Fire Service always has driven, and always will drive changes to NFPA 1981, because equipment continually has to improve to keep up with changes, and firefighting conditions, and techniques. Firefighter safety is not threatened by standardization, as Scott’s motion would have you believe; it is enhanced. I urge you to vote against the amendment.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you.

DANIEL O’CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. I’m going to go to Microphone Number Eight, and then we will come back to the gentlemen at Two. Number Eight, please.

BOB HINALL (phonetic): My name is Bob Hinall. I’m with 3M Scott Safety, and I’m in favor of the amendment. Firefighter safety is not threatened by standardization, as Scott’s motion would have you believe; it is enhanced. I urge you to vote against the amendment.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you.
DANIEL O'CONNOR: Okay. Thank you.

DAVID FISHLER: I'm a retired fire chief, 29 years career Fire Service; 43 years in the Volunteer Fire Service. I've been involved in my career with multiple firefighter fatalities. Some of them were involved in trying to extract them from a hazardous environment. This motion - it, it should be defeated. We need to be able to supply the lifesaving life safety air to our members while they're trying to be extracted. We've been - I've been there where we've tried to find bottles, moving SCBA bottles because that was the only way you could make a connection to keep these people breathing. So this is a critical item. We are losing too many firefighters every year, and if - we can really make a difference for the fire department, for the firefighters, for their communities by opposing this motion. So please, I urge everyone here, on behalf of all the firefighters of this country, oppose this motion.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you.

DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. Microphone Number Seven.

CAPTAIN ALBERT YANAGISAWA: My name is Captain Albert Yanagisawa, affiliated with the Los Angeles County Fire Department. I'm here to oppose the motion. I'm against the motion. Our fire department has 3100 first responders who may or may not use SCBAs on any case where we might have a firefighter down.

MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

CAPTAIN ALBERT YANAGISAWA: I understand the requirement for a universal EBSS. We believe that at some point, we have to start standardizing and making a universal EBSS, so - because of all of the mutual aid, automatic aid agencies that we respond with within Los Angeles County. The current standard within our department may not - our, our EBSS may not work with other agencies. But if we don't establish the Standard moving forward at some point, we'll never have that Standard. I think the option of a third connector is - is - is a bad option. And the reason why is when you're in a situation where somebody runs out of air, you're usually in a, in a dark environment; you're in a very high stress environment; and trying to find a third connector and make that work would - is non-tenable.

Again, as a member of our Department, representing Los Angeles County Fire Department, we urge you to consider firefighters' safety - we want to have this universal EBSS - by doing a vote against this motion. Thank you.

DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. I'm going to move to Microphone Number Four.

DAVE BURNSWOG (phonetic): Dave Burnswog, member of the Technical Committee, and a firefighter in Columbus, Ohio. I rise against the motion. To give you some perspective of, of this issue and why it came up in the Committee - this problem wasn't about compatibility within the department. It was compatibility with mutual aid, which is the norm in the Fire Service. And so the Committee rightfully addressed the issue and, and wants universal interoperability, with regard to emergency connections. And we do it with other emergency connections on the SCBA. It was the desire of the Fire Service to have this, and this is - this is why we made the changes.

Using the logic of the submitter, we could never really move forward with new, with new technologies, with new requirements, and safer technologies if it didn't automatically integrate with the past. And that, that just doesn't make any sense. There is a mechanism to address backwards compatibility. It's actually pretty simple. It doesn't even require a complete upgrade. It, it really is as simple as the manufacturer submitting for, for approval - a new fitting, and you can have the new fitting replaced as, as just an upgrade to that part or that piece. It wouldn't require a complete upgrade to the, to the 2018 edition. I'll just close with basically, the edition or, or the rejection of this is, is, is really important. I urge you to oppose the motion. If it, if it wasn't - the real, the real safety - or the real threat to our firefighters is having multiple, multiple fittings. That's what we're trying to avoid. Thank you.

DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you. And I will move now to Microphone Number Seven.

STEVE WEINSTEIN: Steve Weinstein again, from Honeywell. I'm speaking against the motion once again. Something that I, I think should be brought out. When Scott filed their NITMAM, it was a shock to the members of the Technical Committee, because in the 17 days of the eight meetings of the TC on Respiratory Protection Equipment that were held over the four-year period between the issuance of NFPA 1981, 2013 Edition, and the release from the TC of the Second Revision of NFPA 1981, 2018 Edition, Scott never once mentioned the issue they raised in their motion. They
I see no one at the mikes, on the floor. So again, again, is there any further discussion on Motion 1981?

DANIEL O'CONNOR: Okay. Thank you, Sir.

JUDGE MORGAN: Judge Morgan with Scott Safety Productions Equipment knew about Scott’s so-called safety issue was when the NITMAM was filed. Apparently, Scott had been asleep at the wheel for four years, but finally woke up after the Standard had been put to bed.

DANIEL ROSSOS: I do. I think you’ve heard a number of different comments made by the Fire Service.

DANIEL O’CONNOR: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

DANIEL ROSSOS: Thank you very much. Again, I think we’ve had many, many statements made. This is a critical issue. I think what, what becomes more important is when you hear the voice, and the heart of the firefighters. We’re, we’re the ones - we’re, we’re the ones this was made for. And, and one thing we need to keep in mind regarding our Committee. Our primary focus is the protection of firefighters. Firefighters very seldom get to choose what they put on their back.

MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

DANIEL ROSSOS: A decision is typically made by somebody in a purchasing department, or somebody in some other bureau that is making their decisions. We very, very carefully vet these processes out, and these changes, because we know there’s going to be impact. And when it becomes serious enough, and it’s a life safety issue, we make the decision that we make it a requirement. That then takes it out of the budgets. It takes it out of those purchasing agents, if you will. I’m not trying to make them some evil person. I’m just saying the reality is, firefighters very seldom get to make that decision about what they wear. I would urge you to support the Committee, and in so, supporting the Fire Service, and the firefighters. I thank you very much.

DANIEL O’CONNOR: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Before we vote, let me restate the motion. The motion on the floor is to Reject Second Revision Numbers 4, 17, and 22; Second Correlating Revision Number 3, and any related portions of First Revision Number 18, resulting in returning Section 6.6 to previous edition text. Mr. Chair, do you have any final comments?

DANIEL ROSSOS: I do. I think you’ve heard a number of different comments made by the Fire Service.

To vote, touch the Vote button. If you wish to vote in support of the motion, and recommend the text on Screen One, touch Yes. If you wish to vote against the motion, and recommend the text on Screen Two, touch No. Please record your vote. The voting will be closed in five seconds. The vote is closed. Thank you. The results of the vote are 25 in support of the motion, and recommend the text on Screen One; and 360 against the motion, and recommend the text on Screen Two. The motion has failed.

So we - thank you, Mr. Chair.

DANIEL ROSSOS: Thank you very much. Thank you all for --

DANIEL O’CONNOR: We’ll move to the next report under consideration.

MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.
JIM CRAWFORD: Thank you. My background - I motion, Sir. Second. Please proceed with a discussion on the
DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you. We do have a
MALE SPEAKER: Second. MALE SPEAKER: Second.
DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you. We do have a
JIM CRAWFORD: Thank you. My background - I
started in the Fire Service in 1975 as a volunteer firefighter; ended it as Fire marshal in Portland, Oregon, and Vancouver, Washington. I now serve, as I said, as Project Manager for Vision 20/20; a past President of the International Fire Marshals Association. I've been involved with NFPA since the 80s.
We are asking for some basic public
education skills. Don't you think a firefighter ought to be able to recognize common home hazards, and how to correct them, and to be able to answer questions from the community in that regard, to be able to install a smoke alarm when they're called upon to do so by the AHJ, who says we are going to be in a home, and doing home safety visits. We feel like that is appropriate. And again, you can get that free, online, anywhere, any computer with an internet connection, through IFSTA ResourceOne. All of that training is paid for by grant funds.
We think all of that is reasonable. And with respect, and I mean that sincerely, we've proposed this before to the Committee; they don't agree. We know that the National Volunteer Fire Council is opposed to this. I have a letter of support from the International Fire Marshals Association - an email, rather; another one from the National Fallen Firefighters Foundation. I believe you're going to hear from some others today. But we think we're being reasonable in this regard. Four hours of training is not unreasonable, and we're asking your support of this motion. Thank you.
DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Let's now proceed with the discussion on Certified Amending Motion 1001-3. Microphone Three.
JIM CRAWFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Jim Crawford. I'm Project Manager for Vision 20/20. I'm moving CAM 1001-3 to Accept Public Comment Number 17.
DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you. There's a motion on the floor to Accept Public Comment Number 17. Do I hear a second?
DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you. We do have a second. Please proceed with a discussion on the motion, Sir.
JIM CRAWFORD: Thank you. My background - I
25 culture, firefighters, when they would engage in 24 to suppress fires. To impact the Fire Service 23 Really? Why do you think that is? We only train them 22 culture of the Fire Service does not value prevention. 21 from Oklahoma State University, and I speak in favor 20 of the motion. Microphone Number Three.

DANIEL O’CONNOR: With that - thank you, 19 gentlemen, we will open up debate on the motion. Please provide, again, your name, your affiliation, and whether you are speaking in support of, or against the motion. Microphone Number Three.

NANCY TRENCH: Thank you. I’m Nancy Trench 18 from Oklahoma State University, and I speak in favor of this motion. It’s commonly accepted that the culture of the Fire Service does not value prevention. Really? Why do you think that is? We only train them to suppress fires. To impact the Fire Service culture, firefighters, when they would engage in prevention - it’s because Firefighter One duties 17 include fire prevention, knowledge, and skills.

So there’s three things this motion will achieve. Number one, it’s the first step to change the culture of the Fire Service to accept the value of prevention, and that entry level firefighters will accept their role as the member of a community risk reduction team. Second of all, firefighters need to know how to install smoke alarms in homes, including their own home. And number three, there is no better occupational safety and health for firefighters than when they respond to a house fire, that family’s waiting outside, because the smoke alarms that fire station installed, or maybe even those responding firefighters, alerted the family to a fire, and they are waiting outside when the fire department arrives, eliminating the need for an interior search.

Community risk reduction makes firefighters safer. So three things. Let’s change the culture. Let’s change the culture. Let’s change the culture. Let’s change the culture.

DANIEL O’CONNOR: Thank you. KEN FONDO: I also am a principle member of the 1001 Committee, as well, and I’m a, an alternate on 1021 and 1700. And in my career, I also served as State training in Louisiana, and have taught thousands of firefighters their basic skills. And I don’t believe that adding CRR to the basic skills of a entry level firefighter is appropriate.

So I would like to read to you a letter from the Chairman of the Fire Council, Kevin Quinn. The following is an open letter from NVFC Chair, Kevin Quinn, on the NVFC position. ‘On behalf of the National Volunteer Fire Council, which represents the interests of the nation’s volunteer fire, EMS, and rescue services, I am writing in opposition to Certified Amending Motion 1001-1, and 3, which would add language related to community risk reduction, public education delivery, and smoke alarm installation to the NFPA 1001 document. To be clear, the NVFC strongly supports, and actively promotes CRR. We simply do not believe that the proposed language is appropriate for the NFPA 1001 document, which identifies minimum job performance requirements for career and volunteer structural firefighters. The purpose of the 1001 document is to ensure that people..."
meeting the requirements of the Standard are qualified to fight fire. Public education, and smoke alarm installation are critical services that many fire departments deliver, but they are not baseline skills that every firefighter needs to have. Adding this language to the document would add unnecessary time and expense to basic firefighter training, and make it harder for people to get certified.

MALE SPEAKER: (unintelligible)

KEN FONDO: There are already skills related to public education in the 1001 document, for personnel who are trained to the Firefighter Two level. The NFPA 1035 document identifies the minimum JPRs for public life, fire and safety educators. NFPA 13 - 1300, which is the NVFC helping to develop, will establish the standards on the community risk assessment, and community risk reduction. There is language dealing with CRR in, in 1021, the Professional Qualification for Fire Officers, and new language that has been proposed to be added to the revision cycle.’ Ding - ding?

DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. Okay. I think there's a number of people at the mike. I'm going to go to this side of the room, to Microphone Number Four, then I'll come - I'll start to circulate back to the gentleman - the gentleman at the green stands. So Number four, please.

BILL FISKE: Thank you, Chairman. My name is Bill Fiske, and I'm speaking for myself, in opposition to this motion, because it is much too sweeping. It seems to assume that there is only one kind of community in which a firefighter works. But there are many different kinds of communities, and this - this is probably fine for a bedroom community. But if the community in which the firefighter works is an industrial plant, say, a semiconductor fab, or a pharmaceutical plant, this totally breaks down. 

DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. I think I will jump back to Microphone Number Eight, and then we'll come back to Three here, in the front.

THOMAS BRYER: Thank you, Sir. My name is Thomas Breyer. I'm with the International Association of Fire Chiefs. I'm in support of the motion. The IFF is in support of incorporating the language related to community risk reduction into NFPA 1001. The practice of reducing the risk of fire, and fire related injuries and deaths to firefighters and the public is a core responsibility of all fire departments, from volunteer to career. As earlier referenced, the free standardized online program is available, thus mitigating one of the principle concerns related to implementation as it relates to cost. Additionally, the reason it belongs in this Standard is because risk reduction is not isolated to the supervisory level, and should be part of a entry firefighter level's skill set. Thank you.

DANIEL O'CONNOR: And Sir, you were - I'm not sure if I caught that. You were for the motion.

THOMAS BRYER: Yes, Sir, I was for the motion.

DANIEL O'CONNOR: Okay. Microphone Number Three.

DAN FINNEGAN: Good afternoon. My name is Dan Finnegan, and I stand here in support of the motion, and I stand as a representative, and speaking for the Board of Directors of the International Association of Fire Chiefs, Fire Life Safety Section. The topics of community risk reduction and public safety education are very important for the overall public safety, and firefighters’ safety. It is important to understand that successful community risk reduction begins with emergency response, but may integrate other protection systems and strategies. Firefighters only need to understand there is more than one way to solve a public safety problem, and the importance of an integrated approach. Please support the Fire Service, and please support CAM 1001-3. Thank you.

DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you. I'll move to Microphone Number Six.

BOB UPSON: Bob Upson, speaking for myself as a retired firefighter and fire marshal. I speak in favor of the motion. It's been pointed out that many of these, many of these requirements are associated with officer level training, or with people specifically assigned to public education duties. I'd like to submit to you that firefighters, despite their long hours, spend most of their time off duty.

There's over 1.1 million firefighters in this country, and they all know people. They talk to their neighbors. They are role models. These are the people who need, from the Day One, to have the basic fundamentals of risk reduction and public education instilled from the beginning of their training. The overview of, of training that's being requested in this motion would provide only a small fraction of their training, but it will lay the underpinnings for the entire purpose for a firefighter's duties in the fire department as part of a unified system, of not just putting wet stuff on the red stuff, but in preventing fires, and reducing risk in general.

DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you. I am going to go
to Microphone Number Two, and then following that, I'm going to go back to Eight. The gentleman's been waiting at Eight for a while, so we'll go to --

KEN FONDO: I'm Ken Fondo, National Volunteer Fire Council. And the crux of the issue is, is this a basic Firefighter One skill? The --

DANIEL O'CONNOR: Sir, could I interrupt you --

KEN FONDO: Against the motion --

DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir.

KEN FONDO: -- Mr. Chair. The Technical Committee has addressed --

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you.

KEN FONDO: -- this issue many times, and the consensus of the Committee has been to reject this. Both representatives of the IAFF and IAEC were present, or they voted, and you know, there was no consensus to go forward with the motion. Our basis has not changed. This is not a basic Firefighter One skill. I have, as Chief of Training, participated in a smoke alarm program. Our firefighters worked directly under the supervision of their company officers. They did not need to know how to install these; they were told how to do it. We really believe that adding this to the basic skill level just becomes more encumbersome, and burdensome for the basic firefighter. Agreed, CRR is very important to reducing the fire risk in the US, and changing the culture, which is the number one initiative in the life safety, is certainly very, very prominent amongst what we do. But I'm not sure that this is the best way to accomplish that. Teaching them the basic firefighter skills to be able to protect themselves, protect the citizens in an emergency, is the job of a baseline firefighter. Thank you.

DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. Microphone Eight.

VINCENT QUINTERNO: Vincent Quinterno, in favor of the motion. As a Community Risk Reduction Officer, a Training Officer for the Rhode Island State Fire Marshals Office Training Academy, I, myself, train all types of firefighters - Firefighters One, and Firefighters Two. In today's day, firefighters have a multidisciplinary job, which may not be requiring putting the wet stuff on the red stuff. It may be requiring them to do injury and fire prevention messaging within their own community, whether they work in a facility that has a semiconductor plant, or whether they have a farm or rural community. So it's a community that everybody needs to know what they need to do for risk reduction, and it's - needs to start somewhere. Four hours of training, online, free - training is knowledge. Thank you.

DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. Microphone Number Three.

TONY APFELBECK: Tony Apfelbeck, Fire Marshal and Building Official with the City of Altamonte Springs, and I'm speaking for the motion. Whether we call it community risk reduction, or we don't; or whether we include it in this Standard, or we don't - CRR activities are at the core of the services provided by firefighters, and we are conducting them today. From an emergency response, to conducting a home safety survey, to performing public education, or performing a smoke alarm installation, our job is to reduce risk. These types of tasks are absolutely integral to the environment we should be promulgating in our communities. The reality is that the 21st century firefighter performing CRR activities - it's an integral aspect of their job function, as is an emergency response. Approving this motion ensures that our entry level recruits understand the totality of the environment of risk reduction that they function within, and it gives them some of the basic tools to be able to perform in that environment. I ask that you approve this motion. Thank you.

DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. I'm going to move to Microphone Number Seven.

JERRY PERRITY (phonetic): My name is Jerry Perrity. I'm speaking for myself. Call for the question.

MALE SPEAKER: Okay.

DANIEL O'CONNOR: Okay.

MALE SPEAKER: Second.

DANIEL O'CONNOR: Second.

DANIEL O'CONNOR: The question has been called.

It's a, a privileged motion. So there's a motion from the floor to Call the Question. I would like to note there were some people still at the microphones, waiting to provide their commentary, and waiting to speak. But we will proceed with the vote on the call of the question. I did have the second, so - in order vote on this motion, please scroll down to the bottom of the tablet to vote. Give you a second to do that. Okay. Again, you need to be at the bottom of the tablet. So if you wish to vote in support of the motion --

FEMALE SPEAKER: No, the call of the motion.

It's different --
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24 Prevention, Organization, and Deployment is presented
23 the report of the Technical Committee on Fire
22 RONALD FARR: Mr. Chair, ladies and gentleman,
21 you give us your report?
20 will - we will proceed with the Agenda. Mr. Farr, can
19 that I need to clarify that there is a, a Motion
18 with the first, first motion (unintelligible), except
17 screen as they are under debate. We will now proceed
16 with the first, first motion (unintelligible), except
15 that I need to clarify that there is a, a Motion
14 Clarification and, and, and a second here. But we
13 will - we will proceed with the Agenda. Mr. Farr, can
12 you give us your report?
11 RONALD FARR: Mr. Chair, ladies and gentleman,
10 the report of the Technical Committee on Fire
9 Prevention, Organization, and Deployment is presented
8 for adoption, and can be found in the First Draft
7 Report, and then in the Second Draft Report for the
6 2018 Annual Revision Cycle. The Technical Committee
5 has published a First and Second Draft Report
4 consisting of revisions to the NFPA 1730 Standard on
3 Organization and Deployment of Fire Prevention
2 Inspection and Code Enforcement, Plan Review,
1 Investigation, and Public Education Operations. These
2 reports were submitted to letter ballot of the
1 responsible Technical Committee. The reports and
2 ballots results can be found on the Next Edition tab
1 of the Document Information Page for NFPA 1730, at
2 www.nfpa.org/1730.
1 DANIEL O’CONNOR: Thank you, Mr. Chair. A
little bit of a clarification here. The next motion
1 on NFPA 1730-1 appeared on our Agenda. However,
2 the authorized maker of the motion has notified NFPA
1 that he no longer wishes to pursue this motion.
2 Therefore, in accordance with NFPA rules, the
1 Convention Rules at Section 2.7, the motion may not be
2 considered by the assembly, and is removed from the
1 Agenda.
2 We will now move onto the next motion. Let's
3 now pursue discussion on Certified Amending Motion
1 TONY APFELEBECK: Tony Apfelbeck. I am the Fire
2 Marshal and Building Official with the City of
1 Altamonte Springs, Florida, regarding Motion 1730-2, I
2 make a motion to Accept Public Comment Number One.
1 FEMALE SPEAKER: Second.
2 MALE SPEAKER: Second.
1 DANIEL O’CONNOR: Okay. There is a motion on
2 the floor to Accept Public Comment Number One. We do
1 have a second. Please proceed with the discussion on
2 the motion, Sir.
1 TONY APFELEBECK: Ladies and gentlemen, as you
observed by my testimony earlier today, supporting an
2 inclusion of community risk reduction in NFPA 1001, I
1 strongly support the concept of community risk
2 reduction and assessment. However, sometimes our
3 desires for advancement outpaces our current
4 knowledge. This motion addresses one of those
5 circumstances where this has occurred. In the last
6 cycle for NFPA 1730, the TC inserted new language to
7 allow community risk assessment to substitute for the
8 prescriptive existing occupancy inspection frequencies
9 in NFPA 1730. In concept, I agree, this is an
10 excellent idea. However, the evidence shows that
11 we're not ready for this leap yet. While it is easy
12 for the 1730 document to appoint a user, QSCRA, in
13 order to create an existing occupancy inspection
2 frequency, the document fails to provide any direction
1 on methodology, or how to conduct such a review; nor
2 does it provide examples of such an assessment in the
1 Annex text.
2 Both of these approaches were requested by this
1 writer in public inputs, and rejected by the Technical
2 Committee. I also submitted a public input to NFPA
1 1300 on this same issue, Standard on Community Risk
2 Assessment, and Community Risk Reduction Plan
3 Development. The Standard is intended to specify how
4 users shall, quote, "Develop the process to conduct
5 community risk assessment and reduction programs." End
6 quote. The TC’s response to including this type
7 of methodology in 1300 was, ‘NFPA 1300 does not cover
8 inspections of existing occupancies.’
9 So what we're left with here is we have an
10 option for a user to use a CRA, in NFPA 1300, but no
11 methodology or guidance in the NFPA Standard on CRAs
12 to begin to implement this goal, or ensure integrity
13 of an approach to developing such a, a conclusion.
14 It's important to note that both the 1300
15 document and the 1730 document are the same Technical
16 Committee. As a result of this lack of detail to the
17 user, we now have an approach before us that would
18 result in 10 different AHJs receiving the exact same
19 results.
data, and developing 10 completely different existing occupancy inspection frequencies in a CRA. That's not science or evidence based decision making. It is pseudoscience. Once a methodology is developed to accurately create an existing occupancy inspection schedule as part of a CRA, and we adopt it within the Standard, I will be the first to stand here and support this language as being appropriate. Until then, we need to step back, let the science be developed to guide us in making good decisions in this area.

In conclusion, I ask that you support this motion, and give the Technical Committee the opportunity to go ahead and do the research on this issue, through maybe a Code Fund project with the Fire Protection Research Foundation, or other opportunities, and put language in the Standard, and examples in the Annex. Thank you very much.

DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. Mr. Farr, would you like to offer the Committee's position?

RONALD FARR: 1730 Committee rejected the motion, and put language in there so we can go ahead and develop a CRA, and we adopt it within the Standard. Thank you. Microphone Number Three.

TONY APFELBECK: Tony Apfelbeck, Fire Marshal and Building Official, City of Altamonte Springs. Again, there, there is no objective language in 1300. I tried to go ahead and submit a PI to go ahead and put that language in there so we can go ahead and refer to that, and create an inspection schedule as a result of that, based on consistent data. And the, the Committee did not go ahead and accept it.

The - my other concern with this is as I called out in the Public Comment on this issue. The NFPA Manual of Style has very specific language that is intended to protect the integrity of the Standards development process, by mandating the provisions of Codes and Standards shall not contain requirements that are, quote, "...unenforceable, and vague."... End quote. Shall not create, quote, "...multiple levels of safety." End quote. And shall, quote, "... minimize inspection frequencies, based on a community risk assessment, in rejecting the Amending Motion that is presented here today.
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MATTHEW MERTENS: Matthew Mertens, North Shore
Microphone Number Seven.

BOB UPSON: Bob Upson, speaking on my own behalf. I have to speak in, in favor of the motion.

TONY APFELBECK: Tony Apfelbeck, Fire Marshal, Fire, speaking against the motion, to support the motion, to move forward. Please support the Committee action.

DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. I will move to Microphone Number Six.

BOB UPSON: Bob Upson, speaking on my own behalf. I have to speak in, in favor of the motion.

I, I have to commend the Committee for the foresight of including a community risk assessment as an alternative to a prescriptive schedule, but I agree with Mr. Apfelbeck. There is no provided methodology, and the proposed language in 1300, which is still an unreleased Standard, is vague. It provides only the most subjective guidelines, saying, 'Go out, collect some information, analyze it, and make your decisions.' There's no framework for analysis. There's no basis for an objective, an objective decision. The concept is good. It's just not quite ready for prime time.

DANIEL O'CONNOR: Microphone Number Four, please.

VINCENT QUINTERNO: Vincent Quinterno, voting against the motion. As a Community Risk Reduction Officer, like most people in this room, or that are AHJs - we wear multiple hats. To say - give us a schedule and say, 'You're going to be doing this here,' when that may not be a priority, when I may be doing juvenile fire setting, is the priority at that time. So give me a schedule, and I may not be able to adhere to it. So I'm, I'm opposed to the motion.

DANIEL O'CONNOR: Microphone Number Three.

TONY APFELBECK: Tony Apfelbeck, Fire Marshal, Building Official, Altamonte Springs, for the motion. Just in rebuttal to some of the previous testimony, the, the fact that a local community may have other priorities - let's create a methodology that includes that. I have no objection to that whatsoever. But let's go ahead and look at that, and create an objective methodology that gives guidance to us as AHJs so we can then go sell this to the people, and our policy makers that are going to go ahead and say, "Well, how did you develop this?" 'Well, you know, I just went ahead and, and pretty much made it up.' 'Well, is there a standard methodology, within the standard of care within the - in the NFPA process?' If we have one, yes. Then we can go ahead and point to that, and it gives the credibility for this process, because if we move forward, credibility and the integrity of this process is important, and we have the tools to create this.

John Hall with the Fire Protection Research Foundation created the first inspection schedule recommendations that are in - in 1730. There's no reason we can't go ahead and move towards a performance based aspect of that, to incorporate local needs in that, and move forward. Thank you.

DANIEL O'CONNOR: For the motion, Sir, right?
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TONY APFELBECK: Yes, for the motion.

DANIEL O’CONNOR: Thank you. I am going to move to Microphone Number Five in the back of the room.

KEN DUNCAN (phonetic): How you doin’ today?

Ken Duncan, Performance Design Technologies. The National Fire Protection Association --

DANIEL O’CONNOR: For or against the motion?

KEN DUNCAN: -- against the motion -- several years ago, through the Research Foundation, actually issued a guideline on incorporated risk methodologies into NFPA Standards. I don’t know that enough people have actually looked at that, but it sets up a framework that allows us to do more risk informed decisions. And while we may not have a single methodology, or a preferred methodology, the option of staying with the prescriptive is perfectly acceptable to those who don’t want to do the risk assessment, but it provides the option to advance risk based decision making. So I, I am against the motion.

DANIEL O’CONNOR: Okay. Microphone Number Four, please.

MALE SPEAKER: Call the Question.

MALE SPEAKER: Question (unintelligible).

DANIEL O’CONNOR: Well - okay. There’s a motion from the floor to Call the Question, and I thought I had - saw somebody at the mike, but maybe they sat down. So I don’t see anybody at the microphones right now. So do we have a second to Call the Question?

DANIEL O’CONNOR: Second.

DANIEL O’CONNOR: Okay. We have a second. In order to vote on this motion, again, you need to please scroll down to the bottom of your tablet, to vote. So I’ll give you a second to do that, find that. If you wish to vote in support of the motion to Call the Question touch Yes. If you wish to vote against the motion, touch No. Please record your vote.

FEMALE SPEAKER: (unintelligible).

DANIEL O’CONNOR: Voting will close in five seconds. The vote is closed. Okay. The, the question of calling the, the - the motion to Call the Question passes 419 to 17.

We will move to vote on the motion on 13 - on 1730-2. Before we vote, though, let me restate that motion. The motion on the floor is to Accept Public Comment Number One. To touch - to vote, touch the Vote button. If you wish to vote in support of the motion, and recommend the text on Screen One, touch

Yes. If you wish to vote against the motion, and recommend the text on Screen Two, touch No. Please record your vote. The voting will close in five seconds. The voting is closed. Thank you. And the vote, results of the vote are - 276 in support of the motion, and recommend the text on Screen One; 154 against the motion, and, and recommend the text on Screen Two. The motion has passed.

Is there any further discussion on NFPA 1730?

Seeing none, we will move on to the next document. Thank you, Mr. Farr.

Before we begin the next Standard, I would like to introduce to you, James Golinveaux, member of the Standards Council, who will be the Presiding Officer for motions before the membership on the next, and final two Standards today. James.

(applause)

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Good afternoon. The next report under consideration - this is out of the Committee on Emergency - Committee on Emergency Power Supplies. Here to present the Committee Report, and the - and Committee Member James Gregory of the Florida Agency for Healthcare Administration, Tallahassee, Florida. The Committee Report, that is the First and Second Draft Reports, is located on the NFPA 110, on the NFPA website. All Certified Amending Motions are contained in the NFPA Technical Meeting (Tech Session) Agenda, and will be displayed behind me on the screen as they are under debate. We will proceed in the order of the motions as included in the Agenda. Mr. Gregory.

JAMES GREGORY: Thank you. Mr. Chair, ladies and gentlemen, the report of the Technical Committee on Emergency Power Supplies is presented for adoption, and can be found in the First Draft Report, and the Second Draft Report for the 2018 Annual Revision Cycle. The Technical Committee has published a First and Second Draft Report consisting of revisions to the NFPA 110 Standard for Emergency and Standby Power Systems. These reports were submitted by letter ballot to the responsible Correlating and Technical Committee. The reports and ballots results can be found on the Next Edition tab of the Document Information Page for NFPA 110, at www.nfpa.org/110next.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you, Mr. Gregory. And to proceed with the discussion on the Certified Amending Motions on NFPA 110 - Mr. Ron Bourgault hasn't checked in yet. Mr. Bourgault, are you here?
Ron Bourgault: Yes, I'm here.

James Golinveaux: Okay. So you are here. So proceed with the Certified Amending Motions of NFPA 110. Mr. Bourgault.

Ron Bourgault: Thank you.

James Golinveaux: Microphone Three.

Ron Bourgault: My name is Ron Bourgault. I'm with Mazzetti Engineering. And I make a motion to accept Public Comment Number Three.

James Golinveaux: Thank you. Is there a second?

Male Speaker: Second.

James Golinveaux: Mr. Gregory or Mr. Bourgault.

Ron Bourgault: Yes. Thank you. So the addition of this to NFPA 110 really is adding fuel cells to, to be an allowable source of energy for emergency systems. This, what this really is doing - it is aligning NFPA 110 with NFPA 70, the National Electric Code, and NFPA 99. In NFPA 99, Section 701 that allow fuel cells - that's in the healthcare, fuel cells are allowed, as well as in Section 517 on emergency - or electrical systems, fuel cells are required, as the way generators do. Well, fuel cells operate all the time. There is no need for them to start up. They're constantly online, so there are no issues with that. It does meet it. And the other, the other item for rejection was that they cannot - they will not maintain the load. If there's a large load that's switched in, like a chiller, the fuel cells can't handle it. That's incorrect, as well. A fuel cell system is designed to - for the specific system it's going in. It would have storage capacitors in it. So any load that switch into it, it will certainly work just fine. So the reasons for rejection are incorrect, and they, they shouldn't have been used.

A couple other things. NFPA 110 is a Standard for emergency power supply systems. It's not dedicated strictly to generators. It's - it's for emergency power supply systems. So it talks about ATS's and parallel equipment. So this is certainly appropriate to put in this section.

And finally on maintenance and operation of fuel cells - they don't have to be maintained in the same way that generators are maintained, because generators sit idle for long periods of time. Fuel cells are online seven - seven days a week, 24 hours a day, and they are constantly monitored. So whenever there's an issue with the fuel cell, it's picked up right away. You don't have to test it - it's always under test. Thank you.

James Golinveaux: Thank you. Mr. Gregory, would you like to offer the Committee's position?

James Gregory: Yes. Thank you. In addition to the Committee's published statement that fuel cells cannot provide the required start time of 10 seconds...
Committee. When it reached the comment phase, the information, and it was brought forward to the opposer of the motion submitted additional opinion; I am not speaking on behalf of the Committee that we not, did not give the fuel cell technology thorough thought as we went through the process. During the input phase, the Committee responded with a Reject/Resolve, with the comment saying, 'Currently, fuel cells do not meet all of the performance requirements within 110.' After that, the opposer of the motion submitted additional information, and it was brought forward to the Committee. When it reached the comment phase, the Committee then stated in its rejection, 'Fuel cells cannot meet the 10 second startup time.' We've already heard from the proposer of the motion, and in the next CAM, they'll be some specific requirements that will indicate that that 10 second criteria is not relevant, because these things are operational 24/7.

There were some additional concerns from the Committee that stated that fuel cells need to provide the capability for the loads necessary. If and when fuel cells are included in this document, there is an expectation that you meet all the requirements of that document, which will address the issue of capacity of load. So that also is not relevant, from a Committee's perspective.

Another concern the Committee had was - does fuel cells fit into the scope of the document. We heard the scope of the document. Fuel cells - this, this question is addressed very easily. Fuel cells is a technology that's emerging; it's reliable; and it's, and it's - and in some cases, might even be better. NFPA 99 already acknowledges it, and recognizes it for this type of an installation, and NFPA 70 does the same. There's an argument - if those documents have it in it, why does this one need it? Well, often when AHJs are looking to enforce these types of emergency power systems, the very first document they go to is 110.

So I would reiterate, I don't think the
submitted installation. Do we allow that to happen? I mean, it has no operational issues. It has no maintenance requirements, and it has no testing requirements associated with it. Additionally, generators - let's look back at history a brief moment. Generators used to have a testing requirement of only 30 minutes. It's been moved now to four hours. Why is that? Well, in the north, a major city has a - a Level 1 trauma center hospital, and they had a major ice storm. They did all the testing and requirements for 30 minutes, as required by NFPA. And through the major ice storm, electrical wires started breaking all over the city, and people were being brought to the hospital. Eventually, the lines going to the hospital broke, and all the generators came on as planned, and worked perfectly. And they ran past the 30 minutes, up to three hours. And at three hours, even though they were M-plus one, being a Level 1 trauma center, the generators started failing after three hours, because they hadn't been tested and ran long enough for them to know what's going on.

Is it going to take loss of life, with these fuel cells in line, for the Committee and the body to understand that we need testing, and maintenance, and understand fully how this new technology, all support of it - this new technology is going to keep us safe? Do you want to be on an operating table when this has not been tested and vetted appropriately, and the proper requirements in place?

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone Three, please.

TIM ADAMS: Hello. Tim Adams, speaking on behalf of the American Hospital Association. A couple of the --

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Are you speaking for or against?

TIM ADAMS: I'm speaking for this motion, in favor of this motion. A couple of the items that have been mentioned are going to be addressed in the next motion, 110-2. That includes that these fuel cell units would have an M-plus one redundancy; that there is normal utility power available - assuming the, the fuel cell is operating full time and supplying power to the facility; there is a backup of utility power in the case of a, a failure of that fuel cell; and also that there'd be a diesel connection available for the life safety loads, if that fuel cell is being used in this mode.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. And returning to Microphone Three, please.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 114</th>
<th>Page 116</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RON BRIGEL: Ron Brigel with Mazzetti, in support of the motion. I heard some comments about generators and their failures. The thing with these fuel cells, they're online all the time, and they will, as, as it was just mentioned, there will be redundancy in the systems. So if there's a failure, it's going to switch over to the backup anyway. So we don't have to test them four hours a, four hours a month, or eight hours a month. They're under test constantly. These are far more reliable systems than generator systems are. So I'd - it's a system that allows us really to work towards a micro grid process, which is really where the industry's going to, and this is the first step. And it does - it is just combining with the other Standards to allow it. And if you do look in the testing section, Section Eight of 110, most of those items will apply to the fuel cell, other than one or two of the minor items. You can apply those tests to a fuel cell system, just as you apply them to a generator system. Thank you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone Four, please. MARTY HUIE: Marty Huie, Jacobs Engineering Group, speaking against the motion. I guess it goes back to why was this not submitted? Why was the testing, and maintenance, and operational not submitted? We keep hearing it's, it's inline, it works simultaneously, it works continuously. Has all that been tested when a major load gets applied instantaneously? The catastrophic event that happened that caused generators to go from 30 minute test to a four hour - they also had M-plus one, just like we heard this is M-plus one. They had loss of life to cause us to go to four hour testing. What - I don't even know what the testing is. I don't think anybody understands what the testing requirements are for fuel cells. Let's figure it out; let's get it in place. It's already in the Annex, folks. And we don't need this in this section. It's in the Annex. It can be used today as an alternative, in line. It's - it - it - it's not a proper Code to be in this section at this time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone Three, please. DAVE DAGENAIS: Dave Dagenais, speaking on behalf of myself, in favor of the motion. The fact that it is in the Annex acknowledges that it has some validity to be in the document itself - so that it eliminates the question of whether or not it belongs in the document. The issue associated with loading is a simple issue. If we were going to install a brand new generator today, we would have to size that appropriately for the loads that are there. It is no different with, with this - it's the same thing. So I - so all the arguments around loading, 10 second ramp-up time, maintenance - those are all items that are addressed in, in - more importantly in the next CAM we're going to bring forward. So please, I urge you, vote in favor of this motion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Okay, thank you. Is there any further discussion on Motion 110-1, to Accept Public Comment Number Three? Seeing none, Mr. Gregory, do you have any final comments? JAMES GREGORY: Yes. Thank you. Let me just remind you that this NFPA 110 is a Standard, not a Code. The Committee action is not entirely about fuel cells, or any other proposed emergency power supply that would be - become of, of NFPA 110. The Committee action is about revising the Standard in accordance with its established scope. It is hard to understand why a new emergency power supply is trying to be injected into this Standard, without providing the necessary requirements for the safe, reliable operation, maintenance, and testing that that particular power supply requires. Not only does this not meet the scope of this Standard, it will lead to misunderstanding and confusion in the use of NFPA 110. I urge you to stand with the Technical Committee; vote the color on your badge, against the motion. (laughter) JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you, Mr. Gregory. Before we vote, let me restate the motion. The motion on the floor is to Accept Public Comment Number Three. To vote, touch the Vote button. If you wish to vote in support of the motion, and recommend the text on Screen One, touch Yes. If you wish to vote against the motion, and recommend the text on Screen Two, text No - touch No. Please record your vote. Voting will close in five seconds. The voting is closed. The results are 236 in favor of the motion; 137 against the motion. The motion passes. Now let's proceed to the discussion on Certified Amending Motion 110-2. Microphone Three, please. RON BRIGEL: Thank you. Ron - Ron Brigel with Mazzetti. I make a motion to Accept Public Comment Number Four. JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. There is a motion on the floor to Accept Public Comment Number Four. Is there a second?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for fuel cells. There is no possible way that fuel cells can use generator testing and operation requirements. I urge you to reconsider. Thank you.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. With that, we'll open up the debate on the motion. Please provide your name and affiliation, and whether you're speaking in support, or against the motion. Microphone Three, please.

DAVE DAGENAIS: Dave Dagenais, speaking on behalf of myself, in favor of the motion. This is Step Two of the previous motion, with the passing of the first motion, and this - this allows all those expectations that I was mentioning earlier around redundancy, and actually redundant, redundant systems. So I urge you to pass this, because it will close the loop, and give a much more reliable system with these in there.

In response to the testing and maintenance, we have the expectation within 110 anyways that you test anything per manufacturer's recommendations. So that is not as big of an issue that exists that, that some people may say. So this is Step Two of really incorporating this fuel cell concept. I think it's essential we include this, to put those safeguards in place. It allows for those redundancies and, and...
motion; and I won't take up any more of your time. Thank you.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone Three, please.

DAVE DAGENAIS: Dave Dagenais, speaking on behalf of myself, in favor of the motion. I just want to address those comments around failure. I've been in - I've been in healthcare for over 28 years, and I have multiple generators within my facility; and any given day, that generator could fail. That is just as much as a risk as a fuel cell technology, except the fuel cell technology gives me redundancies, and it operates 24/7. So the reality is, is I don't have to worry about whether it's going to start during a power failure, because it's already running. It will provide a much quicker, has the potential to provide a much faster transfer, much more reliable, and this also indicates you also have to have the ability to have a, a, another means of, of backup - like a diesel generator. So the redundancy and the failure rate is not an issue. This is more reliable than generators.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Is there any further discussion on Motion 110-2, to Accept Public Comment Number - oh, excuse me. Microphone Three.

RON BRIGEL: Ron Brigel with Mazzetti, for the motion. One thing I didn't mention before is, these three items, they're actually in alignment with --

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Oh --

RON BRIGEL: -- NFPA --

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: -- excuse me. I'm sorry, for or against the motion?

RON BRIGEL: For - yeah, for the motion.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Okay.

RON BRIGEL: These three items are, are in alignment with NFPA 70, and NFPA 99. They're not straying from them whatsoever. So obviously, I got, I got ticked on the 'when they fail' - this is when, if there is an internal failure of one of the cells, the system is always online. Generators often fail. They fail to start. They don't - they can't even serve the load. The fuel cells are serving the load from Day One, and they're always serving your emergency load. It's a very different system. If, if there is a failure in, in one of the cells, it's already backed up. It's, it's just - there's no way it's going to have the same issues that generators have in trying to get started. Thank you.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Is there any further discussion on Motion 110-2, to Accept Public Comment Number Four? Seeing none, Mr. Gregory, do you have any final comment?

JAMES GREGORY: Thank you. I believe I've made the position of the Technical Committee clear, and I don't need to say anything else. Thank you.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Okay. Thank you. Before we vote, let me restate the motion. The motion on the floor to is - is to Accept Public Comment Number Four. To vote, touch the Vote button. If you wish to vote in support of the motion, and recommend the text on Screen One, touch Yes. If you wish to vote against the motion, and recommend the text on Screen Two, touch No. Please record your vote. The voting will be closed in five seconds. The voting is closed. The result of - the results of the vote is 331 in favor of the motion; 45 against the motion. The motion passed.

Is there any further discussion on NFPA 110? Seeing none, we'll move on to the next document. Thank you, Mr. Gregory.

The last report under consideration is that of the Committee on Signaling Systems for the Protection of Life and Property. Here to present the Committee Report is Correlating Committee Chair Merton Bunker, of Lewis Berger, Stafford, Virginia.

The Committee's Report, that is the First and Second Draft Report is located on the Document Information Page for NFPA 72, on the NFPA website. All Certified Amending Motions are contained in the NFPA Technical Meeting (Tech Session) Agenda, and will be displayed behind me on the screen as they are under debate.

We have four Chairs of the Signaling System Committees that due to tenure policy, will be stepping down as Chairs. They are Lawrence Delair (phonetic), Chair of the Single and Multiple Station Alarms and Household Systems; Daniel O'Connor, Chair of the Initiating Devices for Fire Alarm and Signaling Systems; Warren Olsen, Supervisor - Supervising Station Fire Alarm and Signaling Systems; and J. Jeffrey Moore, Chair of the Testing and Maintenance of Fire Alarm and Signaling Systems. I'd like to express our thanks to these gentlemen for their leadership of these committees. We will proceed in the order of the motions as included in the Agenda. Mr. Bunker.

MERTON BUNKER: Thank you. Mr. Chair, ladies and gentlemen, the Report of the Committees on Signaling Systems for the Protection of Life and Property is presented for adoption, and can be found in the First Draft Report and in the Second Draft Report for the 2018 Annual Revision Cycle. The Technical Committees have published a First and Second
Section 18.4.2.1, and the Annex to this section, this motion is basically - it's the body of the Code, requires - it choose the words 'shall be' - Temporal-3 pattern is a recognizable signal for evacuation, and relocation messages. When you go to Section 24.4.8.3 --

Male speaker: Yeah.

Sagiv Weiss-Ishai: -- this is the conflict right there. It says, 'Under a fire condition where the system is used to transmit relocation instruction, or other fire emergency, known evacuation messages, a one-second to three-second alert, and followed by the message, shall be provided.'

So this is a conflict right now. The intent is to say that when we have an evacuation, we need to have a Temporal-3 code, because people are leaving the building. When we have a relocation, people do not leave the building, and they just relocate within the building to a different area.

Therefore, there should be different tones for these two signals. The intent of this motion is to fix the conflict. Now, if a certain AHJ wants to require to have Temporal-3 tone on an evacuation message, or on a relocation message, that's okay, but that's moved to the Annex. So that's why we group these two section - section - the, the, the body, and the Annex into one motion, and it has a permissive language in the Annex for a specific AHJ on a case by case, to require Temporal-3 for relocation, but not in the body of the Code. Thank you.

James Golinveaux: Thank you. Mr. Bunker, would you like to offer the Committee's position?

Merton Bunker: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to call on Mr. Lowrey, Chairman of the Technical Committee on Notification Appliances to give us some insight from the Committee.

Dave Lowrey: Dave Lowrey, Technical Chair of Chapter 18 Notification. The Committee rejected this at Committee meeting, basically on the fact that the
James Golinveaux:  Yeah.  Thank you.

Ray Grill:  I’m speaking against the motion.

James Golinveaux:  Excuse me.

Ray Grill:  -- a Temporal-3 --

James Golinveaux:  Are you speaking for, or against the motion?

Ray Grill:  I’m speaking against the motion.

James Golinveaux:  Yeah.  Thank you.

Ray Grill:  Ray Grill with Air Up, Fire Protection Engineer, and I’m a long time member of Notification Appliances, Chapter 18, and a past Chair.  I also serve on Chapter 24 Emergency Communication Systems.  So to reinforce what Mr. Delair (phonetic) just noted - the reason we incorporated that --

James Golinveaux:  Thank you.  Microphone Seven.

Ray Grill:  Ray Grill with Air Up, Fire Protection Engineer, and I’m a long time member of Notification Appliances, Chapter 18, and a past Chair.  I also serve on Chapter 24 Emergency Communication Systems.  So to reinforce what Mr. Delair (phonetic) just noted - the reason we incorporated that --

James Golinveaux:  Excuse me.  We're talking about requirements for existing buildings versus new buildings.  We’re referring to a general tone, which as we’ve seen when we talk about CO alarm evacuation, we’re expecting people to count four pulse Temporal-4 to evacuate, versus Temporal-3.  I think the key here is to ensure that we have the right signals for the right application; and whether or not it’s - relocation is different from evacuation.  And then we get into the signaling, or the pre-signals, when we are combining this with mass notification.  On those bases, I vote in support of this motion.

James Golinveaux:  Thank you.  Microphone Three, please.

Steven Lewis:  Yes.  My name is Steven Lewis.  I also serve on Chapter 18, but I’m representing myself today.  Been in the industry over --

James Golinveaux:  Are you speaking for --

Steven Lewis:  -- 20 --

James Golinveaux:  -- or against the motion?

Steven Lewis:  For the motion.  Thank you.  Been in the industry 25 years, and I agree with John, and also Sagiv, and having seen buildings evacuate, and they - and what happens, I - it's confusing, and I think this is the way to go to prevent issues.

James Golinveaux:  Thank you.  Is there any further discussion on the Motion 72-1, to Accept Public Comments 386 and 387?  Not seeing any - Mr. Chair, do you have any final comments?

Merton Bunker:  I stand by the work of the Committee.  Otherwise, I have no comment.  Thank you.

James Golinveaux:  Thank you.  Before we vote, let me restate the motion. The motion on the floor is to Accept Public Comments Number 386 and 387. To vote, touch the Vote button. If you wish to vote in support of the motion, and recommend the text on in Chapter 18. You don’t need to do anything to Chapter 24. If we accept this motion today, this problem will be resolved. Again, for the person that spoke before - if you have an issue in a specific building with an old system that doesn't have the capability, that's okay. For that building, you can have a Temporal-3. But you don't have to do it for all the system that have the capability to do that. Thank you.

James Golinveaux:  Thank you.  Microphone One, please.

John Kepus:  John Kepus with Coffman Engineers, speaking on behalf of myself, and in support of the motion.  I agree with Sagiv on this, for a number of measures. One, we're talking about requirements for existing buildings versus new buildings.  We’re referring to a general tone, which as we’ve seen when we talk about CO alarm evacuation, we’re expecting people to count four pulse Temporal-4 to evacuate, versus Temporal-3.  I think the key here is to ensure that we have the right signals for the right application; and whether or not it’s - relocation is different from evacuation.  And then we get into the signaling, or the pre-signals, when we are combining this with mass notification.  On those bases, I vote in support of this motion.

James Golinveaux:  Thank you.  Microphone Three, please.

Steven Lewis:  Yes.  My name is Steven Lewis.  I also serve on Chapter 18, but I’m representing myself today.  Been in the industry over --

James Golinveaux:  Are you speaking for --

Steven Lewis:  -- 20 --

James Golinveaux:  -- or against the motion?

Steven Lewis:  For the motion.  Thank you.  Been in the industry 25 years, and I agree with John, and also Sagiv, and having seen buildings evacuate, and they - and what happens, I - it's confusing, and I think this is the way to go to prevent issues.

James Golinveaux:  Thank you.  Is there any further discussion on the Motion 72-1, to Accept Public Comments 386 and 387? Not seeing any - Mr. Chair, do you have any final comments?

Merton Bunker:  I stand by the work of the Committee.  Otherwise, I have no comment.  Thank you.

James Golinveaux:  Thank you.  Before we vote, let me restate the motion. The motion on the floor is to Accept Public Comments Number 386 and 387. To vote, touch the Vote button. If you wish to vote in support of the motion, and recommend the text on in Chapter 18. You don’t need to do anything to Chapter 24. If we accept this motion today, this problem will be resolved. Again, for the person that spoke before - if you have an issue in a specific building with an old system that doesn't have the capability, that's okay. For that building, you can have a Temporal-3. But you don't have to do it for all the system that have the capability to do that. Thank you.

James Golinveaux:  Thank you.  Microphone One, please.

John Kepus:  John Kepus with Coffman Engineers, speaking on behalf of myself, and in support of the motion.  I agree with Sagiv on this, for a number of measures. One, we're talking about requirements for existing buildings versus new buildings.  We’re referring to a general tone, which as we’ve seen when we talk about CO alarm evacuation, we’re expecting people to count four pulse Temporal-4 to evacuate, versus Temporal-3.  I think the key here is to ensure that we have the right signals for the right application; and whether or not it’s - relocation is different from evacuation.  And then we get into the signaling, or the pre-signals, when we are combining this with mass notification.  On those bases, I vote in support of this motion.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Mr. Bunker, would you like to offer the Committee's position?

MERTON BUNKER: I'd like to call on Mr. Lowrey.

DAVE LOWREY: Dave Lowrey, Technical Chair, Chapter 18, Notification. So this proposal was rejected at the Committee at the, at the meeting stage. This is - I don't know how long this has been in the document. It has been there a very long time. I didn't trace it back all the way. This is basically a design option that basically says that your fire alarm has to run for 180 seconds. It is allowed to shut off after that, depending on if it's, if, if basically that's the design option, and approved by the authority having jurisdiction. It's like he said - if the authority says, 'You can't shut it off after 180 seconds. It must run until we show up,' then that's what it has to do. But it's simply a design option that's in there that allows for certain occupancies to say after three minutes we can go ahead and have it silence itself. And, and as said, if that's acceptable through the authority having jurisdiction, then, then it can happen.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. With that, we'll proceed with the discussion on the motion.

SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: Okay. So the - this motion, the intent is to prohibit automatic cutoff of fire alarm evacuation signal. This is unsafe. It is unsafe to have fire alarm signal going for a, a pre-assigned time, in this case, 186 - 180 seconds, and then automatically shut down. This is unsafe. What happens when people are evacuating the building, they go to the outside of the building, and the - and the evacuation time is unknown. All kinds of things can happen during the evacuation. So even if you set the time - you do an analysis, said, 'This building should evacuate within five minutes,' and you said the fire alarm signal will stop after five minutes automatically, it might not happen. People might be still evacuating, and the people that - who are already evacuated and staying outside, waiting for the Fire Department to arrive, they might come back into the building when the system stop the signal. This is unsafe.

So the proposal is to say, to eliminate the - to, to eliminate this, this automatic cutoff from the, from the Code, and basically said only the firefighter, or the response - or the responding emergency personnel can manually reset the system and silence the system when they've verified that everything is safe. Now, if a specific AHJ, on a specific jurisdiction, would like to have an automatic cutoff after whatever time, for whatever reason, that's okay. Do it on a, on a case by case basis, on a specific whatever. But in the body of the Code that we are approving, or we are publishing, the safest condition needs to be. And this is not to allow an automatic cutoff of fire alarm evacuation signal.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone Three, please.

SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: Thank you. Sagiv Weiss-Ishai, with San Francisco Fire Department. I move to Accept Public Comment Number 388.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. There is a motion on the floor to Accept Public Comment Number 388. Is there a second?

MALE SPEAKER: Second.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: We do have a second. Please proceed with the discussion on the motion.

SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: Okay. So the - this motion, the intent is to prohibit automatic cutoff of fire alarm evacuation signal. This is unsafe. It is unsafe to have fire alarm signal going for a, a pre-assigned time, in this case, 186 - 180 seconds, and then automatically shut down. This is unsafe. What happens when people are evacuating the building, they go to the outside of the building, and the - and the evacuation time is unknown. All kinds of things can happen during the evacuation. So even if you set the time - you do an analysis, said, 'This building should evacuate within five minutes,' and you said the fire alarm signal will stop after five minutes automatically, it might not happen. People might be still evacuating, and the people that - who are already evacuated and staying outside, waiting for the Fire Department to arrive, they might come back into the building when the system stop the signal. This is unsafe.

So the proposal is to say, to eliminate the - to, to eliminate this, this automatic cutoff from the, from the Code, and basically said only the firefighter, or the response - or the responding emergency personnel can manually reset the system and silence the system when they've verified that everything is safe. Now, if a specific AHJ, on a specific jurisdiction, would like to have an automatic cutoff after whatever time, for whatever reason, that's okay. Do it on a, on a case by case basis, on a specific whatever. But in the body of the Code that we are approving, or we are publishing, the safest condition needs to be. And this is not to allow an automatic cutoff of fire alarm evacuation signal. Thank you.
which states that when an alarm signal deactivation
means is actuated, both audible and visual appliances
shall be simultaneously deactivated. Annex material
further stated that the intent of both visual and
audible appliance are to shut off when the signal
silence feature is activated on the fire alarm control
unit. There was no changes in 2010; and in 2016 - if
there is a need to shut off the notification
appliances, then the intent was to have something on
the exterior of the building.
But let’s go back to 4.4.3.7 initially, and it
provided a means to manually do this, not an automatic
shutoff. It is therefore - I agree with Sagiv on this
- it is an unsafe condition to do an automatic
shutoff. The Code already has the provisions in it
for manual means to control this activation. Thank
you.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone
Three, please.
DAN FINNEGAN: Hi. Good afternoon. Dan
Finnegan of Siemens Building Technologies; also a
member of the AFAA Board of Directors, and former Fire
Code official, speaking for myself. And I’m speaking
in support of the motion. And I’m not going to repeat
the Code references that we just heard. That was a
good, historic statement. I’m going to leave us with
the message of - please support this CAM, because it’s
the right thing to do. Nowhere in our history of fire
life safety with a fire alarm system have we ever
designed anything to automatically shut off. We need
to have personal interface, and personal action to
take place. So this idea of an automatic shutoff of
an alarm signal is a bad move to take. If this CAM
corrects that, then we’re in good shape. Please
support the CAM. Thank you.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone
Three, please.
SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: Sagiv Weiss-Ishai, San
Francisco Fire Department, speaking in favor of the
motion. So I just wanted to say - to, to state what
the Committee response was when they rejected the
proposal. They said that the intent is to allow a
system to be designed and accepted by the AHJ, even an
automatic cutoff provided, it repeats at least for at
least 180 second. This allows the AHJ to review and
approve or reject such plan. If the AHJ requires that
only emergency personnel stop the notification
appliance, they should reject and propose automatic
cutoff, and pass a law or regulation stating the
requirement for their jurisdiction. I’m an AHJ, and I
don’t want to do that. I don’t want to pass a law
regulation to - not about this. I want the Code to
have the safest language. If an AHJ would want to do
an automatic cutoff, they need to pass the law or
regulation to allow that. So I want to reverse the
logic of the Committee. Thank you.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone
Three, please.
STEVEN LEWIS: Yes, my name is Steven Lewis,
served on Chapter 18, but speaking on behalf of myself
today. And I’m for the motion.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Sagiv Weiss-Ishai, San
Francisco with all the multi-culturals we have,
and the people, and all the different communities, I
can see this is a real issue, having been in a number
of these high rise buildings, and seeing how buildings
have - is evacuated. I think it completely needs to
be up to the authority having jurisdiction, and, and
not put restraints on, on time. Thank you.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Okay. Thank you. Is there
any further discussion on Motion 72-2 to Accept Public
Comment Number 388? Mr. Chair, any final comments?
MERTON BUNKER: I have nothing, Sir.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Before we vote, let me
restate the motion. The motion on the floor is to
Accept Public Comment Number 388. To vote, touch the
Vote button. If you wish to vote in support of the
motion, and recommend the text on Screen One, touch
Yes. If you wish to vote against the motion, and
recommend the text on Screen Two, touch No. Please
record your vote. The voting will close in five
seconds. Voting is closed. The results of the vote
are 396 in favor of the motion; 42 against the motion.
The motion passes.
Now, let’s proceed with the discussion on Certified
Amending Motion 72-3; and Microphone Three, please.
SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: Sagiv Weiss-Ishai, San
Francisco Fire Department. I move to Accept Public
Comment Number 389.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. There is a
motion on the floor to Accept Public Comment Number
389. Is there a second?
MALE SPEAKER: Second.
MALE SPEAKER: Second.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: We do have a second. Please
proceed with the discussion on the motion.
SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: Okay. The intent of this
motion is - it's - I can say, pretty procedural; like,
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past Chair of the Manuals Committee, who was involved in the creation of what was the SB-30 document, I'm speaking in support of the CAM.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: All right. And --
DAVE LOWREY: Mr. Lowrey, please.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: I was going to get you there
DAVE LOWREY: All right. Dave Lowrey, Technical Chair, Chapter 18, Notification. So the Committee rejected this, just based on the fact that it's - the authority having jurisdictions, which could be the owner or a facility complex, chooses to have a standard interface, meaning they could - they could pick a particular brand if they wanted to; they could - a specific control unit; maybe a, a specific interface. It's intended for the user of those interfaces. It was not - this section now has kind of evolved. It's not intended to mandate or establish a standard interface in the industry.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you, Mr. Lowrey. With that, we'll open up the debate on the motion. Please provide your name, and affiliation, whether you're speaking in support or against the motion. I'll start with Microphone Three, please.
DAN FINNEGAN: Hi. Good afternoon. Dan Finnegan of Siemens Building Technologies, and at this time, I'm also speaking as a member of NIMA 3SB, and one last time.

DAVE LOWREY: Thank you.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: You knew my name?
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Did.
DAVE LOWREY: All right. Dan Lowrey, past Chair of the Manuals Committee, who was involved in the creation of what was the SB-30 document, I'm speaking in support of the CAM.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: All right. And --
DAVE LOWREY: Mr. Lowrey, please.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: I was going to get you there
DAVE LOWREY: All right. Dave Lowrey, Technical Chair, Chapter 18, Notification. So the Committee rejected this, just based on the fact that it's - the authority having jurisdictions, which could be the owner or a facility complex, chooses to have a standard interface, meaning they could - they could pick a particular brand if they wanted to; they could - a specific control unit; maybe a, a specific interface. It's intended for the user of those interfaces. It was not - this section now has kind of evolved. It's not intended to mandate or establish a standard interface in the industry.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you, Mr. Lowrey. With that, we'll open up the debate on the motion. Please provide your name, and affiliation, whether you're speaking in support or against the motion. I'll start with Microphone Three, please.
DAN FINNEGAN: Hi. Good afternoon. Dan Finnegan of Siemens Building Technologies, and at this time, I'm also speaking as a member of NIMA 3SB, and one last time.

DAN FINNEGAN: Hi. Good afternoon. Dan Finnegan of Siemens Building Technologies, and at this time, I'm also speaking as a member of NIMA 3SB, and one last time.

DAVE LOWREY: Thank you.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: You knew my name?
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Did.
DAVE LOWREY: All right. Dan Lowrey, past Chair of the Manuals Committee, who was involved in the creation of what was the SB-30 document, I'm speaking in support of the CAM.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: All right. And --
DAVE LOWREY: Mr. Lowrey, please.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: I was going to get you there
DAVE LOWREY: All right. Dave Lowrey, Technical Chair, Chapter 18, Notification. So the Committee rejected this, just based on the fact that it's - the authority having jurisdictions, which could be the owner or a facility complex, chooses to have a standard interface, meaning they could - they could pick a particular brand if they wanted to; they could - a specific control unit; maybe a, a specific interface. It's intended for the user of those interfaces. It was not - this section now has kind of evolved. It's not intended to mandate or establish a standard interface in the industry.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you, Mr. Lowrey. With that, we'll open up the debate on the motion. Please provide your name, and affiliation, whether you're speaking in support or against the motion. I'll start with Microphone Three, please.
DAN FINNEGAN: Hi. Good afternoon. Dan Finnegan of Siemens Building Technologies, and at this time, I'm also speaking as a member of NIMA 3SB, and one last time.
PETE LARIMER: Yes. Thank you. My name's Pete Microphone Five.

DAN FINNEGAN: Thank you, Sir. Yes. The Chair of the Committee, Mr. Coffwell (phonetic) is unable to be here, so I'm going to ask the Secretary of the Committee, Dan Finnegan, to please come up and explain what the Committee has done. Thank you.

MERTON BUNKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Chair of the Committee, Mr. Coffwell (phonetic) is unable to be here, so I'm going to ask the Secretary of the Committee, Dan Finnegan, to please come up and explain what the Committee has done. Thank you.

DAN FINNEGAN: Thank you, Sir. Yes. The Technical Committee for Chapter 24 did review this, and voted against the action at that time, and felt that there really wasn't substantial clarification on an issue that needed to be resolved. Thank you.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. With that, we'll open up the debate on the motion. Please provide your name, affiliation, and whether you're speaking in support, or against the motion. Oh, I'm sorry. You - Microphone Five.

PETE LARIMER: Yes. Thank you. My name's Pete Larimer. I'm with the Department of Veterans Affairs, and I'm against the motion. In, in hospitals, we use this provision all the time. So we generate a tone alert to notify staff, and then we initiate a message to the staff. Actually, in the zone of alarm, we use the temporal pattern so that the staff only has to listen to the message to know that the fire is in their alarm, and they should be starting to evacuate patients. However, we also send out simultaneously, an alert message to the other folks in the building to let them know where the fire is, and that they would - should respond to that location to help assist in relocating patients. There's no reason to continue to make noise that interferes with the staff communications, when they're trying to help other folks in, in that assistance.

This is for relocation. It's not for evacuation of the building. So the reason that you can shut it down after three times is because staff has already been alerted, and then they perform their functions that they're supposed to be doing. There's no reason to continue to have noise in the background that will interfere with what they're supposed to do. Thank you.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone Three, please.

TED LEVENTHAL: Okay. My name is Ted Leventhal. I am a member of 24, but I'm speaking, being - on, on my own behalf. I think this type of control --

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: And are you speaking for or against the --

TED LEVENTHAL: Oh --

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: -- motion?

TED LEVENTHAL: -- for - I'm sorry. I thought I mentioned that. I think this should remain non-automatically shut off. In the situation that was just brought up, which is hospital, they're a unique being on their own, and the requirements may have to be addressed, and the AHJ can address that with the facility. So again, I am for the motion as presented.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone Four, please.

TOM PARRISH: Tom Parrish, Putnam Township Fire Department. I'm also a member of the Committee, but I'm speaking for myself right now. And if you read the text on the screen, which is the same text in the Code, it --

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Are you speaking for or against the motion?
for a, a hospital. It's for any facility. And again, if you want to do something on a specific jurisdiction or in specific facility, just do it. But you can't make it for everything. This is unsafe.

To answer to the last speaker, is the Code right now said at least three times. So it can be five time, or six time. But you can be ever sure that everybody evacuated the building - let's say you predetermined five times. Per the Code today is you can shut down the message after five cycles, because it says at least three times. So you can shut it down after five cycles, automatically, because that's what you determined. But you can never be sure that the building completely evacuated. You can never be sure that the people that are waiting outside for the Fire Department will not come back in the building that might be on the fire. This is unsafe condition. Only the Fire Department should come, and manually reset the panel after they made sure that the building is safe. Thank you.

STEVEN LEWIS: Thank you. Steven Lewis, serve for private mode notification. But in cases for you want, but the message won't tell anybody to leave the facility. This has been used only to notify, as it says, direct occupants, or to inform staff. So to have it ring forever and ever, thinking that you're going to make it safer because it's going to tell people to evacuate the building - it's just not going to happen. It's very different than what we were talking about before - we were, where we were trying to evacuate the building, and not stop the signal. We are not evacuating the building with this message. Thank you.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. I'm going to go to Microphone One, please.

JOHN KEPUS: John Kepus with Coffman Engineers, speaking on my own behalf, for the motion. I think the arguments that we've heard here are all related to applications for private mode notification. That is different than applications where it's public mode notification. The importance of any message that has an alert tone, followed by a message, repeating cycles - what we don't want to see happen is it just stop, or just have the alert tone play, and not the message. Yes, for private mode, those people know what to do, and maybe provisions need to be added into the Code for private mode notification. But in cases for
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JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone Seven, please.

MARTY HUIE: Marty Huie, Jacobs Engineering Group, representing myself. The presenter just --

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Are you speaking --

MARTY HUIE: -- for or against the --

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Speaking against. The presenter just presented an argument that made me want to come up and speak. And that is the number of high rises they may have in San Francisco. With the present language that's being proposed, high rises, single story buildings, hospitals can't shunt the alarm at all until the Fire Department comes and shunts the alarm.

The language that is being recommended by the Committee, the high rise fire - and the Fire Marshal would come to an agreement with that, saying you can't shunt it until such time we arrive. It says at least three times. So he made the argument - at three times, or it could be seven times - earlier. And that is the argument I'm bringing to the table. If it's - the Fire Marshal can - you can have both pieces. The Fire Marshal on this high rise can say it can - it cannot shut down. But if we take the proposed language, a hospital cannot shut down their alarm until such time the Fire Marshal arrives. It just seems like they're asking two different sides of the same coin. And within a hospital facility, we have Alzheimer's patients; we have patients that are heavily estated (phonetic), and if so, they are maybe not being attended to; a nurse is not there by their side; they might be addressing other things. And they start climbing out of their bed, and they fail, and we have major other issues that we're dealing with.

Thank you.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone Four, please.

MALE SPEAKER: I move to Call the Question.

(APPLAUSE)

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: There's a motion on the floor to Call the Question.

MALE SPEAKER: Second.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: I notice that there are a number of people remaining at the microphone, waiting to speak. But we'll proceed with the vote on Call the Question. Do we have a second?

MALE SPEAKER: Second.
MERTON BUNKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

IVAN SPECTOR: Thank you. My name is Ivan Spector. I'm the current President of the Monitoring Association, and I'm speaking in support of the motion. There are a few relevant points that I'd like to make. It is important to note that while a listed supervising station can act as a remote station, a remote station cannot act as a listing supervising station. Our NRTL certification is not an easy process. It takes much planning, investment, and determination. These include, among other things, a minimum of two operators on duty at all times, and their task is dedicated to responding to signals. Our listed supervising stations have limited - limited entry, for security purposes. We are required to have redundant, supervised communication paths; backup generators; stringent recordkeeping regarding system tests and signals received; strict software and hardware testing; and undergo an annual audit. These are rigorous requirements. There are over 400 listed supervising stations operating in the United States today. I'm a Committee member of SIGHAL (phonetic) for the last 18 years. Household Fire Chapter SIGHAL filed the facilities requirements in Section 26.5.3 of NFPA 72, 2016. In 2019, SIGHAL Committee accepted public input, thereby removing the clause where permitted by the AHJ, and now allows listed central supervising stations to monitor household fire alarm systems. The new language reads as follows: 'Alarm supervisory in trouble signals shall be permitted to be received at a listed central supervising station.'

In closing, NFPA 72, 2019 allows listed central supervising stations to monitor central station service alarm systems, build, design, and monitor proprietary supervising station alarm systems, household fire alarm systems, but requires AHJ permission to monitor remote supervising station alarm systems. Support of CAM 6 will resolve this confusion. Vote in favor of this motion. Thank you.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. With that, we'll open up the debate on the motion. Please provide your name, affiliation, and whether you're speaking in support, or against the motion. Microphone Three, please.

IVAN SPECTOR: Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Ivan Spector. I'm the current President of the Monitoring Association, and I'm speaking in support of the motion. There are a few relevant points that I'd like to make. It is important to note that while a listed supervising station can act as a remote station, a remote station cannot act as a listing supervising station. Our NRTL certification is not an easy process. It takes much planning, investment, and determination. These include, among other things, a minimum of two operators on duty at all times, and their task is dedicated to responding to signals. Our listed supervising stations have limited - limited entry, for security purposes. We are required to have redundant, supervised communication paths; backup generators; stringent recordkeeping regarding system tests and signals received; strict software and hardware testing; and undergo an annual audit. These are rigorous requirements. There are over 400 listed supervising stations operating in the United States today. I'm a Committee member of SIGHAL (phonetic) for the last 18 years. Household Fire Chapter SIGHAL filed the facilities requirements in Section 26.5.3 of NFPA 72, 2016. In 2019, SIGHAL Committee accepted public input, thereby removing the clause where permitted by the AHJ, and now allows listed central supervising stations to monitor household fire alarm systems. The new language reads as follows: 'Alarm supervisory in trouble signals shall be permitted to be received at a listed central supervising station.'

In closing, NFPA 72, 2019 allows listed central supervising stations to monitor central station service alarm systems, build, design, and monitor proprietary supervising station alarm systems, household fire alarm systems, but requires AHJ permission to monitor remote supervising station alarm systems. Support of CAM 6 will resolve this confusion. Vote in favor of this motion. Thank you.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. With that, we'll open up the debate on the motion. Please provide your name, affiliation, and whether you're speaking in support, or against the motion. Microphone Three, please.
Dave Baron: Hello. My name is Dave Baron, and I'm here on behalf of the Monitoring Association and Wayne Alarm Systems of Lynn, Massachusetts. My colleague with the Monitoring Association is Robert Burke, and I'm here on behalf of the Fire Marshals Association of Colorado. I speak against the motion. My name is Jay Hahn, and I am a member of the Technical Committee responsible for the section of the Code impacted by this CAM. I'm going to say that you're doing - you're going to hear that this is an affront to the Fire Service. I really do not believe that is accurate, and I'll, and I'll tell you why. First, as the Standards experts in this room know, NFPA 72 is a minimal Standard, defines the minimum requirements that must be met. Exceeding the minimum requirements throughout the Code is an acceptable, normal practice. In fact, Chapter One of NFPA 72, 1.5.3 clearly states, and I quote, 'The systems, methods, devices, or appliances that are found equivalent shall be approved,' unquote. I know of nowhere else in the NFPA 72 Standard where functionality that is not only equivalent, but exceeds the minimum standard, is singled out for specific approval. In this case, a NRTL listed supervising station is not only an equivalent - it significantly exceeds the requirements for a remote station. This CAM corrects that. The requirements to operate a NRTL listed central supervising station are extremely stringent. UL 827, and UL 1981 are standards that are very prescriptive. As you consider what is said here today in determining how to vote, please carefully take the following comment into consideration. Recently added UL 827, UL 1981, and UL 1981 are standards that are very prescriptive. As you consider what is said here today in determining how to vote, please carefully take the following comment into consideration. Recently added Standards language that individually targets NRTL listed central supervising stations, requiring them to get special approval, even though they significantly exceed the minimal standard, is something that needs to be corrected.

I will say that I am on the Committee. It was stated the vote was 18 to 1. I, I was the one vote. I do believe there was really - there is only one representative of a central station on that Committee, and that's me. There are other people - are on that Committee that represents - or central stations, but they are directed votes, central station involved Committee, and there's one vote - one, one central station. That is, that is me. So I ask that you vote in support of this CAM, and correcting 2019 edition of the Code - what was a very controversial change in the 2016 edition. Thank you.

Dave Baron: Hello. My name is Dave Baron, and I'm here on behalf of the Monitoring Association and Wayne Alarm Systems of Lynn, Massachusetts. My colleague with the Monitoring Association is Robert Burke, and I'm here on behalf of the Fire Marshals Association of Colorado. I speak against the motion. My name is Jay Hahn, and I am a member of the Technical Committee responsible for the section of the Code impacted by this CAM. I'm going to say that you're doing - you're going to hear that this is an affront to the Fire Service. I really do not believe that is accurate, and I'll, and I'll tell you why. First, as the Standards experts in this room know, NFPA 72 is a minimal Standard, defines the minimum requirements that must be met. Exceeding the minimum requirements throughout the Code is an acceptable, normal practice. In fact, Chapter One of NFPA 72, 1.5.3 clearly states, and I quote, 'The systems, methods, devices, or appliances that are found equivalent shall be approved,' unquote. I know of nowhere else in the NFPA 72 Standard where functionality that is not only equivalent, but exceeds the minimum standard, is singled out for specific approval. In this case, a NRTL listed supervising station is not only an equivalent - it significantly exceeds the requirements for a remote station. This CAM corrects that. The requirements to operate a NRTL listed central supervising station are extremely stringent. UL 827, and UL 1981 are standards that are very prescriptive. As you consider what is said here today in determining how to vote, please carefully take the following comment into consideration. Recently added Standards language that individually targets NRTL listed central supervising stations, requiring them to get special approval, even though they significantly exceed the minimal standard, is something that needs to be corrected.

I will say that I am on the Committee. It was stated the vote was 18 to 1. I, I was the one vote. I do believe there was really - there is only one representative of a central station on that Committee, and that's me. There are other people - are on that Committee that represents - or central stations, but they are directed votes, central station involved Committee, and there's one vote - one, one central station. That is, that is me. So I ask that you vote in support of this CAM, and correcting 2019 edition of the Code - what was a very controversial change in the 2016 edition. Thank you.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Are you speaking for or against --
ROBERT BURKE: I'm sorry --
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: the motion?
ROBERT BURKE: speaking for the amendment -
for the motion. My colleague from the Monitoring
Association did a great job. I'm not going to re-
cover that area. I think why I've been asked here is
because of my experience as an AHJ for 28 years. And
I don't think anyone should consider this as an
affront to AHJs. When I was an AHJ, I considered
listed central stations as the gold standard, and I
therefore can personally support this motion.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone Four,
please.
MIKE TYKA (phonetic): Thank you. My name is
Mike Tyka. I'm representing the Illinois Fire
Inspectors, and I'm opposing this motion. This motion
does nothing but circumvent the - and limit the
ability of the Building, Fire, or the elected
officials in their community to provide decisions that
they feel are in the best interests of their community
to keep them safe. There is really no technical
significance to this change, except for moving the
language. The language 'of where required by the AHJ'
gives us the ability to have a central location that
can keep up with things, can tell us if we have an
arson attempt at one or more buildings - how we can
address that. We also have the opportunity to look
into the fine details, so we can go to our building if
we had a fire, and compare it to other buildings that
are built the same way to see how we can improve that.
We have a current initiative to put fire alarms in all
of our buildings, even though the Code doesn't require
it. We've been putting fire sprinklers in our
buildings, all of our buildings, since the early
2000s, even though the Code hasn't required it. So
we've tried to be forthright in doing that, and
providing additional protection. So please vote for
the motion. Thank you.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone
Seven, please.
DAN FINNEGAN: Yes, hi. Good afternoon. I'm
Dan Finnegan, with Siemens Building Technologies,
former Fire Code official, and I do oppose this CAM,
and I've asked for everyone to oppose this CAM. As I
mentioned, Siemens is an owner operator of UL listed
central station service operation, and we're also a
member of the Monitoring Association. We're also one
- and I specifically, as one - who have dedicated our
lives to fire and life safety. And I ask you to
oppose this, primarily because we need to support the
Fire Service. Just looking at the language up there
on the screen, when we delete the authority having
jurisdiction, which in almost all cases is the Fire
Service, is, is sad to see. Those are the gentlemen
and ladies, that every time that alarm is dispatched,
they're putting their lives on the line. They
deserve, and they should, and they shall, have the
right to be able to review and approve where the, the
alarm signals are being monitored and dispatched from.
Unfortunately, this CAM, as we know, has been
around for a while, is being driven by greed, and not
life safety. No one yet has brought a life safety
issue forward to the point of discussion, which is the
core competence of NFPA. There is no life safety
issue here. The Code should remain as it is. I ask
for you to oppose this, and to please support the Fire
Service. Thank you.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. I'm going to go
to Microphone One. I know you've been standing on Two
for a while. Be patient with me, just for a second.
Microphone One, please.
PATRICK EGAN: Thank you. My name is Patrick -
oh, boy, that echo is terrible. My name is Patrick
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We heard today about redundancy in the, the battery cells, fuel cells. We talk about safety, having some standards in, in, in, in the air pack designs for SCBAs; redundancy for, for fire departments. There's very few fire departments that don't have at least two fire trucks. (Laughter) The, the, the language in the Standard for some reason specifically requires special approval for a level of service that significantly - significantly exceeds the minimal standard, is frankly, irrational. I am voting in support of this CAM, and I ask that you all do the same. Thank you.

MICHAEL RONS: My name is Michael Rons. I'm the Fire Marshal at the Village of Schaumburg. I'm here to speak against the motion. After decades of having our fire alarms directly connected to our dispatch center, a little over 10 years ago, we allowed the community to, to revert to central stations. Earlier, we heard a member talk about the gold standard that the central stations offer. We've had a different experience, and we've had a number of issues over the last 10 years with these central station alarm monitoring companies.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone Two, please.

MICHAEL RONS: Yes, thank you. My name is Michael Rons. I'm from Select Security, from Lancaster, Pennsylvania. I'm speaking in - for the motion. I'm a past member of the NFPA Committee that had handled this Section 72 for more than 20 years. I'm a retired Fire Chief from Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. I'm a 51-year member, and current member of the Lancaster Township Volunteer Fire Department.

You will hear that this is a subrogation of the authority having jurisdiction. As a retired Fire Chief, and an AHJ, I do not agree. I just listened to Mr. Finnegan's comments about how we need to support the Fire Service, and how this is not a life safety issue. I want to call into question that using a remote station does not require, or the Standard does not require any redundancy whatsoever. In many UL listed central stations, UL redundancy is required, and most central stations have redundant re - central stations. Thinking having a single fire alarm going to a remote station, a fire station, with the requirement of only one person on duty - I hope he's not taking a break, taking a nap, or in the toilet when that one fire alarm comes in at three o'clock in the morning.

Remote station requirements are decades old. They have very, very minimal technical requirements.

We started documenting this in 2014. Over a year and a half period, we had documented 30 issues related to out of service alarms, trouble alarms, supervisor alarms not being notified to the Fire Department. We've had issues with transmissions delays and errors. Our Village Board has an ordinance to go back to the way we were doing things before, and have a direct connection to our dispatch center. We've still been documenting those issues, and have had another 27 issues since that time. We've had multiple discussions with the central stations in our area, and they haven't been able to address those issues.

With the language that's currently in the Code, that would be against the current motion, the Fire Department would have the ability to address those issues with those central stations. Not every department may need to go to a direct connect ordinance, such as we have, but they should be able to address the issue with central stations that are underperforming. So I encourage everyone here today to vote against this motion. Thank you.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone One, please.

ROBERT SHORE: My name is Robert Shore. I'm from Systems Design Group in Flemington, New Jersey. And I just want to --

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Are you speaking in favor or against the motion?

ROBERT SHORE: I am speaking in favor of this motion. And I want to address the comment by my colleague, Dan Finnegan, where this is motivated by greed - for greed. For 35 years, since 1984, central stations have been providing this service, and have doing - have done a very, very good job. I believe that giving the option of using a central station to the AHJ is a huge mistake, being that they could essentially put a lot of alarm businesses out of business - companies that have been around for many years, building a recurring revenue base in monitoring, by subbing it out to a central station, could be adversely affected. I don't think that's a good move. We've been building our businesses for - for decades, and building our retirements, which could be wiped away out of our community easily by an AHJ.

Now, I believe if there's any greed motivating this, it is coming from the Fire Service more than it is coming from the central station businesses; and that maybe the greed is what's motivating them, because of the revenue. Thank you.
JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone Eight, please.

BILL FISKE: Thank you, Chairman. My name is Bill Fiske, and I am speaking for myself, in support of this motion. Now, I recognize that every NFPA Code and Standards Committee can decide for itself. But I have been a member of the National Electrical Code Committee since 1985, on three different Code Panels, and the Correlating Committee at one time or another. And in the NEC, as most of you know, if equipment is listed that has to be (unintelligible) - that it is approved, the AHJ has very little to say about that. And in those 33 years that I've been on the NEC Committee, I don't recall an instance of an AHJ representative ever complaining about that. So as far as AHJ prerogatives, I'm not quite convinced.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. I'm going to move to Microphone Seven, then I'll come to Three.

DAVE BARON: My name is Dave Baron, and I am speaking against the motion. I, I was for a short time on Fire Department, and I've listened to a lot of the, the proponents for this motion. I'm a simple sprinkler guy now. I can't believe that there are any even suggestions that an AHJ would take advantage of a position in, in any way, shape, or form, adversely to

TED LEVENTHAL: Thank you. I am for the motion. My name is Ted Leventhal; 41 years in the industry. I actually don't have a dog in this race, shall we say. I don't run a central station; I don't run an alarm company any more. It's a question of accountability. In the fire alarm industry, we have always made sure there is an accountability, and central stations are forced to have accountability. If they are UL listed, FM listed, whatever it is, they have to account to a standard of operation. And that's the real question - accountability. Thank you.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. I'm going to go to Microphone Eight.

KEVIN LEHAND (phonetic): I'm for this motion. My name is Kevin Lehand. I'm from Emergency 24. I want to address specifically Mr. Rons from Schaumburg. I was in those meetings with you. We offered you solutions. I've also reviewed the Freedom of Information documents that we received back and the, the statements that you made about the issues with central stations - I, I don't believe are accurate. I also didn't hear you say anything about the systems that were not monitored - system owned - or systems owned by the City of Schaumburg. So I would just like that there would be full transparency here. Thank you.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. We do have a second. In order to vote on this motion, please scroll down to the bottom of the tablet to vote. If you wish to vote in support of the motion to Call the Question, touch Yes. If you wish to vote against the motion to Call the Question, touch No. Please record your vote. The voting will be closed in five seconds. Voting is closed. The vote is 389 in favor of calling the question; 33 against. The motion to Call the Question has passed. Therefore, we will move directly to voting on the motion.
Before we vote, let me restate the motion. The motion on the floor is to Accept Public Comment Number Six.

And before we vote here, I just want to - there's a couple of housekeeping items that I'm going to need to announce, because I know once this final vote is done, some of you are going to be bolting from the door. (laughter) So before you jump, listen to what I have to say, because it's very important about your voting tablet, the way you log out, and the way you need to return it. So we will go through this, but just be patient with me.

So we - before we vote on the motion, let me restate the motion. The motion on the floor is to Accept Public Comment Number Six. To vote, touch the Vote button. If you wish to vote in support of the motion, and recommend the text on Screen One, touch Yes. If you wish to vote against the motion, and recommend the text on Screen Two, touch No. Please record your vote.

MALE SPEAKER: Hmm?

MALE SPEAKER: Not with (unintelligible).

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: The voting will be closed in five seconds, or the time it takes me to get a margarita. (laughter) The voting is closed. (applause) The results are 304 in favor of the motion; 128 against the motion. The motion has passed.

Is there any further discussion on NFPA 72?

Thank you, Mr. Bunker.

MERTON BUNKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Could you - could everyone please look at their device; click on the button next to your name, and type the following log, log-out code: 1218. So there's a button next to your name; and type log-out code 1218. You can then drop your devices off at the back of the hall.

This officially concludes the 2018 NFPA Technical Meeting. I want to thank you for your participation, interest, and support. I now declare the 2018 NFPA Technical Meeting officially adjourned. (applause)

(END OF MEETING)