

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 NATIONAL FIRE PROTECTION ASSOCIATION

11 2018 JUNE MEETING

12 THURSDAY, 14 JUNE 2018

13 AUDIO TRANSCRIPTION OF TECHNICAL COMMITTEE SESSION

14 8:00 AM - PART ONE

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

ATKINSON-BAKER, INC.

22

COURT REPORTERS

(800) 288-3376

23

www.depo.com

24

TRANSCRIBED BY: TIMOTHY ROBERT DUVAL

25

FILE NO. AC068DF

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



1	by Mr. Campbell:	57
2	VOTE	58
3	MOTION FAILED	58
4	CERTIFIED AMENDING MOTION 241-2 REMOVED FROM AGENDA	59
5	PRESENTATION OF NFPA 289	
6	by Mr. Badders:	61
7	MOTION TO REJECT AN IDENTIFIABLE PART OF SECOND REVISION NUMBER 6 AND ANY RELATED PORTIONS OF FIRST REVISION NUMBER 7 AND 10	
8		
9		
10	by Ms. Newman:	62
11	PRESENTATION	
12	by Ms. Newman:	63
13	COMMITTEE'S POSITION	
14	by Mr. Badders:	65
15	DEBATE	
16	by Mr. Hirschler:	66
17	by Ms. Newman:	67
18	by Mr. Hirschler:	68
19	by Ms. Newman:	68
20	by Mr. Hirschler:	69
21	by Mr. Badders:	70
22	VOTE	70
23	MOTION FAILED	70
24	DISCUSSION ON CERTIFIED AMENDING MOTION 289-2 TO REJECT AN IDENTIFIABLE PART OF SECOND REVISION 2 AND ANY RELATION PORTION OF FIRST REVISION NUMBER 19	
25		

Page 6

1	by Ms. Newman:	70
2	COMMITTEE'S POSITION	
3	by Mr. Badders:	71
4	DEBATE	
5	by Mr. Hirschler:	72
6	by Mr. Shapiro:	73
7	by Mr. Hirschler:	74
8	by Mr. Shapiro:	74
9	by Mr. Batters:	75
10	VOTE	75
11	MOTION PASSED	76
12	MOTION TO ACCEPT PUBLIC COMMENT NUMBER 54	
13	by Mr. Hirschler:	79
14	COMMITTEE'S POSITION	
15	by Mr. Leavitt:	81
16	DEBATE	
17	by Mr. Hirschler:	82
18	by Mr. Harrington:	83
19	by Mr. Leavitt:	83
20	VOTE	83
21	MOTION PASSED	83
22	DISCUSSION ON CERTIFIED AMENDING MOTION 13-2	
23	MOTION TO ACCEPT PUBLIC COMMENT NUMBER 53	
24	by Mr. Hirschler:	84
25	COMMITTEE'S POSITION	

Page 7

1	by Mr. Linder:	85
2	VOTE	86
3	MOTION PASSED	86
4	DISCUSSION ON CERTIFIED AMENDING MOTION 13-3	
5	MOTION TO ACCEPT PUBLIC COMMENT NUMBER 55	
6	by Mr. Hirschler:	86
7	VOTE	87
8	MOTION PASSED	88
9	DISCUSSION ON CERTIFIED AMENDING MOTION 13-5	
10	MOTION TO ACCEPT 13-5 TO REJECT SECOND REVISION 386 AND RELATED PORTIONS OF FIRST REVISION 751	88
11		
12	by Mr. Asp:	88
13	PRESENTATION	
14	by Mr. Asp:	89
15	COMMITTEE'S POSITION	
16	by Mr. Leavitt:	90
17	DEBATE	
18	by Mr. Caputo:	92
19	by Mr. Isman:	93
20	by Mr. Hopkins:	95
21	by Mr. Caputo:	97
22	by Mr. Backer (phonetic):	98
23	by Mr. Bowe:	99
24	by Mr. Stanley:	99
25	by Mr. Isman:	100

Page 8

1	by Mr. Asp:	101
2	CALL THE QUESTION MOTION	
3	by Mr. Hirschler:	102
4	VOTE	103
5	CALL THE QUESTION MOTION PASSED	104
6	VOTE	105
7	MOTION PASSED	105
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Page 9

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

<p>1 [Music.] 2 ANNOUNCEMENT: Ladies and gentlemen, may I 3 have your attention, please? Today's session will 4 begin at 8:10 to allow those who are still at 5 Registration to join us here in the ballroom. Thank 6 you. 7 [Music.] 8 ANNOUNCEMENT: Good morning, ladies and 9 gentlemen, and welcome to the 2018 NFPA Technical 10 Meeting. Please take a moment to familiarize yourself 11 with the room, noting exits in the unlikely event of the 12 need to evacuate. Let me remind you being a safety 13 organization NFPA is always concerned for your safety. 14 Please look around for the marked emergency exits. 15 Keep in mind that the nearest emergency exit may be 16 behind you. 17 In the event of an emergency in the convention 18 center, dial 77911 from any house phone or 702-632-7911. 19 Do not call 911. If there is an emergency requiring 20 evacuation, please follow the directions of the Security 21 staff who are dressed in black uniforms with visible 22 Security arm patches, badges, and name tags. 23 Additionally, an announcement will be made 24 over the public address system, and if necessary, horns 25 and strobe lights will also go off. The fire alarm</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 10</p>	<p>1 establish the process for today's session. Both 2 documents are included in the 2018 NFPA Standards 3 Directory available on NFPA's website. 4 The Certified Amending Motions of today's 5 session will be taken in the published order of the 6 NFPA Technical Meeting Agenda. For viewing, please see 7 the NFPA website or the NFPA CNE (phonetic) mobile app. 8 The agenda combines all Certified Amending Motions from 9 the Fall 2017 and Annual 2018 Motions Committee Report 10 and identifies which motions will be considered during 11 the Technical Meeting. Only Certified Amending Motions 12 and subsequent Allowable Follow-Up Motions as determined 13 by the Presiding Officer will be entertained at this 14 meeting. An authorized person must sign in as per the 15 convention rules to indicate presence and intention to 16 pursue each Certified Amending Motion. 17 By obtaining your credentials at 18 Registration, you have electronically signed in for 19 these purposes. Statements for the record, statements 20 for which no Certified Amending Motions or Allowable 21 Follow-Up Motion is available shall not be permitted. 22 All Certified Amending Motions were reviewed 23 by the Motions Committee for determination of 24 certification following submission of Notices of Intent 25 To Make A Motion.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 12</p>
<p>1 signal is a long slow whoop along with flashing strobe 2 lights followed by a voice announcement. If you hear 3 the alarm, please quietly leave the room using the exit 4 nearest you. Remember, the nearest exit may be behind 5 you. 6 If you are a person with disabilities who has 7 not already made arrangements with NFPA staff for 8 emergency evacuation, please see someone at the 9 Registration Desk prior to the initiation of today's 10 session. 11 During the Technical Meeting, the use of 12 recording devices of any type is prohibited. The 13 regulations governing the development of NFPA Standards 14 or the Regs primarily govern the NFPA Standards 15 Development Process, including processing of Certifying 16 Amending Motions at Technical Meetings. The complete 17 Regs are available on NFPA's website and published in 18 the NFPA 2018 Standards Directory. 19 As a participant in the process and attendee, 20 you should familiarize yourself with the Guide For The 21 Conduct Of Participants In The NFPA Standards 22 Development Process prior to the start of considerations 23 of today's Certified Amending Motions. 24 Additionally of importance to be familiar with 25 are the NFPA Convention Rules. The Convention Rules</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 11</p>	<p>1 For the NFPA Technical Meeting, a quorum is 2 to be established prior to conducting business in 3 consideration of Certified Amending Motions. Should the 4 quorum be lost during proceedings, the session will 5 terminate without further action by the membership. 6 Any Certified Amending Motions not acted upon prior to 7 the loss of quorum shall be forwarded directly to the 8 Standards Council without recommendation of this 9 Meeting for action and accordance with Section 4.7 of 10 the Regs. 11 Any Motions to Amend or Return that pass 12 prior to the loss of quorum shall be processed and 13 forwarded to the Standards Council in accordance with 14 the Reg Sections 4.5.3, 4.6, and 4.7. 15 Any appeals based upon NFPA Technical Meeting 16 Actions must be filed with the Standards Council within 17 twenty days following adjournment. An appeal for any 18 amendment passed at this Meeting which fails Committee 19 ballot shall be filed no later than five days after 20 publication of the amendment ballot results in 21 accordance with Section 4.2.6 of the Regs. Typically, 22 results of amendment ballots are published within 23 twenty days of the Technical Meeting's adjournment. 24 The votes cast at the Technical Meeting, in 25 conjunction with the debate prior to voting, are an</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 13</p>

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

<p>1 integral and important contribution to NFPA's Consensus 2 Process. Through motions, debate, and voting, you, our 3 NFPA membership, make recommendations to the Standards 4 Council. The majority vote results today are for the 5 sole purpose of providing recommendations to the 6 Standards Council prior to the issuance of Standards. 7 The Standards Council decision on issuance is 8 based upon the entire record, including the discussion 9 and resulting votes at the Technical Meeting. Voting 10 at the NFPA Technical Meeting is a privilege granted to 11 voting members of the Association who are physically 12 present. Voting members are identified as such on 13 registration badge, utilize a voting device, and 14 should be seated in areas of the room designated for 15 voting members. Presiding Officers regardless of 16 membership status do not vote on matters before the 17 membership. Voting will be recorded and entered 18 through the electronic devices issued at today's 19 registration. In the event of a tie vote, the issue 20 fails. 21 Once the session begins today, a Presiding 22 Officer will recognize each authorized maker of a 23 motion or designee in the published agenda order. At 24 that time to proceed, the maker must approach a 25 to present the motion.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 14</p>	<p>1 appropriate. 2 To officially conduct this meeting, the 3 Presiding Officer will allow each speaker three 4 minutes to speak. However, the Presiding Officer may 5 limit speaking time afforded in the event that this 6 becomes necessary. With one minute remaining, a bell 7 will sound and a timer will appear on the center 8 screen. Once your time has ended, please conclude 9 your remarks. 10 Following close of debate, the membership 11 will be asked to vote on the motion. Once the vote is 12 final, the Presiding Officer will announce the results 13 of the membership's vote. 14 If the motion was successful, the Presiding 15 Officer shall entertain follow-up motions, if any. The 16 maker of a follow-up motion shall explain why the motion 17 is in order before the Presiding Officer makes 18 determination as to whether the motion is a proper 19 follow-up motion. 20 If determined proper, debate on the floor 21 follows the same order as Certified Amending Motions. 22 As presentations and debate of each motion continues, 23 five screens will display the text of the motion: 24 Screen 1 will show the recommended text if 25 the motion passes or, should the motion's text be</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 16</p>
<p>1 Following presentation, the Chair of the 2 responsible Technical Committee shall report. 3 The floor is then open for discussion. Anyone 4 in attendance has the privilege of participating, 5 speaking either in support of or opposition to the 6 motion. Please preface all remarks with your name, 7 company or organizational affiliation, and whether you 8 are speaking in favor of or against the presented 9 motion. Again, identify yourself by name, company or 10 organizational affiliation, and your position each time 11 you address the membership. Should you forget to do 12 so, the Presiding Officer will remind you of this as 13 the information assists the stenographer of the 14 session. Green signs indicate microphones for 15 supporters of the motion; red signs indicate 16 microphones for opponents of the motion. 17 Per the Regulations governing NFPA Sections, 18 a Section may present a position on a motion at the 19 Technical Meeting. The position of a Section does not 20 necessarily reflect the views of all Sectionmembers, 21 but minimally must have been established by a majority 22 of members with twenty-five or more votes cast. The 23 position of a Section is awarded no special status in 24 the NFPA Standards Development Process and may be 25 weighed and assessed by you as the membership deem</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 15</p>	<p>1 lengthy, refer the audience to the electronic agenda. 2 Screen 2 will show the recommended text 3 of the Technical Committee and if the motion fails. 4 The center screen will show the actual motion 5 and action on the floor that the IMAC (phonetic) camera 6 captures during debate. Following close of a motion's 7 debate and membership vote, the center screen will 8 display the total number of votes in support and in 9 opposition to the motion. 10 Together we will make the NFPA 2018 Technical 11 Meeting a success. We thank you in advance for your 12 participation and welcome any comments that you may 13 share and suggested improvements for future events. 14 At this time, I invite you to please take 15 your seats. The 2018 NFPA Technical Meeting will 16 begin shortly. Your efforts to assist us in starting 17 timely are graciously appreciated. 18 ANNOUNCEMENT: Ladies and gentlemen, may I 19 have your attention please? Would Laurence Dallaire, 20 David Fischler, Stephen Verbil please join your follow 21 award-winners in front of Screen Number 2 at the front 22 of the room? Thank you. 23 [Music.] 24 ANNOUNCEMENT: Ladies and gentlemen, we still 25 have individuals checking in, so we're going to get</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 17</p>

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

<p>1 started in five minutes. Thank you. 2 [Music.] 3 ANNOUNCEMENT: Ladies and gentlemen, we still 4 have a rather long line, and in order to allow as many 5 participants to be in the room as possible, we're going 6 to delay the start until 8:30, but we will be starting 7 at 8:30. Thank you very much. 8 [Music.] 9 MR. BELL: Thanks, everyone, for your 10 patience. We now have everybody checked in and 11 everybody is here on stage. 12 Good morning, and welcome, ladies and 13 gentlemen, to the 2018 Technical Meeting. My name is 14 Kerry Bell, and it's my distinct pleasure to serve as 15 Chair of your Standards Council and to take part in 16 this meeting. 17 Before I get started, I want to introduce the 18 individuals here with me on stage. 19 Toward the end of the stage there is Sally 20 Everett, who is NFPA's General Counsel. 21 To her -- 22 [Applause.] 23 To her left is Suzanne Gallagher, who is 24 NFPA's General Counsel. 25 Behind me --</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 18</p>	<p>1 single project that has enhanced the NFPA Standards 2 Development Process. We have three of these awards to 3 present here this morning, and the first award goes to 4 Russell Leavitt of the Telgian Corporation in Phoenix, 5 Arizona. 6 [Applause.] 7 Russ, please join me on stage. 8 [Music.] 9 MS. BELLIS: My mike's... Oh, my mike is 10 on now. Thank you. 11 Russ is being recognized today for his active 12 role with the NFPA 13 Restructuring Task Group for the 13 2019 Edition. 14 During the development of the 2016 Edition of 15 NFPA 13, several Technical Committees recommended major 16 structural and organizational changes to NFPA's Flagship 17 Standard. This request was approved by the NFPA 13 18 Correlating Committee, and Russ volunteered to serve as 19 Chair of the NFPA 13 Restructuring Task Group for the 20 2019 Edition. This task group met face-to-face five 21 times and held more than a dozen conference calls in 22 the eighteen-month window following the printing of the 23 2016 Edition. Reorganizing and restructuring a 24 document of this magnitude requires both attention to 25 detail and strong leadership skills, both of which Russ</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 20</p>
<p>1 [Applause.] 2 Behind me is Linda Fuller, who is the 3 Recording Secretary of the Council. 4 [Applause.] 5 And then at the other podium is Dawn Michele 6 Bellis, who is the Secretary of the Standards Council. 7 [Applause.] 8 Now, as you know, the NFPA Standards 9 Development Process is a consensus process that 10 encourages participation by anyone who is interested in 11 improving safety and reducing loss from fire. 12 Now, as a part of this process, we have 13 countless volunteers who freely share their time and 14 expertise to develop standards that address these 15 safety concerns, as well as address new technologies. 16 It's my distinct pleasure here to recognize some 17 outstanding NFPA participants who have gone above and 18 beyond to help advance NFPA's safety mission. Please 19 join me in thanking each award recipient and 20 recognizing their stellar contributions to the 21 development of NFPA Standards. 22 Now, the first award that we have to give 23 here this morning is the Special Achievement Award. 24 The Special Achievement Award is presented to recognize 25 the significant contribution of a Committee Member to a</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 19</p>	<p>1 exhibited as Chair. Under Russ's direction, the task 2 group developed a methodology for tracking changes of 3 each section of the 2016 Edition to where they were 4 relocated into the 2019 Edition. This effort assured 5 that nothing was lost and that the Technical Committees 6 who would ultimately review and act on the proposed 7 restructured document would not be delayed, tracking 8 changes themselves during the First Draft meeting. 9 In addition to the tactical approach to the 10 restructuring, Russ educated stakeholders of the 11 impending reorganization, presenting at several 12 industry association conferences, answering questions, 13 and ultimately alleviating any lingering concerns 14 around the restructuring. This monumental effort was 15 completed by the appointed Task Group and presented to 16 the responsible Technical Committees for review. The 17 Technical Committees accepted the majority of the Task 18 Group's work at the First Draft meeting. 19 The daunting undertaking of this 20 restructuring was made successful and seamless by 21 Russ's personal investment in achieving the task 22 assigned by the Correlating Committee. 23 MR. BELL: Please join me in congratulating 24 Russ for this Special Achievement Award. 25 [Applause.]</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 21</p>

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

<p>1 MR. BELL: On behalf of the Standards 2 Council, we thank Russ for his dedication to the NFPA 3 Standards Development Process. 4 Now, the second Special Achievement Award 5 goes to Warren Olsen of Fire Safety Consultants, 6 Incorporated, in Elgin, Illinois. 7 Warren, please come up here on stage. 8 MS. BELLIS: Warren is being recognized today 9 for his active role as Chair of the Technical Committee 10 on Supervising Station Fire Alarm and Signaling 11 Systems for NFPA 72, National Fire Alarm and Signaling 12 Code. 13 Warren Olsen has been a member of the 14 Technical Committee on Supervising Station Fire Alarm 15 and Signaling Systems for NFPA 72 since October of 2009. 16 Warren served as Principal and currently acts as Chair 17 of the Technical Committee. When Warren became Chair, 18 his persistence and desire to understand every detail 19 of NFPA 72 led him to schedule a trip from his home in 20 Illinois to meet with the former Chair in California to 21 fully discuss each paragraph of the Code, the intent 22 and reasons supporting each requirement. 23 During his tenure as Chair, Warren spearheaded 24 a complete review and reorganization of the requirements 25 and recommendations pertaining to the three types of</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p>	<p>1 The third and final Special Achievement Award 2 to be presented here this morning goes to John Welling 3 of Bristol-Meyers Squibb in Princeton, New Jersey. 4 John, please join me on stage. 5 [Applause.] 6 MS. BELLIS: John is being recognized today 7 for his significant contributions to pre-incident 8 planning resulting in the first NFPA Pre-Incident 9 Planning Standard for the emergency responder 10 community, community, NFPA 1620. 11 John has served on the Technical Committee on 12 Pre-Incident Planning for twenty years, recently 13 stepping down from the Chair position after thirteen 14 years of leadership. 15 John was instrumental in transitioning NFPA 16 1620 from a Recommended Practice to a Standard. John 17 also represents NFPA's Industrial Fire Protection 18 Section on the Technical Committee on Loss Prevention 19 Procedures and Practices. He has been a member of 20 NFPA for thirty-four years. 21 John has been serving on the Technical 22 Committees on Loss Prevention Procedures and Practices 23 since 2013, and also served as a member of the 24 Technical Committee on Mass Evacuation and Sheltering. 25 MR. BELL: Please join me in congratulating</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p>
<p>1 supervising station alarm systems, thus ensuring 2 consistency and parallel requirements leading to 3 increased user-friendliness of the Code. 4 Similarly, Warren guided the Technical 5 Committee through a number of industry technology 6 breakthroughs, applying revolutionary Code concepts to 7 address these changes. 8 Additionally to his credit, the Technical 9 Committee on Supervising Station Fire Alarm and 10 Signaling Systems was completely reformed and 11 reorganized. 12 Through all the challenges and changes, 13 Warren shepherded the project and Technical Committee 14 with steadfast determination. 15 In addition to his remarkable Committee work, 16 Warren also teaches seminars on the National Fire Alarm 17 and Signaling Code and is a major contributor to the 18 National Fire Alarm and Signaling Code Handbook. 19 MR. BELL: Please join me again in 20 congratulating Warren for this Special Achievement 21 Award. 22 [Applause.] 23 MR. BELL: On behalf of the Standards 24 Council, we thank Warren for his dedication to the NFPA 25 Standards Development Process.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p>	<p>1 John again for this Special Achievement Award. 2 [Applause.] 3 MR. BELL: On behalf of the Standards Council, 4 we thank John for his dedicated, dedication to the NFPA 5 Standards Development Process. 6 Now, this concludes the Special Achievement 7 Awards. I'd like to move on to the Committee Service 8 Awards, and the Committee Service Awards is given to a 9 Technical Committee Member for their continuous and 10 exemplary service on one or more Committees over a 11 substantial period of time and in recognition and 12 participation in the NFPA Standards Development 13 Process. 14 I am pleased to present this award to the 15 following very worthy individuals, and our first 16 recipient of the Committee Service Award goes to Joseph 17 Cox. 18 [Applause.] 19 MS. BELLIS: Joseph Cox of Chamber of 20 Shipping of America in Washington, D.C. serves on the 21 Technical Committees of Shipbuilding, Repair, and 22 Lay-Up from 1983 to the present. He's been Chair since 23 2008 and also served as Chair from 1988 to 1999; 24 Marine Field Service Advisory Committee from 25 1983 to the present;</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p>

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

<p>1 Gas Hazards from 1982 until the present, 2 being Chair from 1982 until 1988. 3 Joseph also served on the Technical Committee 4 on Merchant Vessels from 1994 until 1998. 5 MR. BELL: Thank you, Joseph, for your many 6 years of service to the NFPA Standards Development 7 Process. 8 Now, our next Committee Service Award winner 9 is Bradford Cronin. 10 [Applause.] 11 MS. BELLIS: Bradford Cronin of Newport Fire 12 Department in Newport, Rhode Island serves on the 13 Technical Committees on Cultural Resources from 2015 14 until present; 15 Building Code and Safety to Life – 16 Residential Occupancies from 2012 to present; 17 Marinas and Boatyard, 2012 to present, being 18 Chair since 2017; 19 Commissioning and Integrated Testing from 20 2011 to present; 21 Fire Pumps, 2010 to present; 22 Automatic Sprinkler Systems – Residential 23 Sprinkler Systems, 2010 until present; 24 Signaling Systems for the Protection of Life 25 and Property – Carbon Monoxide Detection, 2007 to</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 26</p>	<p>1 dedication to the NFPA Standards Development Process. 2 The next worthy Committee Service Award goes 3 to David Fischler. 4 David, please join me on stage. 5 [Applause.] 6 MS. BELLIS: David Fischler of Pompano Beach, 7 Florida serves on the Technical Committee on Ambulances 8 from 2009 to the present and is the Chair of that 9 Technical Committee. 10 MR. BELL: Thank you, David, for your many 11 years of service to the NFPA Standards Development 12 Process. 13 Now, our next Committee Service Award Winner 14 is Mark Hilbert. 15 Mark, please join me on stage here. 16 [Applause.] 17 MS. BELLIS: Mark Hilbert of MR Hilbert 18 Electrical Inspection and Training in Wolfboro, New 19 Hampshire serves on the National Electric Code - Code- 20 Making Panel 2 from 2010 as Chair until the present. 21 He also serves on the Technical Committee on 22 Electrical Equipment of Industrial Machinery from 2003 23 to the present and has Chaired that Committee since 24 2008. 25 And, finally, Mark served on the Code-Making</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 28</p>
<p>1 present; 2 And finally the Animal Housing Facilities 3 Technical Committee, 2006 to present, and he's been 4 Chair since 2007. 5 MR. BELL: Thank you, Brad, for your years of 6 service to the NFPA Standards Development Process. 7 Now, the next Committee Service Award goes to 8 Laurence Dallaire. 9 Laurence, please join me on stage. 10 [Applause.] 11 MS. BELLIS: Laurence Dallaire, Architect of 12 the Capital in Washington, D.C., serves on the 13 Correlating Committee on Signaling Systems for the 14 Protection of Life and Property from 2009 until present, 15 as well as the Technical Committees on: 16 Building Code and Safety to Life – Board and 17 Care Facilities, 2009 to present; 18 Signaling Systems for the Protection of Life 19 and Property – Single and Multi, excuse me, Multiple- 20 Station Alarms and Household Signaling Systems, 2004 21 to the present, being Chair since 2009. 22 Laurence also serves on the Technical 23 Committee on Cultural Resources and did so from 2006 24 until 2009. 25 MR. BELL: Thank you, Laurence, for your</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 27</p>	<p>1 Panel 4 for the NEC from 2002 until 2008. 2 MR. BELL: Thank you, Mark, for your years of 3 service to NFPA. 4 Now, the next recipient of the Committee 5 Service Award is Karen Lehtonen. 6 Karen, please join me on stage here. 7 [Applause.] 8 MS. BELLIS: Karen Lehtonen of Lion Group, 9 Incorporated, in Dayton, Ohio, serves on the 10 Correlating Committee on Fire and Emergency Services 11 Protective Clothing and Equipment from 2007 to present. 12 Fire and Emergency Services Protective 13 Clothing and Equipment Technical Committees on: 14 Emergency Medical Services Protective 15 Clothing and Equipment from 1999 to present; 16 Hazardous Materials Protective Clothing and 17 Equipment from 1999 to the present; 18 Special Operations Protective Clothing and 19 Equipment from 1999 to the present; 20 Structural Proximity Fire Fighting Protective 21 Clothing and Equipment from 1998 until the present. 22 She has previously participated on the other 23 Technical Committees including Fire Department Rescue 24 Tools, Air Purifying Personal Respiratory Protective 25 Escape Devices, and Specialized Fire Fighting</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 29</p>

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



<p>1 Applications Protective Clothing and Equipment. 2 Karen also served on Flash Fire Protective 3 Garments from 1999 to 2000, Wildland Fire Fighting 4 Protective Clothing and Equipment, and Electronic 5 Safety Equipment from 2003 until 2008. 6 MR. BELL: Thank you, Karen, for your many 7 years of service. 8 Congratulations now to the next worthy 9 Committee Service Award winner, Norbert Makowka. 10 [Applause.] 11 MS. BELLIS: Norbert Makowka, National 12 Association of Fire Equipment Distributors of Chicago, 13 Illinois serves on the Technical Committees on: 14 Aerosol Extinguishing Technology from 2016 to 15 the present as Chair; 16 Portable Fire Extinguishers from 2009 to the 17 present; 18 Commissioning and Integrated Testing from 19 2008 to the present; 20 Venting Systems for Cooking Appliances, 2004 21 to the present; 22 Dry and Wet Chemical Extinguishing Systems 23 from 1992 to the present; 24 Signaling Systems for the Protection of Life 25 and Property – Initiating Devices for Fire Alarms and</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p>	<p>1 Signaling Systems for the Protection of Life and 2 Property from 1997 until 2018, as well as the Technical 3 Committee on Premises Security from 2002 until 2018. 4 MR. BELL: Thank you very much, Tom, for your 5 many years of service to NFPA. 6 MR. BELL: The next Committee Service Award 7 winner is Stephen Verbil. 8 Stephen, please join me on stage here. 9 [Applause.] 10 MS. BELLIS: Stephen Verbil of the 11 Connecticut Department of Emergency Services and Public 12 Protection in Middletown, Connecticut, serves on the 13 Technical Committee on Public Emergency Service 14 Communication. He's been on this Technical Committee 15 from 1993 until the present and has served as Chair 16 since 2008. 17 MR. BELL: Thank you, Stephen, for your years 18 of service to NFPA. 19 Now, we have four Committee Service Award 20 recipients who couldn't be here with us today, but we 21 want to acknowledge and thank them for the service 22 despite their absence. 23 MS. BELLIS: The remaining NFPA Technical 24 Committee Members receiving awards are: 25 John Bell of Marine Inspection Services,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p>
<p>1 Signaling Systems from 1992 to the present; 2 And Gases on Fire Extinguishing Systems from 3 1992 until the present. 4 Norbert also served on the Technical 5 Committees on Foam, Carbon Dioxide, Water Mist Fire 6 Suppression Systems, and Commissioning Fire Protection 7 Systems. 8 MR. BELL: Okay. Thank you, Norbert, for 9 your many years of service to NFPA. 10 Our next recipient is Joyce Rizzo. 11 Joyce, please join me on stage. 12 [Applause.] 13 MS. BELLIS: Joyce Rizzo of JD2 Environmental, 14 Incorporated, of West Chester, Pennsylvania, serves on 15 the Technical Committee on Tank Leakage and Repair 16 Safeguards from 1989 until the present. She served as 17 Chair from 1992 until 2003. 18 MR. BELL: Congratulations, Joyce, for your 19 service to NFPA. 20 The next Committee Service Award winner is 21 Tom Smith. 22 Tom, please join me on stage here. 23 [Applause.] 24 MS. BELLIS: Tom Smith of Oklahoma City, 25 Oklahoma, served on the Correlating Committee on</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p>	<p>1 Incorporated, of Channel View, Texas. He serves on the 2 Technical Committee on Gas Hazards. 3 Charles Hahl of GDH, Incorporated, of 4 Chantilly, Virginia, serves on the Signaling Systems 5 for the Protection of Life and Property; 6 Technical Committees on Emergency 7 Communication Systems, Public Emergency Reporting 8 Systems, Premises Security, and also serves on the 9 Technical Committee on Telecommunications. 10 David Kirby of Baker Engineering and Risk 11 Consultants, Incorporated, of Charleston, West 12 Virginia, serves on Flammable and Combustible Liquids 13 Technical Committees on Operations, Storage and 14 Warehousing of Containers and Portable Tanks, Tank 15 Storage and Piping Systems, as well as Technical 16 Committees on Explosion Protection Systems and 17 Combustible Dusts – Handling and Conveying of Dusts, 18 Vapors, and Gases. 19 Joseph Versteeg of Versteeg Associates, 20 Torrington, Connecticut, serves on the Correlating 21 Committees on Health Care Facilities, Safety to Life, 22 and Building Code. He also serves on the Technical 23 Committees on Marinas and Boatyards and Safety to Life – 24 Alternative Approaches to Life Safety. 25 He serves on Building Code Technical</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 33</p>

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

<p>1 Committees for Structures, Construction, and Materials 2 and Building Construction where he served as Chair since 3 2006 to 2014. 4 He also serves on Building Code and Safety to 5 Life Technical Committees on Means of Egress and 6 Residential Occupancies. 7 And, finally, Joseph served on the Building 8 Code Technical Committee on Materials from 2003 as 9 Chair through 2006. 10 MR. BELL: Again, let's show our thanks for 11 each of these award recipients. 12 [Applause.] 13 Thank you for your sincere appreciation with 14 that, and now I'm going to turn the floor over here to 15 Michael Snyder, the Presiding Officer, who is going to 16 proceed with the order of business for today. 17 Mike? 18 MR. SNYDER: Thank you, Kerry. 19 As introduced, I am Michael Snyder, and as 20 Presiding Officer, I declare that a quorum is present 21 for the purposes of conducting business today. 22 Let me remind you, being a safety 23 organization, NFPA always is concerned about your 24 safety. Please look around for the marked emergency 25 exits. Keep in mind that the nearest emergency exit</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p>	<p>1 Council. The majority vote results today are for the 2 sole purpose of providing recommendation to the 3 Standards Council prior to the issuance of Standards. 4 Any appeal based upon Technical Meeting 5 actions must be filed with the Standards Council by 6 July 5th, 2018; that is twenty days following the 7 adjournment of this Meeting. An appeal for any 8 amendment passed at this Meeting which fails Technical 9 Committee or Correlating Committee ballot shall be 10 filed no later than five days after publication of the 11 Technical Committee ballot results in accordance with 12 Section 1.6.2(b) of the Regulations. Typically, 13 results of ballot... Oh, excuse me. 14 Typically, results of amendment ballots are 15 published within twenty days of the Technical Meeting 16 adjournment. 17 The Standards Council's decision on issuance is 18 based upon the entire record before it, including the 19 debate and resulting votes at today's Technical Meeting. 20 The Standards Council will meet on August 13th 21 through 15th, 2018, to hear appeals and make final 22 determinations on issuing Standards. 23 Today's session will include Certified amending, 24 Amending Motions, also known as CAMs, related to NFPA 25 400, 241, 289, 101A, 13, 13D, 1981, 1001, 1730, 110,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p>
<p>1 may be behind you. 2 In the event of an emergency in the 3 convention center, on a house phone dial extension 4 77911 or 702-632-7911. Please do not call 911. 5 If there is an emergency requiring 6 evacuation, please follow the directions of the 7 Security staff who are dressed in black uniforms in 8 visible Security arm patches, badges, and name tags. 9 Additionally, an announcement will be made 10 over the public address system, and if necessary, horns 11 and strobe lights will also go off. The fire alarm 12 signal is a slow whoop along with flashing lights 13 followed by a voice announcement. If you hear the 14 alarm, please quietly leave the room using the nearest 15 exit. Remember, the nearest exit may be behind you. 16 If you are a person with disabilities who has 17 not already made arrangements with NFPA staff for 18 emergency evacuation, please see someone at the 19 Registration Desk prior to the initiation of today's 20 session. 21 The votes cast at the Technical Meeting, in 22 conjunction with the debate prior to voting, are an 23 integral and important contribution to NFPA's consensus 24 process. Through motions, debate, and voting, you, our 25 NFPA membership, make recommendations to the Standards</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p>	<p>1 and 72. Please note that the submitters of the 2 Certified Amending Motions for NFPA 51B and NFPA 260 3 have notified NFPA that they will not be pursuing their 4 CAMs. The Motions Committee, having approved this 5 withdrawal request, therefore has removed NFPA 51B and 6 NFPA 260 from today's Agenda. NFPA 51B and NFPA 260 7 have been forwarded directly to the Standards Council 8 for issuance. 9 Before we move on to the business of today, 10 let's confirm that your voting devices are operational. 11 You will see on the screen a sample motion that is 12 ready for your review. 13 I have been informed that approximately the 14 first twenty to thirty people who were issued a voting 15 device today may not see at the top of your options 16 Motion 2018-1. That can simply be remedied by hitting 17 the Refresh button and you should have an entire list 18 of the motions for today's order of business. If you 19 do not, please return your voting device to the table 20 in which you got it and a new one will be issued to 21 you. 22 I will call for a test vote in just a 23 moment after we have had time to read the text 24 presented. The motion on the floor is to Accept Public 25 Comment 16. I will then ask, "Is there further</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p>

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

<p>1 discussion on Motion 2018-1 to accept Public Comment 2 Number 16?" In this hypothetical case, seeing none, we 3 will move to vote on Motion 2018-1. 4 On your voting device, you will see the 5 motion number that is being balloted. Please touch the 6 "Vote" button that is identified for this motion. This 7 will initiate your screen for voting. If you wish to 8 vote in support of the motion, touch "Yes," which is a 9 green background. If you wish to vote against the 10 motion, touch "No," which is the red background. You 11 may change your vote at any time until my announcement 12 that voting is closed. 13 Please record your vote now. 14 [Voting.] 15 Voting will be closed in five seconds. 16 [Voting continued.] 17 Voting is now closed. 18 The results of the test vote are two hundred 19 and seventy-three in favor, two hundred and thirty-six 20 against, and our "test" motion results are in support 21 of the motion and recommendation of the text on Screen 22 1. 23 Again, if anyone has a problem with their 24 voting device, please return it to the table on which 25 you got it and a new device will be issued to you.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 38</p>	<p>1 have any questions, concerns, or experience any 2 difficulties, please see the Technical Support Desk. 3 I would like to make one additional 4 announcement before we start today. NFPA Staff 5 contacted, contacted the submitters of the Motions for 6 NFPA 1001-1 and 1001-3 and asked to reorder the 7 motions, and the submitter agreed. So for the purposes 8 of today's Technical Session, Motion 1001-3 will be 9 heard first, followed by Motion 1001-1, and the final 10 motion to be heard on NPFA 1001 will be Motion 1001-2, 11 and we'll refresh your memory on that as we get to that 12 Session later today. 13 Now that we've reviewed the process and you 14 are comfortable with your voting device, let's begin 15 today's Technical Session. 16 As I previously mentioned, although NFPA 51B 17 appeared on the originally posted agenda, the submitter 18 of the motion requested to withdraw the Certified 19 Amending Motion. Therefore, after approval of the 20 Motions Committee and in accordance with NFPA Rules, 21 that's Regulations at Section 4.5.3.7, and Convention 22 Rules at Section 2.7, the Standard will not be 23 considered at this meeting. 24 NFPA 51B instead becomes a Consent Standard 25 that will be forwarded directly to the Standards Council</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 40</p>
<p>1 The tablet as you see will automatically 2 return to the home page after recording your vote for 3 each motion. If there is a follow-up motion or a call 4 the question motion today, the voting button for these 5 motions will be found at the bottom of the list of 6 motions on your voting device. The Presiding Officer 7 will remind you of the location of these options 8 should they be necessary throughout our activities 9 today. 10 If for any reason you leave the Technical 11 Session and turn in your tablet, upon your return the 12 staff will re-scan your badge and assign you another 13 tablet. Because your voting is linked to your NFPA 14 badge identification, a newly-assigned tablet will 15 recall your votes from earlier and record any new votes 16 you make. Following the conclusion of today's session, 17 all recorded votes will be purged. NFPA will not 18 maintain anyone's voting record. 19 Let me reiterate, the tablet assigned by the 20 NFPA badge ID, and it is - excuse me - is assigned by 21 your NFPA badge ID, and you are responsible for 22 returning the tablet at the end of today's session. 23 As I previously mentioned, a Help Desk is 24 available throughout the duration of this Session and 25 is in the back of our auditorium today, and if you</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 39</p>	<p>1 for issuance or other action. We would like to thank 2 the Committee for their work on this Standard, and we 3 will now move on to Certified Amending Motions for NFPA 4 400. 5 So our first report today under consideration 6 is that of the Technical Committee on Hazardous 7 Chemicals. Here to present the Committee Report is 8 Committee Chair Robert James of UL, Northbrook, 9 Illinois. The Committee Report, that is the First and 10 Second Draft Reports, is located on the Document 11 Information Page for NFPA 400 on the NFPA website. All 12 Certified Amending Motions are contained in the NFPA 13 Technical Meeting, that is the Tech Session, Agenda, 14 and will be displayed behind me on the screen as they 15 are under debate. We will now proceed with the first 16 motions of the day as included in the agenda. 17 Mr. James? 18 MR. JAMES: Good morning. I'd like to 19 present the first document for consideration this 20 morning by giving you the Committee Statement. The 21 Committee Statement is as follows: 22 "The maximum allowed quality listed in 23 Sections 5.2.1.1.3 through 5.2.1 -- 24 MR. SNYDER: Sir? 25 MR. JAMES: Yes?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 41</p>

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

<p>1 MS. BELLIS: Just a second. 2 MR. SNYDER: Can, can you start with the 3 Committee Report, please? 4 MR. JAMES: I'm sorry. 5 MS. BELLIS: That's okay. This part. 6 MR. JAMES: Yeah, I think I got that. Okay. 7 MR. SNYDER: Mr. James, if you'd like to 8 proceed? 9 MR. JAMES: I skipped, I skipped ahead, I 10 guess. All right. So, yes, thank you, Chair. 11 Ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to report the 12 Committee of Hazardous Chemicals as presented for 13 adoption, and it can be found in the First Draft Report 14 and the Second Draft Report for the 2018 Annual 15 Revision Cycle. The Technical Committee has published 16 the First and Second Draft Report consisting of 17 revisions to NFPA 400, Hazardous Materials Code. 18 This report was submitted by letter ballot of 19 the responsible Technical Committee and the report 20 ballot results can be found in the Next Edition tab of 21 the Document Information page for 400 at www.nfpa.org\ 22 400next. 23 MR. SNYDER: Thank you, Mr. James. 24 Let's now proceed with the discussion on the 25 Certified Amending Motions on NFPA 400.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p>	<p>1 to make a wide variety of products like wind turbine 2 blades and recreational boats. Organic peroxide is one 3 of the substances regulated or included in the Standard 4 on Hazardous Materials is an important part of our 5 process. The organic peroxide initiators function to 6 initiate the cross-linking reaction that transforms the 7 liquid mix of raw materials into a solid product, and 8 we rely on NFPA 400 to guide the safe use and storage 9 of organic peroxides. We... There's three ways for us 10 to use and store these materials under the Standard: in 11 control areas, in areas meeting requirements for 12 protection levels, and in detached, single-purpose 13 buildings. 14 In the 2016 Standard, tables in Chapters 5 15 and 14 specify the maximum quantities that are 16 permitted in control areas, in areas complying with 17 protection level requirements, and in detached storage. 18 The quantity limits for control areas are 19 very small. Therefore, even uses of this material take 20 place typically in protective, areas meeting protection 21 level. 22 In the 2019 Standard, however... 23 This is difficult because as I'm speaking, my 24 voice is coming over the speakers with about a one- 25 second delay and it's very hard to talk here, so I'm</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p>
<p>1 Mr. Schweitzer, are you going to be making a 2 motion on NFPA 400? 3 MR. SCHWEITZER: I am. Thank you. I mis... 4 I misunderstood the procedure. 5 I am John Schweitzer with the American 6 Composites Manufacturers Association. Our industry 7 uses thermosetting polymer resins and reinforcing 8 fibers to make a variety -- 9 MR. SNYDER: Excuse me, sir. Will you simply 10 just present your motion as to move forward Motion 11 400-1? 12 MR. SCHWEITZER: Okay. I move to move 13 forward with <b>Motion 400-1</b>. 14 MR. SNYDER: Okay. So there is a motion on 15 the floor to Accept Public Comment Number 4. Is there 16 a second? 17 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 18 MR. SNYDER: Okay. We have a second. 19 Now, Mr. Schweitzer, if you will proceed with 20 your discussion on the motion. 21 MR. SCHWEITZER: Thank you. I'll get this 22 straight eventually. 23 MR. SNYDER: Oh, no problem. 24 MR. SCHWEITZER: Our industry uses 25 thermosetting polymer resins and glass and carbon fiber</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p>	<p>1 moving very slowly, and I beg your forgiveness. 2 In the 2019 Standard, the tables in Chapters 3 5 and 14 were revised so that the maximum permitted 4 quantities for protection levels were removed. In 5 other words, in the 2019 Edition, provisions are made 6 for use and, for use and storage of organic peroxides in 7 control areas and detached storage only. This 8 effectively prohibits the use of organic peroxides by 9 my industry. 10 At the Second Draft stage, we -- 11 MR. SNYDER: Mister, Mr. Schweitzer, may I 12 ask that you please conclude your comments? 13 MR. SCHWEITZER: I'm doing my best. 14 At the Second Draft stage, we submitted a 15 public comment asking for the protection level maximum 16 quantities to be reinserted into the appropriate 17 tables in Chapter 14. 18 MR. SNYDER: Okay, Mr. Schweitzer, I'm going 19 to have to ask that you... At this point, we will stop 20 your comments. We can add additional things during the 21 debate. 22 Mr. James, would you like to offer the 23 Committee's position, please? 24 MR. JAMES: Okay. Now's, now's the time. 25 So the Committee Statement was to reject the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p>

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

<p>1 public comment and the maximum allowable quantities 2 listed in the various tables, tables, Sections 3 5.2.1.1.3 through 5.2.1.12, which are the occupancy 4 classification for MAQ's apply, and that segregated and 5 cutoff storage are old concepts that do not provide or 6 not, have been shown not to provide and were deleted 7 and should have been deleted in the 2010 edition. 8 NFPA 400 then sent the users to Chapter 14 9 so you could find the requirements for sprinkled and 10 unsprinkled buildings for this material and that the 11 cutoff storage and segregated storage are addressed 12 through the protection levels and control area 13 concepts. 14 MR. SNYDER: Okay. Thank you, Mr. James. 15 We will now open up debate on the motion, and 16 to help me and my fellow Presiding Officers, I will ask 17 that you please provide your name, affiliation, and 18 whether you are speaking for or against the motion. So 19 we will now open up the floor for debate. 20 Microphone Number 6. 21 MR. SCHWEITZER: Can I speak? 22 John Schweitzer with American Composites 23 Manufacturers Association again. I'd just like to add 24 that the -- 25 MR. SNYDER: Sir, speaking for or against the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 46</p>	<p>1 The motion on the floor is to Accept Public Comment 2 Number 4. As we have in the practice session, to 3 touch, to vote, touch the "Vote" button. 4 If you wish to vote in support of the motion 5 and recommend the text on Screen Number 1, touch "Yes." 6 If you wish to vote against the motion and 7 recommend the text on Screen 2, touch "No." 8 Please record your vote. 9 [Voting.] 10 The voting will be closed in five seconds. 11 [Voting continued.] 12 The voting is now closed. 13 The results of the voting are one hundred 14 and eighty in support of the motion and to recommend the 15 text on Screen 1 and two hundred and forty-six 16 against the motion. 17 The motion has failed. 18 Is there any further discussion on NFPA 400? 19 Seeing none, we will move on to the next 20 document. 21 Thank you, Mr. James. 22 The next report under consideration this 23 morning is that of the Technical Committee on 24 Construction and Demolition. Here to present the 25 Committee Report is Committee Chair Bruce Campbell of</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p>
<p>1 motion? 2 MR. SCHWEITZER: Speaking for the motion. 3 Thank you. 4 I'd just like to add that the justifications 5 given by Mr. James to my understanding have nothing to 6 do with the safety of these materials as they are used 7 and stored, and I have no reason to question that the 8 language and definitions and provisions of Chapter 14 9 need to be brought into compliance with the general 10 approaches in Chapter 5 and elsewhere in the Standard. 11 However, to achieve that, it's probably not 12 necessary to throw my industry out of the Standard for 13 an entire cycle, which I submit is what would happen 14 under the current addition of 2019, the 2019 Edition as 15 it is proposed before the, before the Standards 16 Council. Thank you. 17 MR. SNYDER: Thank you, sir. 18 Is there any further discussion on Motion 19 400-1, which is to Accept Public Comment Number 4? 20 Mr. Chair, do you have any other final 21 comments? 22 MR. JAMES: Not at this time. 23 MR. SNYDER: Thank you, and seeing none we 24 will move to a vote. 25 Before we vote, let me restate the motion.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p>	<p>1 Jensen Hughes, Georgetown, Texas. The Committee 2 Report, that is the First and Second Draft Reports, is 3 located on the Document Information Page for NFPA 241 4 on the NFPA website. All Certified Amending Motions 5 are contained in the NFPA Technical Meeting, that is 6 the Tech Session Agenda, and will be displayed behind 7 me on the screen as they are under debate. We will now 8 proceed with the motions as included in the agenda. 9 Mr. Campbell, will you issue the Committee 10 Report, please? 11 MR. CAMPBELL: Good morning. Mr. Chair, 12 ladies and gentlemen, the report of the Technical 13 Committee on Construction and Demolitions presented for 14 adoption can be found on the First Draft Report and in 15 the Second Draft Report for the 2018 Annual Revision 16 Cycle. The Technical Committee has published a First 17 and Second Draft Report consisting of revisions to 18 NFPA 241, Standard for Safeguarding Construction, 19 Alteration, and Demolition Operations. These reports 20 were submitted to letter ballot of the responsible 21 Technical Committee. Reports and the ballot results 22 can be found in, on the Next Edition tab of the 23 Document Information page for 241, and you can see the 24 website is <a href="http://www.nfpa.org/241next">www.nfpa.org/241next</a>. 25 Thank you, Mr. Chair.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 49</p>

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

1 MR. SNYDER: Thank you, Mr. Campbell.  
2 Now let's now proceed with the discussion on  
3 the **Certified Amending Motions on NFPA 241**.  
4 Microphone Number 3, please.  
5 MR. HUIE: Marvin Huie, Jacobs Engineering  
6 Group. I speak in favor of this motion for it to pass.  
7 I guess I'm at the right mike.  
8 MR. SNYDER: Okay. Sir, so you're making a  
9 motion to essentially... You're making a motion to  
10 reject Second Revision Number One, is that correct?  
11 MR. HUIE: Correct.  
12 MR. SNYDER: Okay.  
13 Is there a second to this motion?  
14 MALE SPEAKER: Second.  
15 MR. SNYDER: Okay. There is a second.  
16 Please proceed with your discussion on this  
17 motion.  
18 MR. HUIE: I think this wording is really  
19 ill-advised. Does a cooking truck comply when it pulls  
20 onto the job site? We have a number of crews that will  
21 be on the job site throughout a large project. They  
22 might have different cooking areas. Depending on the  
23 stage of construction, it may not, may or may not be  
24 enclosed. How do we designate this? Is it one sign?  
25 The sign is inside the cooking area. How do you tell

Page 50

1 people outside the cooking area that it is, you're in  
2 the wrong area or where you need to go? Yes, it's part  
3 of training. Just overall I think this is bad wording  
4 and leaving the AHJ with a lot of additional authority  
5 that may or may not be understood by the contractor.  
6 MR. SNYDER: Thank you, Mr. Huie.  
7 Mr. Campbell, would you like to offer the  
8 Committee's position?  
9 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes sir.  
10 The Committee evaluated the recommendation  
11 and voted against it. The Committee felt that the  
12 wording and the text is sufficient for most  
13 contractors to understand and that it's, with the rise  
14 in fires lately, it's important that we do control  
15 cooking. Cooking is one of the major causes of fires  
16 in new construction, and we need some sort of wording  
17 in there in order to protect against those type of  
18 fires, and clearly in the future we can massage those  
19 words and try to improve them as we, in the next cycle  
20 as we see if there's any input from the community.  
21 Thank you, sir.  
22 MR. SNYDER: Thank you, Mr. Campbell.  
23 With that, we will now open up debate on the  
24 motion. I would ask again when you come to the  
25 microphone that you please state your name,

Page 51

1 affiliation, and whether you are speaking in support of  
2 or against the motion.  
3 Microphone Number 3.  
4 MR. HUIE: Marvin Huie, Jacobs Engineering  
5 Group. I submitted this comment earlier --  
6 MR. SNYDER: Sir, speaking for or against the  
7 motion?  
8 MR. HUIE: Speaking for the motion.  
9 MR. SNYDER: Thank you.  
10 MR. HUIE: I submitted this comment early on  
11 in the process. The Committee had plenty of time to  
12 make modifications to it. If... We just heard  
13 additional wording is necessary or additional wording  
14 may be required to better clarify. This is not the  
15 time to let that happen. A Code goes into place or a  
16 Standard goes into place, we should have thought it  
17 through, so during the process of the time that we've  
18 submitted this until the time it gets through, there is  
19 going to be a lot of confusion and a lot of heartache  
20 by everyone. I just think it's the wrong process.  
21 MR. SNYDER: Thank you, sir.  
22 Microphone Number 2, please.  
23 MR. SHAPIRO: Good morning. My name is Jeff  
24 Shapiro. I'm the proponent of the Second Revision that  
25 this CAM is attempting to remove. When I submitted

Page 52

1 this change, I did it on behalf of the National  
2 (unintelligible) --  
3 MR. SNYDER: Sir, speaking for or against the  
4 motion.  
5 MR. SHAPIRO: -- and I am speaking against the  
6 motion.  
7 MR. SNYDER: Thank you.  
8 MR. SHAPIRO: I no longer have any client  
9 interest in this. I'm here testifying on my own behalf.  
10 Over the past several years I've been very active in  
11 studying construction fires, and for the most part we  
12 know where construction fires come from, and our  
13 standards address those issues. We tend to have  
14 problems with enforcement. The issue of cooking on-site  
15 was an exception.  
16 An NFPA report entitled Fires In Structures  
17 Under Construction And Undergoing Major Renovation Or  
18 Being Demolished was published in April 2017. That  
19 report showed for the period of 2010 to 2014 cooking  
20 equipment was the number one cause of fire ignitions  
21 in buildings under construction. Cooking fires were  
22 more than twice the number of fires of heating  
23 equipment, more than twice the number of fires due to  
24 arson, and more than five times the number of fires  
25 caused by smoking. Cooking was also associated with

Page 53

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

<p>1 the highest number of civilian injuries over any other 2 equipment. 3 Without this new Section, NFPA 241 will have 4 absolutely no regulation on cooking fires to deal with 5 what is now documented by NFPA's fire data as the 6 number one cause of fires in buildings under 7 construction. 8 It's worth mentioning that this requirement 9 has also already been adopted in the 2018 Edition of 10 the International Fire Code, so any jurisdiction in the 11 U.S. that's using the IFC already has this. We don't 12 want to put jurisdictions using the NFPA Codes and 13 Standards at a disadvantage, so this will correlate 14 NFPA with the international code requirements. 15 This Section was adopted by the 241 Committee 16 with a unanimous vote. I ask that you uphold the 17 Committee's decision and I ask that you vote against 18 the motion on the floor. Thank you. 19 MR. SNYDER: Thank you, sir. 20 Microphone Number 6, please. 21 MR. JONES: Chad Jones, Cisco Systems. Oh, 22 yeah, this is bad. I'm going to go to another mike. 23 MR. SNYDER: Okay. Thank you, sir. 24 MR. JONES: (Unintelligible)? 25 MR. SNYDER: Okay, we'll, we'll, we'll, we'll</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 54</p>	<p>1 (phonetic) speaking against the motion. I'm speaking 2 for myself. Based on the information that was said 3 earlier about cooking being one of the top causes or 4 the top cause for construction fires and from what 5 I've heard and seen other the years, as well, I'm 6 speaking against the motion. 7 I tend to disagree with the gentleman who 8 spoke originally for the motion in that this language 9 needs significant changes. I, I in reading the language 10 think that the concerns that he raises about, about 11 cooking vehicles and such being able to come on the 12 site, that can be definitely addressed using this 13 language. I don't think that it's giving too much 14 jurisdiction to the AHJ. I think that it goes into the 15 pre-planning pretty well and people can set up where 16 those commercial vehicles can park and where the 17 cooking operations can be done. 18 I think not having this... By not having 19 this language in is a serious deficit for 241 and 20 seriously increases a risk for construction sites, 21 and so I urge you to vote against the motion. 22 MR. SNYDER: Thank you, sir. 23 Microphone Number 3, please. 24 MR. HUIE: Marty Huie, Jacobs Engineering 25 Group speaking for the motion. This is my last time.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 56</p>
<p>1 bring you back here in just a second. 2 Microphone Number 2, please. 3 MR. DAVIS: Dick Davis, FM Global, speaking 4 against the motion. I'm a member of the 241 Committee, 5 but I'm speaking for myself. As you heard, cooking is 6 the leading ignition source for construction fires, and 7 I've been on this committee for thirty-five years. 8 I'm ashamed that we didn't attack this in another, at 9 a previous time, so I urge you to oppose this motion. 10 Thank you. 11 MR. SNYDER: Thank you, sir. 12 We'll try it at Microphone Number 1. 13 MR. JONES: Trying again. The delay is 14 better over here. 15 Chad Jones, Cisco Systems, speaking for the 16 motion. What I hear is that this is a good thing to 17 do, but not completely written correctly. I don't like 18 putting solutions that are only half-done into law, so 19 therefore I will vote for this. 20 MR. SNYDER: Thank you -- 21 MR. JONES: Better, but not great. 22 MR. SNYDER: Thank you, sir. 23 Microphone Number 7, please. 24 Thank you. 25 MR. ZAMELL (phonetic): Felix Zamell</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 55</p>	<p>1 Toasters. Multiple... You know, you have different 2 construction crews as I stated earlier. Your plumbing 3 crew may have a microwave oven. That microwave oven 4 needs, would potentially need to be secured and signs 5 posted. How many different coffee pots do we have? 6 Yes, I do recognize that all these are fire hazards. 7 I do recognize they should be in the Section. It's just 8 really poorly written and during the time, until such 9 time it is written properly, we are causing everyone in 10 the industry problems. 11 MR. SNYDER: Thank you, sir. 12 Microphone Number 2, please. 13 MR. SHAPIRO: Jeff Shapiro speaking on my own 14 behalf against the motion, and as the author of that 15 text, I'll take offense to it being poorly written. 16 It's damn well written, and I've been writing Codes for 17 forty years. Thank you. 18 This is modeled after what we do for smoking. 19 Smoking is only in designated areas. Smoking is only 20 done in areas where signs are posted. We control 21 smoking. What used to be a major cause of fire at 22 construction sites is now a fraction of cooking fires, 23 and the reason is we did this for smoking. Please do 24 it for cooking. Oppose the motion on the floor. Vote 25 no.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 57</p>

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

<p>1 MR. SNYDER: Thank you, sir, 2 Microphone Number 7, please. 3 MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH 4 International, speaking for myself and against the 5 motion. The major argument, the major argument that is 6 being made by the proponent of the motion is that the 7 wording in his opinion is unclear. For once, I will 8 agree with my friend, Jeff Shapiro. The wording is 9 pretty clear. Can wording ever be improved? It always 10 can be improved, but the meaning is clear, and if we 11 defeat, if we allow the motion to go through, this 12 information, whether the wording might be slightly 13 modified or not, this information will be in the 14 Standard. Please vote against the motion. Thank you. 15 MR. SNYDER: Thank you, sir. 16 Is there any further discussion on Motion 17 241-1, which is to reject Second Revision Number 1? 18 Mr. Chair, do you have any final comments? 19 MR. CAMPBELL: My only final comment is I've 20 been doing this for forty-one years, Jeff, and I 21 agree. I think the wording is fine. I've acted in the 22 capability of an AHJ for probably twenty years or so, 23 and from my experience, I think the wording is more 24 than adequate, and with the quality of the fire 25 marshals and authority having jurisdictions, I don't</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 58</p>	<p>1 Mr. Kelly, as the maker of Certified Amending 2 Motion 241-2, will you be moving your motion at a 3 microphone, please? 4 MS. BELLIS: (Unintelligible). 5 MR. SNYDER: Is it not pursued? 6 MS. BELLIS: (Unintelligible). 7 MALE SPEAKER: He's not here. 8 MR. SNYDER: Okay. So just -- 9 MS. BELLIS: (Unintelligible). 10 MR. SNYDER: Okay. Yeah. 11 All right, so Motion 241-2, which did appear 12 on our agenda. However, the authorized maker has not 13 willing or indicating that they're pursuing the 14 motion. Therefore, in accordance with NFPA rules, 15 the convention rules at Section 2.7, the motion may 16 not be considered by the assembly and is now removed 17 from agenda. 18 Is there any further discussion on NFPA 241? 19 So, and then seeing none we will continue to 20 the next document. 21 Thank you very much for the Committee's 22 report -- 23 MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, sir. 24 MR. SNYDER: -- Mr. Campbell. 25 So I would like to make a general</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 60</p>
<p>1 see any issue whatsoever with them applying this 2 Section of the Standard. Thank you. 3 MR. SNYDER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 4 Before we vote, let me restate the motion. 5 The motion on the floor is to Reject Second Revision 6 Number 1. To vote, touch the "Vote" button. 7 If you wish to vote in support of the motion 8 and recommend the text on Screen 1, touch "Yes." 9 If you wish to vote against the motion and 10 recommend the text on Screen 2, touch "No." 11 Please record your vote. 12 [Voting.] 13 The voting will be closed in five seconds. 14 [Voting continues.] 15 The voting is now closed. 16 The results of the vote are seventy-three in 17 favor in support of the motion, four hundred and 18 fourteen against the motion and the recommend, and 19 recommending the text on Screen Number 2. The 20 motion has failed. 21 We will now proceed with the discussion on 22 <b>Certified Amending Motion 241-2.</b> 23 Mr. Kelly, will you be coming to the 24 microphone? 25 Is he signed in?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p>	<p>1 announcement. Throughout the day we will only be 2 taking fifteen-minute breaks and we will not be 3 breaking formally for lunch. We encourage you to 4 leave to get snacks or lunch at your convenience. 5 There is a food court that is open at the bottom of the 6 escalators and a food cart immediately out, sorry, 7 excuse me, a food cart immediately outside this 8 ballroom. 9 Before we begin debate on the next Standard, 10 I would like to introduce Gary Keith, Member of the 11 Standards Council, who will be the Presiding Officer 12 for motions before the membership on the next two 13 Standards. 14 MR. KEITH: Thank you. Good morning. 15 The next report under consideration this 16 morning is that of the Technical Committee on Fire 17 Tests. Here to present the Committee Report is 18 Committee Chair Barry Badders of Intertek Testing 19 Services, Elmendorf, Texas. 20 As you heard earlier, although NFPA 2, 260 21 appeared on the originally posted agenda, the 22 submitters of the motion requested to withdraw the 23 Certified Amending Motion. Therefore, after approval 24 of the Motions Committee and in accordance with NFPA 25 Rules, Regulations at 4.5.3.7 and Convention Rules at</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p>

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



1 2.7, the Standard will not be considered at this  
2 meeting. NFPA 260 instead becomes a Consent Standard  
3 that will be forwarded directly to the Standards  
4 Council for issuance or other action. We would like  
5 to thank the Committee for their work on this  
6 Standard. We will now move on to the Certified  
7 Amending Motions for NFPA 289.  
8 Mr. Badders.  
9 MR. BADDERS: Mr. Chair, ladies and  
10 gentlemen, the report of the Technical Committee on Fire  
11 Tests as presented for adoption can be found in the  
12 First Draft Report and in the Second Draft Report for  
13 the 2018 annual revision cycle. The Technical  
14 Committee has published the First and Second Draft  
15 Report consisting of revisions to NFPA 289, Standard  
16 Method Of Fire Tests For Individual Fuel Packages.  
17 These reports were submitted to letter ballot of the  
18 responsible Technical Committee. The reports and  
19 ballot results can be found in the Next Edition tab  
20 of the Document Information page from NFPA 289 at  
21 www.nfpa.org/289next.  
22 MR. KEITH: Thank you.  
23 Let's now proceed with the discussion on  
24 Certified Amending Motions on NFPA 289.  
25 Does Ms. Newman want to move **Motion 289-1?**

Page 62

1 MS. NEWMAN: Yes, I do.  
2 MR. KEITH: Sorry.  
3 MS. NEWMAN: Yes. Over here.  
4 MR. KEITH; Got it. Thank you. Please  
5 proceed. Thank you.  
6 MS. NEWMAN: Thank you.  
7 My name's Kathleen Newman. I'm with Firetect,  
8 Inc., and speaking in favor the motion. The current  
9 Code does not address --  
10 MR. KEITH: Excuse, excuse me. Could you  
11 identify yourself and then actually make the motion?  
12 MS. NEWMAN: Yes. My name is Kathleen  
13 Newman, I'm with Firetect, Inc., speaking in favor of  
14 the motion.  
15 MR. KEITH: And --  
16 MANY SPEAKERS: (Unintelligible).  
17 MS. NEWMAN: May I begin?  
18 MR. KEITH: To, to actually state the motion  
19 that you're... To... To reject an identifiable part of  
20 Second Revision Number 6 and any related portions of  
21 First Revision Number 7 and 10? Is that the intent of  
22 your motion?  
23 MS. NEWMAN: Yes, it is.  
24 MR. KEITH: Thank you. You... Please  
25 proceed.

Page 63

1 MS. NEWMAN: Thank you.  
2 MR. KEITH: Is there a second?  
3 FEMALE SPEAKER: Seconded.  
4 MR. KEITH: Second.  
5 Please proceed. Thank you.  
6 MS. NEWMAN: The current Code does not  
7 address Christmas trees specifically. While it is  
8 important to address Christmas trees, the new text has  
9 no substantiation. No technical data has been produced  
10 to justify these changes. ASTM E 3082 may have been  
11 considered in this new language, but the impact of  
12 these changes has not been studied. NFPA 289, Section  
13 5.5.6, requires four Christmas trees to be conditioned  
14 at fifty percent humidity and well-watered for two to  
15 four weeks.  
16 Why four Christmas trees? The cost of  
17 inventory space and time for trees to be well-  
18 watered by lab personnel is going to be exorbitant.  
19 Why not one treated and one untreated or why not one  
20 treated tree or just several treated branches? There  
21 is no definition of what "well-watered" means.  
22 In the new language, all four untreated  
23 Christmas trees are to be conditioned for two to four  
24 weeks. That is too broad of a range. Wouldn't there  
25 be different outcomes when a Christmas tree has been

Page 64

1 sitting for two weeks compared to four weeks before the  
2 flame retardant is applied? Why wouldn't the flame  
3 retardant be applied on the first day of conditioning  
4 as it would when the tree is installed? ASTM E 3082  
5 conditions them for two to four weeks, but that is  
6 because these trees are freshly-cut. Trees that will  
7 be tested in labs to comply with NFPA 289 have been cut  
8 and sitting at a Christmas tree lot for several days or  
9 weeks. It makes no sense for them to sit another two to  
10 four weeks before applying a flame retardant. Then  
11 they have no... They... Then they have to go back  
12 into conditioning again for another fourteen to  
13 seventeen days with twenty percent humidity and no  
14 water at all.  
15 There is no mention of cutting the base of  
16 the tree. NFPA 1-10.13.9 requires the bottom trunk to be  
17 cut off at least a half-inch prior to placing in a tree  
18 stand and the water level be maintained above the cut  
19 and checked daily to give the tree ability to absorb  
20 the water. ICC Section 806 requires the bottom of tree  
21 trunks to be cut half-inch and the water level cover  
22 the tree by at least two inches. NFPA 289 states that  
23 after the first conditioning the fire retardant  
24 treatment is applied, but by whom? The lab? What is  
25 the cost impact? What if the flame retardant needs to

Page 65

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

<p>1 be applied by a paint sprayer? Do the labs have a 2 paint booth available for proper OSHA requirements? 3 Will they allow the client to come in and do their own 4 application? 5 There is no... There is nothing in the 6 new language that says how many trees are too be tested 7 or what the procedures are for all four trees. There 8 is no instruction on what species of Christmas trees 9 should be tested. Currently the wording says no more 10 than seven inches tall, but there is no minimum. I'm 11 sorry, seven feet tall, but there is no minimum. The 12 test duration is not clear in the document. Most 13 importantly, there is no conditions of acceptance in 14 this document. 15 Please do not do... Let's not duplicate other 16 Fire Codes. Let's use those Fire Codes as a base and 17 build stronger, more logical, effective Standards that 18 will have increased positive influence on the outcome 19 of Fire Codes. 20 MR. KEITH: Thank you. I'm going to have to 21 ask you to finish now. Thank you. 22 Mr. Badders, would you like to respond with the 23 Committee's review? 24 MR. BADDERS: Yes. Thank you. 25 NFPA 289 is the standard method of test for</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p>	<p>1 is measured in the hood. Heat and smoke release and so 2 on is measured in the hood. Like all the other 3 products that are used and tested in this type of test, 4 there are no pass/fail criteria because the pass/fail 5 criteria appropriately belong in the Code. Whether it's 6 the NFPA Code or the ICC Code, it doesn't matter. None 7 of the tests, and there are a whole variety of single 8 items that are tested to NFPA 289, none of them have 9 phosphate criteria. 10 The exact criteria, the exact details of the 11 conditioning were developed by a Task Group that looked 12 at all the proper, proper considerations, and if you 13 look at the language, they're talking about four trees 14 are conditioned, and of the four trees, two are treated 15 and two are untreated. Typically this is the, the 16 process that is conducted in the fire test lab like all 17 other associations, all other procedures that precede a 18 fire test. 19 So I urge you to vote against the motion. 20 This was properly discussed and is ready for primetime. 21 Thank you. 22 MR. KEITH: Thank you. 23 Microphone Number 1, please. 24 MS. NEWMAN: Kathleen Newman, Firetect, Inc., 25 voting in favor of the motion. I just wanted to say</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 68</p>
<p>1 individual fuel packages. During the First Draft, 2 the Technical Committee added a new section to the 3 Natural Christmas Trees. A Task Group with five members 4 was assigned to develop the conditioning requirements. 5 During the Second Draft, the Technical 6 Committee created the Second Revision Number 6 based on 7 the Task Group's recommendations. 8 SR6 was balloted and passed seventeen 9 affirmative, zero negative, and one abstention. The 10 submitter of the Certified Amending Motion voted 11 affirmatively on the Second Revision. 12 MR. KEITH: Thank you. 13 We will now move to debate on the motion. 14 Please provide your name, affiliation, and whether or 15 not you are speaking for or against the motion. 16 Microphone Number Seven, please. 17 MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH 18 International, speaking (unintelligible) opposition to 19 the motion. This... The Committee on Fire Tests 20 developed this Standard many years ago, and just let me 21 clarify for people what this Standard is so they, you 22 understand. 23 It is what's attempt to call a furniture 24 calorimeter. It means a calorimeter where the 25 product is placed under the hood and the heat release</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 67</p>	<p>1 that the five people that were on the Task Group, four 2 of them either are lab-associated or they sell lab 3 equipment. I do not believe that the cost studies have 4 been done, nor was there any technical support. Simply 5 it was mimicking the other ASTM Code, and so I think 6 that that needs to be improved upon and that should be 7 considered. Thank you. 8 MR. KEITH: Thank you. 9 Microphone Number 7, please. 10 MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH 11 International, speaking (unintelligible) against the 12 motion. Excuse me for coming again. If this Section 13 is removed, there will be nothing on conditioning, and 14 we're dealing with testing trees. Trees need to be 15 conditioned so we know the exact type of humidity that 16 is required. 17 Ms. Newman mentioned the ASDM Standard, ASDM 18 3082. In the ASDM Standard, the trees are also 19 conditioned. So if you were to support this motion, 20 then there would be no conditioning in NFPA 289 for 21 treating Christmas trees. That is wrong. Please 22 oppose the motion. Thank you. 23 MR. KEITH: Thank you. 24 Microphone Number 1, please. 25 MS. NEWMAN: One more time. Kathleen Newman</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 69</p>

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

1 voting in favor of the motion with Firetect, Inc.  
2 There would be no, there would be no conditioning  
3 because there would be no test for specifically  
4 Christmas trees. So, yes, they were conditioned for  
5 two to four weeks, but that was immediately after they  
6 were cut. Right now Christmas trees sit for  
7 approximately three weeks before going to a lot and  
8 then again having to condition them another two to  
9 four weeks after that and then another fourteen to  
10 seventeen days, seventeen days after that. So it...  
11 This doesn't make any sense, so thank you.  
12 MR. KEITH: Thank you.  
13 Microphone Number 7, please.  
14 MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH  
15 International, speaking for (unintelligible) against  
16 the motion. I'm sorry to come up again. If you look  
17 at the text, the only thing that is being removed is  
18 the conditioning. Testing of the Christmas trees would  
19 still go on, so if you approve this motion, then you  
20 would still test Christmas trees, but without  
21 conditioning. Please don't approve.  
22 MR. KEITH: Is there any further discussion on  
23 Motion 289-1?  
24 Mr. Badders, would you like any further  
25 comments?

Page 70

1 MR. BADDERS: Yes, I encourage the membership  
2 to support the Committee Action by voting no.  
3 MR. KEITH: Thank you.  
4 Before we vote, let me restate the motion.  
5 The motion on the floor is to Reject an Identifiable  
6 Part of Second Revision Number 6, including any Related  
7 Portion of First Revision, Revision Numbers 7 and 10.  
8 To vote, touch the "Vote" button.  
9 If you wish to vote in support of the motion  
10 and recommend the text on Screen 1, touch "Yes."  
11 If you wish to vote against the motion and  
12 recommend the text on Screen, Screen 2, touch "No."  
13 Please record your vote now.  
14 [Voting.]  
15 The voting will be closed in five seconds.  
16 [Voting continues.]  
17 The voting is closed.  
18 Motion 289-1, yes ninety-seven, no three  
19 thirty-one. The Motion has failed.  
20 Let's now proceed with the discussion on **Certified**  
21 **Amending Motion 289-2**, and if I could remind the maker  
22 of the motion to please state the motion, that would be  
23 helpful. Thank you.  
24 Microphone Number 1, please.  
25 MS. NEWMAN: Yes, my name is Kathleen Newman.

Page 71

1 I'm with Firetect, Inc., and I'm voting in favor of the  
2 motion. The motion states to reject an identifiable  
3 part of Second Revision 2 and any related portion of  
4 First Revision Number 19.  
5 MR. KEITH: Thank you.  
6 Do we have a second?  
7 MALE SPEAKER: Second.  
8 MR. KEITH: We have a second.  
9 Mr. Badders... Mrs., Ms. Newman, please  
10 proceed.  
11 MS. NEWMAN: There is no need to add a  
12 (unintelligible) newspaper ball. While you are  
13 watching a Christmas tree being burned, there is no  
14 reason for additional visual aids, especially when it  
15 is optional. No information about who determines the  
16 option or what the criteria would be for determining  
17 the addition of this newspaper ball. Thank you.  
18 MR. KEITH: Thank you.  
19 Mr. Badders, the Committee's position?  
20 MR. BADDERS: Yes, thank you.  
21 The Technical Committee added language  
22 allowing a paper target to be used as an optional  
23 visual aid to provide a visual aid indicating heat  
24 flux. SR2 was balloted and passed eighteen affirmative  
25 votes, zero negative votes, and zero abstentions. The

Page 72

1 submitter of the Certified Amending Motion voted  
2 affirmative for the Second Revision.  
3 MR. KEITH: Thank you.  
4 We will now open up to debate on the motion.  
5 Again, please provide your name, affiliation, and  
6 whether you are speaking in support or against the  
7 motion.  
8 Microphone 7, please.  
9 MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH  
10 International, speaking for (unintelligible) and  
11 against the motion. This... Again, let me try to  
12 bring you up to date on what the test is. This test is  
13 a furniture calorimeter, so it's a product that's placed  
14 under the, the hood and you expose the product and then  
15 you measure heat release and smoke release and various  
16 other things in the hood, but one of the interesting  
17 things when you... If this were a room as opposed to a  
18 furniture calorimeter, you want to see whether there's  
19 flashover. Since this is open, there's no flashover.  
20 In a room test like NFPA 286, you put this  
21 type of paper target. It is a requirement to put that  
22 in as an indicator of flashover. Clearly when we have  
23 a furniture calorimeter where there is no room, there  
24 is no flashover, but the paper indicator gives you an  
25 indication of about twenty to twenty-five kilowatts per

Page 73

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

<p>1 square meter on the floor. 2 By the way, this information is not specific 3 to Christmas trees testing. It is for any product that 4 is tested in the furniture calorimeter in NFPA 289. 5 Please oppose the motion. Thank you. 6 MR. KEITH: Thank you. 7 Microphone Number 6, please. 8 MR. SHAPIRO: Jeff Shapiro speaking on my own 9 behalf, and just to be clear that Marcelo and I don't 10 always agree, in this case I'm going to agree with Ms. 11 Newman. The body (unintelligible) -- 12 MR. KEITH: Are you speaking for or against 13 the motion? I'm sorry. 14 MR. SHAPIRO: I'm sorry. I'm agreeing with 15 Ms. Newman, and I'm speaking for the motion. 16 MR. KEITH: Thank you. 17 MR. SHAPIRO: I agree with her because the 18 body of the Standard is no place for the text 19 "optional visual aid." If you want to provide guidance 20 on what's optional, do it in the annex, but don't do 21 that in the Code. If the Code doesn't say you can't or 22 the Standard doesn't say you can't, you can. So without 23 this text, you can still have this as an optional 24 visual aid. It doesn't change the test. So I think 25 it's poorly conceived to put an option in a document</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 74</p>	<p>1 MR. SHAPIRO: You were looking at me. 2 The Standard is no place for useful 3 information. It's a place to put requirements. 4 MR. KEITH: Thank you. 5 Is there any further discussion on Motion 6 289-2? 7 Mr. Batters, any final comments? 8 MR. BATTERS: Yes, thank you. 9 Once again, I encourage the membership to 10 support the Committee Action by voting no. 11 MR. KEITH: Thank you. 12 Before we vote, let me restate the motion. 13 The motion on the floor is to Reject an Identifiable 14 Part of Second Revision Number 2 and any related 15 portions of First Revision No. 19. To vote, touch the 16 "Vote" button. 17 If you wish to vote, if you wish to vote in 18 support of the motion and recommend the text on Screen 19 1, touch "Yes." 20 If you wish to touch, vote against the motion 21 and recommend the text on Screen 2, touch "No." 22 Please record, record your vote now. 23 [Voting.] 24 The voting will end in five seconds. 25 [Voting continues.]</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 76</p>
<p>1 that's supposed to be written in mandatory text. I 2 would encourage you to agree with the motion on the 3 floor. It doesn't change anything, people can still 4 use it, but I think the Committee erred by not putting 5 an optional guidance into the annex as opposed to 6 putting it in the body. 7 MR. KEITH: Thank you. 8 Is there any further discussion on Motion 9 289-2? 10 Microphone 7, please. 11 MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH 12 International, speaking for (unintelligible) against the 13 motion. The information provided by the paper target is 14 a very useful information in terms of the heat flux that 15 is formed in the test, and, again, the, the fact that 16 it, it is not a requirement, it doesn't matter that it 17 is written in mandatory language. It explains exactly 18 where it is, where it's supposed to be placed to note 19 whether there is or is not sufficient heat flux to the 20 flow that would cause flashover in a room. That is very 21 useful information. Please vote against the motion. 22 Thank you. 23 MR. KEITH: Thank you. 24 MR. SHAPIRO: Jeff Shapiro for the motion. 25 MR. KEITH: Microphone Number 6, please.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 75</p>	<p>1 The voting is closed. 2 On Motion 289-2, we have two hundred and 3 ninety-nine yes, one fifty-nine no. The motion has 4 passed. 5 Is there any further discussion on NFPA 289? 6 Thank you, Mr. Badders. 7 MR. BADDERS: Thank you. 8 MR. KEITH: The next Report under 9 consideration is that of the Technical Committee on 10 Alternative Approaches to Life Safety. Here to prevent 11 the, present the Committee's Report is Correlating 12 Committee Chair Wayne Carson of Carson Associates, 13 Warrenton, Virginia. The Committee's report, that is 14 the First and Second Drafts, is located on the Document 15 Information page for NFPA 101A on the NFPA website. 16 MR. HIRSCHLER: Mister, Mr. Chair? Marcelo 17 Hirschler, the maker, the proponent of CAM 101A-1. I 18 will not pursue the motion. 19 MR. KEITH: Thank you. 20 The authorized maker of the motion has 21 notified NFPA that we no longer, he no longer wishes 22 to pursue this motion. Therefore, in accordance with 23 NFPA rules and convention rules at Section 2.7, the 24 motion may not be considered by the assembly. It is 25 now removed from the agenda.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 77</p>

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

1 MALE SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. That  
2 was easy.  
3 MR. KEITH: Thank, thank you. I would like  
4 to make note of the service of Mr. Joseph Versteeg  
5 who's Chair on the Committee on Alternative Approaches  
6 to Life Safety and has been Chair since 2009, and due  
7 to the ten-year policy will be stepping down as Chair,  
8 and I'd like to express out thanks to Mr. Versteeg for  
9 his leadership on the Committee.  
10 Again, just an announcement. We will only be  
11 taking fifteen-minute breaks throughout the session  
12 today. We will not be breaking for lunch. We encourage  
13 you to leave to get snacks or lunch at your convenience.  
14 There is a food court that is open at the bottom of the  
15 escalators and a food cart immediately outside this  
16 ballroom.  
17 Before we begin debate on the next Standard,  
18 I would like to introduce James Quiter, Member of the  
19 Standards Council, who will be the Presiding Officer  
20 for motions before the membership on the next two  
21 Standards. Thank you.  
22 MR. QUITER: Thank you, Mr, Keith, and good  
23 morning.  
24 The next report under consideration is that  
25 of the Committees on Automatic Sprinkler Systems. Here

Page 78

1 to present the two parts of the Committee's Reports is  
2 Correlating Committee Chair Kenneth Linder of Swiss Re  
3 of Stafford Springs, Connecticut. Part one of the  
4 Committee Report, that is the First and Second Draft  
5 Reports, is located on the Document Information Page  
6 for NFPA 13 on the NFPA website. All Certified  
7 Amending Motions are contained in the NFPA Technical  
8 Meeting, Tech Session, Agenda, and will be displayed  
9 behind me on the screen as they are under debate. We  
10 will now proceed with the motions as included in the  
11 agenda.  
12 Mr. Linder?  
13 MR. LINDER: Mr. Chair, ladies and gentlemen,  
14 the report of the Committees on Automatic Sprinkler  
15 Systems is presented for adoption in two parts and can  
16 be found in the First Draft Report and in the Second  
17 Draft Report for the 2018 Annual Revision Cycle. The  
18 first part of the report is on NFPA 13. The Committees  
19 have published a First and Second Draft Report  
20 consisting of revisions to NFPA 13, Standard For The  
21 Installation Of Sprinkler Systems. These reports were  
22 submitted to letter ballot of the responsible  
23 Correlating and Technical Committees. The reports and  
24 ballot results can be found in the Next Edition tab of  
25 the Document Information page for NFPA 13 at

Page 79

1 www.nfpa.org/13next.  
2 MR. QUITER: Thank you, Mr. Linder.  
3 Let's now proceed with the discussion on  
4 the **Certified Amending Motions on NFPA 13**.  
5 Microphone 3, please.  
6 MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH  
7 International, speaking for Vinyl Institute, and I  
8 am... Excuse me.  
9 I, I'm making a motion to accept Public  
10 Comment Number 54.  
11 MR. QUITER: Thank you.  
12 There is a motion on the floor to Accept  
13 Public Comment Number 54. Is there a second?  
14 FEMALE SPEAKER: Second.  
15 MR. QUITER; I hear a second, so please  
16 proceed with the discussion on the motion.  
17 MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH  
18 International, speaking for the Vinyl Institute. What  
19 this is is to do exactly the same as we have been doing  
20 in a number of the NFPA documents, in particular NFPA  
21 1, NFPA 101, NFPA 5000, and I can go on and on and on  
22 with this list. The... That is, to do what the manual  
23 style tells us to do, to get out of the area, area of the  
24 in, definitions, things that contain requirements.  
25 Let me show you what to... Today, let me share

Page 80

1 with you what it, it says today on limited combustible  
2 material as a definition: "refers to a building  
3 construction material not complying." That's not a  
4 definition, but it is a requirement. Let me show, show  
5 you what it says on non-combustible material: "It is a  
6 material that meets the following requirements." So in  
7 both cases what we have as requirements placed in the  
8 definitions.  
9 What this motion does in conjunction with the  
10 following two motions is take the definitions out of  
11 the definitions section, take the requirements out of the  
12 definitions section, and put them in the body of the  
13 Standard where they are actually able to be enforced.  
14 Definitions in NFPA are not able to be enforced.  
15 The, the Committee says that because they  
16 have reorganized NFPA 13, it's not time to do it.  
17 The previous cycle there was another excuse, but they  
18 didn't want to do it. This is something that will  
19 bring NFPA 13 in line with the other Standards that,  
20 and Codes, all of the major NFPA Codes and Standards  
21 have done this, have taken out the requirements on  
22 combustible limited, I'm sorry, non-combustible,  
23 limited combustible, from the Section and definitions  
24 and put them in the body. Thank you.  
25 MR. QUITER: Thank you, Mr. Hirschler.

Page 81

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

1 Mr. Linder, would you like to offer the  
2 Committee's position?  
3 MR. LINDER: I will defer to the Technical  
4 Committee Chair, Russ Leavitt.  
5 MR. LEAVITT: Good morning. My name's Russ  
6 Leavitt. I'm the Chair of the Sprinkler Discharge,  
7 Sprinkler System Discharge Criteria Committee,  
8 Technical Committee which considered Public Comment  
9 Number 4. The Committee rejected this comment for  
10 essentially two reasons.  
11 Number one, for the purposes of NFPA 13, they  
12 felt the information that would be contained in Chapter  
13 4 was much too broad for its application. That could  
14 create confusion because of, because of the, the broad  
15 implication beyond simply construction materials.  
16 Number two, for the purposes of the NFPA 13,  
17 the Technical Committee felt that it was better  
18 included in definitions in Chapter 3 using the current  
19 definitions that were included there.  
20 MR. QUITER: Thank you, gentlemen.  
21 With that, we will open up debate on the  
22 motion. A reminder to please provide your name,  
23 affiliation, and whether you are speaking in support of  
24 or against the motion.  
25 Microphone 3, please.

Page 82

1 MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH  
2 International, speaking for the motion. To addressing  
3 the points that were raised by Mr. Leavitt, number,  
4 number one, that it would create confusion, it doesn't  
5 seem to create confusion in NFPA 1, 101, 5000, or any  
6 of the other documents that have done this. It...  
7 This has been done in most NFPA documents.  
8 Number two, the other point is that Chapter  
9 4 is generic and the information on materials shouldn't  
10 be generic. Well, this is a generic type of  
11 information on what is a limited combustible material,  
12 what is, what are the requirements for a material to  
13 become a limited combustible material, what are the  
14 requirements for a material to be a non-combustible  
15 material, and, in fact, the terms and the requirements  
16 for non-combustible material, limited combustible  
17 material, are used throughout NFPA 13 because if a  
18 material is, sorry, if an item of construction contains  
19 only non-combustible, limited combustible materials,  
20 then some criteria apply. If they don't, different  
21 criteria apply.  
22 So with the information that they, that is at  
23 present in Chapter 3, there is no way to mandate that.  
24 Yes, people can refer to something that says "refers  
25 to," but the requirements when they are in the

Page 83

1 definitions are not enforceable. Please support the  
2 motion. Thank you.  
3 MR. QUITER: Thank you.  
4 Microphone Number 6, please.  
5 MR. HARRINGTON: Yeah, J.C. Harrington with FM  
6 Global, and we speak in support of this motion. The  
7 language that Marcelo is introducing here is identical  
8 to the language that's in NFPA 5000, and from my view,  
9 important documents to this association like 5000 and  
10 13 should be in sync when we're talking about subjects  
11 like this, so we would support it.  
12 MR. QUITER: Thank you.  
13 Is there any further discussion on Motion  
14 13-1 to Accept Public Comment No. 54?  
15 Mr. Chairman, would you like to add any  
16 further comment?  
17 MR. LEAVITT: The only other comment would be,  
18 again, just to emphasize that for the purposes of NFPA  
19 13, the Technical Committee felt that the definitions  
20 currently in Chapter 3 are sufficient.  
21 MR. QUITER: For the record, sir, could you  
22 please state your name?  
23 MR. LEAVITT: Russell Leavitt.  
24 MR. QUITER: Thank you. Okay, thank you, Mr.  
25 Chair.

Page 84

1 Before we vote, let me restate the motion.  
2 The motion on the floor is to Accept Public Comment  
3 Number 54. To vote, touch the "Vote" button.  
4 If you wish to vote in support of the motion  
5 and recommend the text on Screen 1, touch "Yes."  
6 If you wish to vote against the motion and  
7 recommend the text on Screen 2, touch "No."  
8 Please record your vote.  
9 [Voting.]  
10 The balloting will be closed in five seconds.  
11 [Voting continues.]  
12 The voting is closed.  
13 Thank you.  
14 The results, results of the vote are three  
15 hundred and eighteen yes and one hundred and thirteen  
16 against the motion. Therefore, the motion has  
17 passed.  
18 Let's now proceed with discussion on **Certified**  
19 **Amendment, Amending Motion 13-2.**  
20 Microphone 3, please.  
21 MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH  
22 International, speaking for the Vinyl Institute, and  
23 I move Certified Amending Motion 13-2, which - sorry -  
24 Accept Public Comment 53. I apologize.  
25 MR. QUITER: There is a motion on the floor

Page 85

<p>1 to Accept Comment Number 53. I think I heard a second, 2 but let me ask officially. Is there a second? 3 MALE SPEAKER: Seconded. 4 MR. QUITER: Thank you. 5 We do have a second. Please proceed with the 6 discussion of the motion. 7 MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH 8 International, speaking for the Vinyl Institute and in 9 support of the motion. This and the next motion are 10 necessary correlations to what you just approved. What 11 we just did is put the definitions, definitions in 12 Chapter 4. Now we then have to delete the definitions 13 from Chapter 3. Thank you. 14 MR. QUITER: Mr. Linder, would you like to 15 offer the Committee's position? 16 MR. LINDER: I think since we've passed 17 Motion Number 13-1, we need to pass Motions 13-2 and 18 13-3 to make the, the Standard correct. 19 MR. QUITER: Thank you, Mr. Linder. 20 With that we will open up debate on the 21 motion. 22 Okay, seeing no debate, I presume you have 23 nothing further to add, Mr. Linder? 24 MR. LINDER: No. 25 MR. QUITER: Okay. So before we vote, let me</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 86</p>	<p>1 motion and a second on the floor to Accept Public 2 Comment Number 55. 3 Mr. Hirschler? 4 MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH 5 International, for the Vinyl Institute. This is the 6 third piece of the action that we took before. This is 7 eliminating the non-combustible material definition and 8 reference to the Section that we approved before. 9 Thank you. 10 MR. QUITER: Mr. Linder? 11 MR. LINDER: I would support passing this 12 motion. 13 MR. QUITER: Thank you. 14 With that, we will open up debate on the 15 motion. 16 Seeing none, we will move to a vote. 17 Before we vote, let me restate the motion. 18 The motion on the floor is to Accept Public Comment 19 Number 55. To vote, touch the "Vote" button. 20 If you wish to vote in support of the motion 21 and recommend the text on Screen 1, vote "Yes." 22 If you wish to vote against the motion and, 23 and recommend the text on Screen 2, touch "No." 24 Please record your vote. 25 [Voting.]</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 88</p>
<p>1 restate the motion. The motion on the floor is to 2 Accept Public Comment Number 53. To vote, touch the 3 "Vote" button. 4 If you wish to vote in support of the motion 5 and recommend the text on Screen 1, touch "Yes." 6 If you wish to vote against the motion and 7 recommend the text on Screen 2, touch "No." 8 Please record your vote. 9 [Voting.] 10 The voting will be closed in five seconds. 11 [Voting continues.] 12 The voting is closed. 13 Thank you. 14 The results of the vote are four hundred and 15 three in support of the motion and recommending the 16 text on Screen 1, thirty-one against the motion and 17 recommend the text on Screen 2. The motion has 18 passed. 19 Let's now proceed with the discussion on 20 <b>Certified Amending Motion Number 13-3.</b> 21 Microphone 3, please. 22 MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH 23 International for the Vinyl Institute, and move to 24 accept Public Comment Number 55. 25 MR. QUITER: There's a motion, there is a</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 87</p>	<p>1 The voting will be closed in five seconds. 2 [Voting continues.] 3 The voting is closed. 4 Thank you. 5 The results of the vote are four hundred and 6 sixteen in support of the motion and recommend the 7 text on Screen 1 and sixteen against the motion and 8 recommend the text on Screen 2. The motion has 9 passed. 10 The next motion on <b>NFPA 13-4</b> appeared in our 11 agenda. However, the authorized maker of the motion 12 has NF, has notified NFPA that he no longer wishes to 13 pursue this motion. Therefore, in accordance with NFPA 14 rules, the motion may not be considered by the 15 assembly and is removed from the agenda. We will now 16 move on to the next motion. 17 Let's now proceed with the discussion on <b>Certified</b> 18 <b>Amending Motion 13-5.</b> 19 Microphone 6, please. 20 MR. ASP: I'm Roland, I'm Roland Asp 21 representing the Engineering and Standards Committee of 22 the National Fire Sprinkler Association, and I make a 23 motion to accept 13-5 to reject Second Revision 386 and 24 related portions of First Revision 751. 25 MR. QUITER: Thank you.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 89</p>

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

<p>1 There is a motion on the floor to Reject 2 Second Revision Number 386 and any related portions of 3 First Revision Number 751. Is there a second? 4 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 5 MR. QUITER: We do have a second. 6 Please proceed with the discussion on the 7 motion. 8 Microphone 6. 9 MR. ASP: Thank you. 10 For several cycles proposals have been made 11 to add safety margins to hydro and flow test. These 12 proposals in the past have, have not been accepted. In 13 2016, a five percent adjustment was proposed and 14 rejection, rejected. Consensus could not be reached. 15 As a result, a Fire Protection Research Foundation 16 Project was initiated to attempt to quantify an 17 appropriate method of applying this adjustment. This 18 project included input from, from the water utilities. 19 This was found to be not possible with the following 20 statement: "Due to the limited available literature 21 regarding the topic of water supply adjustments, 22 insufficient data was considered available to support 23 recommendations for developing adjustments at this 24 time." 25 This fact has not changed; yet this language</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 90</p>	<p>1 lowest static pressure available. If this was not 2 available from the water authority, then it would 3 mandate a ten percent reduction of the, the static 4 pressure that was read. This generated a lot of 5 comment. It resulted in a first revision. There were 6 a number of negative votes because there were concerns 7 about this. The research project that was, report came 8 out during that intervening time between the first 9 revision and the public comment period explaining the 10 fact that having a mandatory reduction at this time, 11 there's just not enough data. There are too many 12 variables. 13 So when the Committee came back and addressed 14 this issue, a Task Group was formed because the 15 Committee was grappling with this. A Task Group was 16 formed. It was a broad range of stakeholders within 17 the Technical Committee. They came back with a 18 recommendation that the language be inserted that, yes, 19 there would be a requirement to apply a reduction, but 20 that reduction would be the result of an evaluation 21 where you would go to the annex and look at all the 22 different factors that could do that. 23 I think it's important to realize that this 24 was a, a, a monumental effort that resulted in a 25 unanimous vote by the Committee. Out of thirty-four</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 92</p>
<p>1 has been added to NFPA 13 to require that adjustments 2 be made with, based on information from the water 3 authority. This CAM seeks to reject this proposed 4 language and return to the language of the 2016 Edition 5 including the associated annex language. The annex 6 language recommends that adjustments be made where 7 appropriate. This is the appropriate language for NFPA 8 13 and as such please support this CAM. Thank you. 9 MR. QUITER: Mr. Linder, would you like to 10 offer the Committee's position? 11 MR. LINDER: I will defer to the Technical 12 Committee Chair, Russ Leavitt. 13 MR. LEAVITT: Good morning again. Russ 14 Leavitt, Chair of the Sprinkler System Discharge 15 Criteria Technical Committee. Water supply is a 16 foundational issue with sprinkler systems, so this 17 has been a discussion as was mentioned by the 18 submitter with the, with the Technical Committee for a, 19 a long time. There has been long concern expressed by 20 many stakeholders over the validity of water flow 21 testing and, and making sure that it is valid as we 22 design and based our system criteria on this water 23 supply. First Revision 751 which was referred to 24 actually did two things: 25 It provided a formula that was based on the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 91</p>	<p>1 members, thirty-three submitted ballots. All thirty- 2 three were affirmative, one with comment not in 3 regard to the comment, but in regards to some of the 4 language and definition. 5 So the Committee worked on this, voted 6 unanimously to require this reduction with the, or this 7 evaluation in reduction with the feeling that it's 8 important to this foundational part of fire sprinkler 9 design. Thank you. 10 MR. QUITER: Thank you, gentlemen. 11 With that, we will open up debate on the 12 motion. Please provide your name, affiliation, and 13 whether you are speaking in support of or against the 14 motion. 15 Microphone number 4. 16 MR. CAPUTO: My name is Bob Caputo, I'm with 17 Fire and Life Safety America, and I rise to speak 18 against the motion on the floor. Without guidance 19 provided in NFPA 13, we get the Wild West of 20 requirements, everything from designing a system right 21 to the water supply curve that's been reported to fire 22 departments and locations where we are seeing 23 requirements of a ten percent up to a forty percent or 24 a forty PSI reduction for safety margins. 25 It seems incredible that we do hydraulic</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 93</p>

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



1 calculations down to the tenth of a PSI and relate this  
2 to a water supply test that doesn't take into account  
3 any seasonal variation, any aging of the piping  
4 system, or future development of the area in which the  
5 facility or building is being built, not to mention  
6 piping changes that are normal under construction  
7 conditions, aging of fire pumps, sizing of fire pumps,  
8 and a host of other reasons for us to be a little bit  
9 more conservative and consider a safety margin when we  
10 look at the evaluation of the available water supply.  
11 Without specific guidance, we continue to see  
12 very matter of fact, "let's do it this way or that way"  
13 across the country. This is needed. As mentioned by  
14 Chairman Leavitt, this is consensus, unanimous decision  
15 of the Committee, and I urge your "no" vote on this  
16 matter. Thank you.  
17 MR. QUITER: Thank you.  
18 Also Microphone Number 4.  
19 MR. ISMAN: Thank you. My name is Ken Isman,  
20 and I'm with the University of Maryland, and I'm  
21 speaking against the motion. There are three reasons  
22 I'm speaking against this motion this morning:  
23 The first is a technical reason. The way the  
24 standard is written, the way it's proposed by the NFSA,  
25 is that there will be no adjustment required to a water

Page 94

1 supply test. Boy, this is really hard. The delay is  
2 amazing. There's no adjustment required for a water  
3 supply test. So a contractor can go out at any time  
4 they want when they know the water supply is strong,  
5 run a test, and use that data all the way up to the  
6 last ounce of pressure, and not make any adjustment to  
7 that, and we all know that's wrong, and yet the  
8 authority having jurisdiction will not have any ability  
9 to point to any Section of NFPA 13 and say, "You  
10 violated this Section. I, I can't allow you to do  
11 that." NFPA 13 can't allow that kind of irresponsible  
12 use of water test data.  
13 The second reason I'm against this is a  
14 procedural issue. The NFSA has, has been a bad  
15 participant in the consensus process. There was  
16 different language in the first draft of the Standard.  
17 The NFSA was against that language, but it still passed  
18 the Committee by a two-thirds vote, and even though we  
19 understood we had the two-thirds, we bent over  
20 backwards at the second draft to, to fix the language  
21 so that the NFSA Reps would be happy with it, and all  
22 of the NFSA Reps at the meeting said they were happy  
23 with the language we developed, and as the Chair  
24 said, the vote was unanimously in favor of this  
25 language, and then afterwards they filed the demand to

Page 95

1 take the language out. We have bent over backwards to  
2 deal with the issues they were concerned with. We've  
3 got some decent language. Quite frankly, I was more  
4 happy with the language at the first draft, but we  
5 revised it to make the NFSA folks happy, and they're  
6 still coming back here and asking you to throw that  
7 language out, and that's not being a good participant  
8 in the consensus process.  
9 And, finally, I'm against this language or  
10 against the motion because the NFSA has represented this  
11 as returning to 2016 language, but that's not correct.  
12 What's in the 2016 Edition is at least an annex note  
13 that tells you it's a good idea to adjust the  
14 information, and that annex note is gone. If you look  
15 at the language that the NFPA has given us, it doesn't  
16 show that that annex text is coming back. So it's not  
17 a return to 2016 text. It's taking everything that's  
18 ever been in the Standard out of the document on this  
19 subject, and that's wrong. Thank you.  
20 MR. QUITER: Microphone Number 1.  
21 MR. HOPKINS: Yes, thank you. Mark Hopkins  
22 representing the NFSA Engineering and Standards  
23 Committee. I just take some umbrage what, what Mr.  
24 Isman just said. You know, the NFSA --  
25 MR. QUITER: Can you say whether you're

Page 96

1 for or against the motion please?  
2 MR. HOPKINS: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm, I'm in  
3 favor of the motion, and there's, there's really one  
4 key thing here is that the U.S. experience with  
5 sprinklers speaks against what Mr. Isman just stated.  
6 In terms of when sprinklers operated during fires,  
7 there has been a ninety-six percent effectiveness.  
8 Now, that's a key statistic saying that what we're  
9 doing is working, and so when you figure in that in  
10 ninety percent, ninety-seven percent of the cases fire  
11 control was achieved with five or few sprinklers, and  
12 in seventy-nine percent of the cases, one sprinkler  
13 was found to be effective.  
14 So this, this doesn't really solve all of the  
15 problems. If we have a declining water supply that's  
16 related to occlusion of piping, this is only going to  
17 mask the problem. It's going to give a false sense of  
18 security. So what NFSA is in favor of is an evaluation  
19 of all water supplies. Having been a practicing fire  
20 protection engineer for a number of years, I evaluated  
21 every water supply that I looked at. We, we just take  
22 umbrage with making an adjustment to every water  
23 supply without having appropriate guidance.  
24 The other thing is having been one of the  
25 authors of the Fire Protection Research Foundation

Page 97

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

<p>1 while working for Jensen Hughes, we found that the key 2 takeaway was that this is a communication issue. We 3 just need to communicate with water purveyors, get the 4 information, figure out how to appropriately evaluate 5 water supplies. Thank you. 6 MR. QUITER: Thank you. 7 Microphone Number 4. 8 MR. CAPUTO: Yes. Once again, Bob Caputo, 9 Fire and Life Safety America, speaking against the 10 motion on the floor. I'd just like to make two points 11 in rebuttal to what we just heard. 12 The first is NFPA 13 is a design and 13 installation document and not every state of 14 jurisdiction requires an engineer of record or an 15 engineering review. So we have fire sprinkler 16 contractors who may or may not have a P.E. on staff 17 performing water flow tests and providing whatever 18 evaluation might be involved at that particular level. 19 Secondly, the data spoken to with regard to 20 the number of activated sprinklers required to control 21 a fire speak to past history of design where fire 22 sprinkler systems had a remote area that included about 23 fifteen hundred square feet or more. Today we have 24 quick response sprinklers and area reductions with a 25 lot of our systems being designed with only five or</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 98</p>	<p>1 every system. Thank you. 2 MR. QUITER: Also at Microphone Number 3. 3 MR. BOWE: My name is Timothy Bowe. I'm 4 voting for the motion. ABCO Peerless Sprinkler, New 5 York City. I'm a fire protection contractor, and I have 6 no problem putting in more equipment. It's going to 7 cost more money. We're going to reduce the reliability 8 of these systems because in many instances we will now 9 need emergency power. The emergency power requirements 10 will be significant, and there is going to be more 11 maintenance required for the fire pump, for the 12 emergency generator, testing, maintenance, and 13 increased cost for the owner, and I ask you to please 14 vote for the motion. Thank you. 15 MR. QUITER: I'm going to continue at 16 Microphone 3, and then go to 4, and then 6. 17 Microphone 3. 18 MR. STANLEY: My name is George Stanley, 19 Wiginton Fire Protection Engineering. I have over... 20 I'm speaking in favor of the motion. I have over 21 forty years of experience of designing systems, 22 calculating, working with water supplies. I have the 23 greatest respect for Mr. Isman, he has taught me quite 24 a bit over the last twenty years, but in this case I 25 feel like he's wrong.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 100</p>
<p>1 perhaps even four sprinklers in the first place. So 2 we've reduced the number of sprinklers designed to 3 function in the first place which increases the need 4 for the reliability of the water supply and speaks to 5 a reasonable reduction or a reasonable safety margin 6 in the evaluation of that water supply to support those 7 five or four sprinklers that have now been included in 8 our area design. Thank you. 9 MR. QUITER: Thank you. 10 Microphone number 3. 11 MR. BACKER (phonetic): My name's Jack Backer 12 (phonetic). I'm for the motion. I'm a fire sprinkler 13 contractor in California. I've been designing and 14 calculating sprinkler systems for sixty years. This 15 is my sixtieth year. I'm also an F.P.E. in California. 16 I've analyzed water supplies since 1960. Every one is 17 different. I would just hate to see that the "shall" 18 word that's in this document will force me to put fire 19 pumps in on projects, projects that are not in need of 20 it, and when I put a fire pump in, I diminish the pipe 21 size, I put less sprinklers in, I put smaller sprinklers 22 in, I reduce the volume, and now my system's based on, 23 on a pump working. I've always used the word "where 24 applicable." "Where appropriate." Every water 25 company's different. There shouldn't be a rule for</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 99</p>	<p>1 Safety margins, we all know that there's 2 safety margins within calculations. It's very hard to 3 calculate right up to the curve with today's materials 4 and methods of connecting pipe. Every system has to 5 have... We have to include hose. Well, that hose is 6 not used until the fire department shows up and 7 pressurizes the system, and now pressure's not an 8 issue. So with those safety margins, no loss history, 9 we really don't feel like we need this in the body of 10 the Standard. Thank you. 11 MR. QUITER: Thank you. 12 Microphone Number 4. 13 MR. ISMAN: Thank you. Ken Isman with the 14 University of Maryland, and I'm against the motion. 15 Just rebuttal for some of the things you've heard. 16 First of all, this ninety-six percent 17 effectiveness with sprinklers, that data has been 18 generated with more than a hundred years of sprinklers 19 and a requirement for an adjustment in the Standard. I 20 went back as far as I could go looking back into the 21 1960s of NFPA 13 additions and there's been a 22 requirement for an adjustment to the water flow test 23 data in all of those Sections, in all of those editions 24 of NPFA 13 all the way back to, to the 1960s and I'm 25 sure even before that. I just couldn't find older</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 101</p>

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

<p>1 editions to look at. So it's only since 2013 that this 2 requirement's been completely eliminated from the NFPA 3 Standards. In 2010 it was eliminated from 13 and in 4 2013 it was eliminated from NFPA 24. So we've 5 generated a whole bunch of data about how good 6 sprinklers are and how well they work with this safety 7 margin required, and you can't use that data as 8 justification for eliminating the safety margin. So 9 that's an inappropriate use of data to say that 10 sprinklers work without this adjustment. The data that 11 says sprinklers work was generated with this 12 adjustment.</p> <p>13 The statement that every system is different 14 is absolutely true. That's why the language the 15 Committee developed specifically speaks to appropriate 16 adjustments, and if you really have a mature water 17 supply that is not going to change in any way, shape, 18 or form and you can document that, then you have 19 applied appropriate procedures and you meet what's in 20 the, the, the language that the NFPA Committee came up 21 with. So there really isn't any really good reason 22 to throw this language out. The Committee's done a 23 really good job of taking into account all of these 24 concerns, and I think we need to just trust the 25 Committee now.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 102</p>	<p>1 MR. QUITER: We do have a second. 2 In order to vote on this motion, please 3 scroll down to the bottom of the tablet to vote. 4 If you, you wish to vote in support of the 5 motion, touch "Yes." 6 If you wish to vote against the motion, touch 7 "No" 8 Please record your vote. 9 [Voting.] 10 The voting will be closed in five seconds. 11 [Voting continued.] 12 The voting is closed. 13 MALE SPEAKER: I can't vote. 14 FEMALE SPEAKER: I can't vote. 15 MALE SPEAKER: It's not letting me vote. 16 MALE SPEAKER: It's not working. 17 MANY SPEAKERS: It's not working. 18 MALE SPEAKER: Point of information. 19 MR. QUITER: Go ahead. 20 MALE SPEAKER: The Chair might want to 21 clarify that this motion that's being voted right now 22 is a Call The Question, and one needs to scroll down 23 to the bottom to vote that. I'm, I'm not sure 24 everybody understands the motion that's being voted. 25 MR. QUITER: Okay. I did think I repeated</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 104</p>
<p>1 MR. QUITER: Microphone Number 6. 2 MR. ASP: Hi, I'm Roland Asp representing the 3 NFSA speaking for the motion. I just wanted to rebut 4 point three that Ken made, Ken Isman made, is the annex 5 language from the 2016 is part of this motion. I 6 confirmed that with NFPA Staff this morning. 7 MR. QUITER: Thank you. 8 Are you at Microphone Number 2 or no? Okay. 9 Microphone Number 7. 10 MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH 11 International. I Call The Question. 12 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 13 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 14 MALE SPEAKER: You've got to be kidding me. 15 MR. QUITER: Okay. 16 There is a motion from the floor to Call The 17 Question. I notice there are a number of people 18 remaining at the microphones waiting to speak -- 19 MALE SPEAKER: Yes sir. 20 MR. QUITER: -- but we'll proceed with the 21 vote on the Call Of The Question. 22 Do we have a second? 23 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 24 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 25 MALE SPEAKER: Second.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 103</p>	<p>1 that, but this is a motion to Call The Question. It is 2 non-debatable. Therefore, when we have a second, we 3 go ahead with, with the vote. 4 To vote on Calling The Question, you scroll 5 down to the bottom of your tablet to vote. 6 So then if you wish to vote yes in support 7 of the motion, touch "Yes." 8 If you wish to vote against it, touch "No." 9 So can we re-open and... Okay. 10 [Voting.] 11 The voting will be closed in five seconds. 12 [Voting continues.] 13 The voting is closed. 14 FEMALE SPEAKER: (Unintelligible). 15 MR. QUITER: (Unintelligible). 16 Okay. The vote is four hundred and eight in 17 support of the motion to Call The Question and one 18 hundred and twenty-four against the motion to call 19 the question. Therefore, the motion has passed. 20 Because the motion has passed, we will bring 21 this to a vote. Before we vote, let me restate the 22 motion. The motion on the floor is to reject Second 23 Revision Number 386 and any related portions of First 24 Revision Number 751. 25 If you wish to vote in support of the motion</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 105</p>

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

<p>1 and recommend the text on Screen 1, touch "Yes." 2 If you wish to vote against the motion and 3 recommend the text on Screen 2, touch "No." 4 Please record your vote. 5 [Voting.] 6 The voting will close in five seconds. 7 [Voting continues.] 8 The voting is closed. 9 The results of the vote are two hundred and 10 eighty-eight in support of the motion and recommend the 11 text on Screen 1, two hundred and forty-four against 12 the motion and recommend the text on Screen 2. 13 Therefore, the motion has passed. 14 MALE SPEAKER: Point of order, Mr. Chair. 15 Microphone 6. 16 MR. QUITER: Yes, microphone 6. 17 MALE SPEAKER: Can we get confirmation on the 18 record from the NFPA of the last statement that was 19 made that in, since this motion passed, is the annex 20 language from the 2016 Edition going to appear in the 21 2019 Edition even though it's not in the portion of the 22 report that says what's going to happen if the motion 23 passes? 24 MR. QUITER: Okay. 25 I am told that any previous edition text will</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 106</p>	<p>1 TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE 2 3 4 5 I, TIMOTHY ROBERT DUVAL, attest that the foregoing 6 proceedings provided to me via audio were transcribed by 7 me to the best of my ability. 8 I further attest that I am not a relative or 9 employee to any attorney or party nor financially 10 interested in this action. 11 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws 12 of the state of that the foregoing is true 13 and correct. 14 15 _____ 16 TIMOTHY ROBERT DUVAL 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 108</p>
<p>1 be applicable. 2 MALE SPEAKER: Thank you. 3 MR. QUITER: Okay. At this point we are 4 going to take a fifteen minute break. Please be back 5 at according to my watch 10:47. 6 (End of audio.) 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 107</p>	

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 NATIONAL FIRE PROTECTION ASSOCIATION

11 2018 JUNE MEETING

12 THURSDAY, 14 JUNE 2018

13 AUDIO TRANSCRIPTION OF TECHNICAL COMMITTEE SESSION

14 PART TWO

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

ATKINSON-BAKER, INC.

22 COURT REPORTERS

(800) 288-3376

23 www.depo.com

24

TRANSCRIBED BY: MARY HARLOW

25 FILE NO. AC068DF

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

Atkinson-Baker Court Reporters  
www.depo.com

<p>1 APPEARANCES 2 3 JAMES QUINTERO PRESIDING OFFICER 4 5 SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI SAN FRANCISCO FIRE DEPARTMENT 6 7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKERS 8 9 KENNETH LINDER CORRELATING COMMITTEE CHAIR SWISS RE, STAFFORD SPRINGS, CONNECTICUT 10 11 JOHN KAPPLA (PHONETIC) BOEHM (PHONETIC) INTERNATIONAL 12 13 ROLAND ASP NATIONAL FIRE SPRINKLER ASSOCIATION 14 15 DAN FINNEGAN SIEMENS BUILDING TECHNOLOGIES AFAA BOARD OF DIRECTORS 16 17 GEORGE STANLEY WIGINTON FIRE SYSTEM 18 19 ED KAMINSKI CLARK COUNTY BUILDING AND FIRE PREVENTION 20 21 LAWRENCE TAYLOR NATIONAL ELEVATOR INDUSTRY, INCORPORATED 22 23 BOB UPSON NFSA 24 25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 2</p>	<p>1 WILLIAM FISKE 2 3 JACK THACKER CONTRACTOR 4 5 CECIL BILBO ACADEMY OF FIRE SPRINKLER TECHNOLOGY 6 7 BOB CAPUTO FIRE AND LIFE SAFETY AMERICA 8 9 DANIEL O'CONNOR PRESIDING OFFICER 10 11 DANIEL ROSSOS OREGON DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY STANDARDS AND TRAINING TECHNICAL COMMITTEE CHAIR 12 13 JUDGE MORGAN SCOTT SAFETY 3M 14 15 WILLIAM HASKELL NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH 16 17 BILL PARSON 3M SCOTT 18 19 ROBIN GAINEY INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FIREFIGHTERS 20 21 STEVE WEINSTEIN HONEYWELL 22 SECRETARY, NFPA TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ON RESPIRATORY PROTECTION EQUIPMENT 23 24 BOB HINALL (PHONETIC) 3M SCOTT SAFETY 25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 4</p>
<p>1 STEVEN LEWIS FIRE LIFE SAFETY INTEGRATORS 2 3 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKERS 4 5 JIM PETERKIN TLC Engineering for Architecture 6 7 RAY GRILL AIR UP INSULATION COMMITTEE CHAIR 8 9 DAVE LOWREY BOULDER FIRE-RESCUE 10 CHAIR, TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ON NOTIFICATION APPLIANCES 11 12 DAVE DAGENAIS HEALTHCARE SECTION 13 14 JEFF HUGO NATIONAL FIRE SPRINKLER ASSOCIATION 15 16 TERRY VICTOR JOHNSON CONTROLS 17 18 TIM ADAMS AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION 19 20 MARTY (MARVIN) HUIE JACOBS ENGINEERING 21 22 MATTHEW MERTENS NORTH SHORE FIRE 23 24 KEN ISMAN UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND 25 CHAIR, COMMITTEE ON RESIDENTIAL SPRINKLER SYSTEMS</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 3</p>	<p>1 DAVID FISHLER (PHONETIC) 2 3 CAPTAIN ALBERT YANAGISAWA LOS ANGELES COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT 4 5 DAVID BURNSWOG (PHONETIC) FIREFIGHTER, COLUMBUS, OHIO 6 7 JOHN CUNNINGHAM NOVA SCOTIA FIREFIGHTERS SCHOOL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE CHAIR 8 9 JIM CRAWFORD PROJECT MANAGER, VISION 20/20 10 11 NANCY TRENCH FIRE PROTECTION PUBLICATIONS 12 13 KELLY NICOLELLO UNDERWRITERS LABORATORIES 14 15 KEN FONDO (PHONETIC) NATIONAL VOLUNTEER FIRE COUNCIL 16 17 THOMAS BREYER INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FIREFIGHTERS 18 19 VINCENT QUINTERO RHODE ISLAND STATE FIRE MARSHAL'S OFFICE 20 TRAINING ACADEMY 21 22 TONY APFELBECK ALTAMONTE SPRINGS BUILDING/FIRE SAFETY DIVISION, FL 23 24 JERRY PERRITY (PHONETIC) 25 26 RONALD FARR PLAINWELL FIRE DEPARTMENT, OTSEGO, MICHIGAN</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 5</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

2 (Pages 2 to 5)

Atkinson-Baker Court Reporters  
www.depo.com

<p>1 MATTHEW MERTENS NORTH SHORE FIRE</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 KEN DUNCAN (PHONETIC) PERFORMANCE DESIGN TECHNOLOGIES</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 JAMES GOLINVEAUX PRESIDING OFFICER</p> <p>6</p> <p>7 JAMES GREGORY FLORIDA AGENCY FOR HEALTHCARE ADMINISTRATION, TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10 RON BOURGAULT MAZZETTI ENGINEERING</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 KEITH WATERS</p> <p>13</p> <p>14 JOHN WILLIAMS WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH NFPA HEALTHCARE SECTION</p> <p>15</p> <p>16 TIM ADAMS AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION</p> <p>17</p> <p>18 RON BRIGEL MAZZETTI ENGINEERING</p> <p>19</p> <p>20 MERTON BUNKER LEWIS BERGER, STAFFORD, VIRGINIA</p> <p>21</p> <p>22 L.J. DELAIR FIRE MARSHAL, ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL</p> <p>23</p> <p>24 JOHN KEPUS COFFMAN ENGINEERS</p> <p>25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p>	<p>1 MIKE TYKA (PHONETIC) ILLINOIS FIRE INSPECTORS</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 MAX SCANDY (PHONETIC) CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST LATTER DAY SAINTS</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 PATRICK EGAN SELECT SECURITY, LANCASTER, PENNSYLVANIA</p> <p>6</p> <p>7 MICHAEL RONS FIRE MARSHAL, VILLAGE OF SCHAUMBURG</p> <p>8</p> <p>9 ROBERT SHORE SYSTEMS DESIGN GROUP, FLEMINGTON, NEW JERSEY</p> <p>10</p> <p>11 KEVIN LEHAND (PHONETIC) EMERGENCY 24</p> <p>12</p> <p>13 CHAD JONES CISCO SYSTEMS</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p>
<p>1 PETE LARIMER DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 TED LEVENTHAL</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 TOM PARRISH PUTNAM TOWNSHIP FIRE DEPARTMENT</p> <p>6</p> <p>7 MICHAEL PALLET (PHONETIC) TELECORE INCORPORATED MEMBER, ECS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE</p> <p>8</p> <p>9 TODD VANGORDER SILCO FIRE AND SECURITY</p> <p>10</p> <p>11 MARK PAVIKA (PHONETIC) SIEMENS FIRE SAFETY</p> <p>12</p> <p>13 RICHARD SIMPSON VECTOR SECURITY</p> <p>14</p> <p>15 WARREN OLSEN CHAIR CHAPTER 26 SUPERVISING STATION ALARM SYSTEMS</p> <p>16</p> <p>17 IVAN SPECTOR PRESIDENT, MONITORING ASSOCIATION</p> <p>18</p> <p>19 DAVE BARON</p> <p>20</p> <p>21 JAY HAHN (PHONETIC) TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBER</p> <p>22</p> <p>23 ROBERT BURKE MONITORING ASSOCIATION WAYNE ALARM SYSTEMS</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p>	<p>1 AUDIO TRANSCRIPTION OF</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 FIRE SAFETY TECHNICAL MEETING</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 PART 2</p> <p>6</p> <p>7 JUNE 14, 2018</p> <p>8</p> <p>9 JAMES QUITER: Please make your way to your 10 seats here. We are reconvening in one minute. 11 (BACKGROUND VOICES) 12 JAMES QUITER: Okay. I'm going to call the 13 meeting back to order. Let's now proceed with the 14 discussion on <b>Certified Amending Motion 13-6</b>. 15 Microphone Three, please. 16 SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: Okay. Good morning. My 17 name is Sagiv Weiss-Ishai, and I'm with the San 18 Francisco Fire Department, and I'm speaking in favor 19 of the motion. 20 JAMES QUITER: Oh, you, you have to make the 21 motion first, Sagiv. 22 SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: All right. The motion is 23 to Reject the Second Correlation, Revision Number 24 Nine, and I'm speaking in favor of the motion. 25 JAMES QUITER: Okay. So give me --</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 9</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

3 (Pages 6 to 9)

<p>1 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 2 JAMES QUITER: Give me a moment to get a 3 second. We have a second. Okay. Please proceed with 4 the discussion on the motion. 5 SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: Okay. So the reason for 6 rejecting the Second Correlation, Revision Number Nine 7 are - first of all, currently there is a conflict 8 within NFPA 13. NFPA 13 requires to have sprinklers 9 in elevator pits. There is an exception for traction 10 elevators. It's basically said the requirement to 11 have sprinklers in elevator pits are only for 12 hydraulic elevator which contains hydraulic, 13 combustible fluids. The conflict with NFPA 13 today 14 is that if you look at the Annex of this section, 15 which explain the intent of this section, it says that 16 the intent is to protect against debris, and garbage, 17 and papers, and things like this. So this is, this is 18 the conflict that is right now in the - in the NFPA 19 13, which the intent, explained in the Annex, is not 20 correlated with the body of the Code. So now, the, 21 the proposal is basically to remove the, the 22 sprinklers completely from hydraulic elevator. And 23 the main reason are that when you have sprinklers in 24 hydraulic elevators, the intent, the real intent, is 25 to protect against hydraulic fluids. Hydraulic fluids</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 10</p>	<p>1 actually came from the Correlating Committee, back to 2 the Installation Criteria Committee. Sprinklers in 3 elevators, and any associated rooms comes up every 4 single year. There's people who want them there. 5 There's people who don't want them there. And it 6 bounces back and forth. And for as long as I've been 7 on the Committee, I, I can't remember a cycle where 8 something didn't come up, and no one ever seems to be 9 happy. 10 So what the Committee has tried to do here is 11 go back and correlate with other Standards, and try to 12 come up with language that is consistent across 13 multiple Standards, that's reasonable, and I would 14 encourage people to vote against the motion on the 15 floor. 16 JAMES QUITER: Thank you, Mr. Linder. With 17 that, we will open up debate on the motion. A 18 reminder to please provide your name, affiliation, and 19 whether you're speaking in support of, or against the 20 motion. Motion - Microphone Number Six, please. 21 JOHN KAPPLA (phonetic): Hi, I'm - oh, that is 22 an echo. I'm John Kappla with Boehm (phonetic) 23 International. We represent a lot of the high rise 24 building owners in the country, and actually around 25 the world. Initially, when --</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 12</p>
<p>1 used for elevators are extremely non-combustible. 2 They need a flashpoint of about 600 degrees 3 Fahrenheit, to get ignited. There is no documented 4 hydraulic fires in elevator pit. 5 Now, what is the problem? The problem - I 6 don't care about one sprinkler in a pit, but I care 7 about the requirement that is an NFPA 72, Section 8 21.3.7, that says where sprinkler are located in the 9 bottom of the hoist way, fire detection devices shall 10 be installed in the pit, in accordance with Chapter 11 710. So NFPA 72 requires fire alarm devices in the 12 pit, to initiate recall. 13 The main reason for this proposal is when we 14 remove the sprinklers, we don't need the fire alarm 15 initiating devices. We don't need people that are 16 doing fire alarm work be inside elevator pit. The 17 statistics that we have today from OSHA is that every 18 year, 31 people die inside the elevator hoist way, and 19 17,000 people get injured in elevator hoist ways. 20 We're trying to prevent known elevator people from 21 being in elevator pit. This is for life safety. 22 Thank you. 23 JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Mr. Linder, would 24 you like to offer the Committee's position? 25 KENNETH LINDER: Yes, thank you. This motion</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 11</p>	<p>1 JAMES QUITER: Oh -- 2 JOHN KAPPLA: -- we looked -- 3 JAMES QUITER: Are you for or against the 4 motion? 5 JOHN KAPPLA: I'm sorry, I'm, I'm for - I'm at 6 the, the green sign. 7 JAMES QUITER: Okay. Our tape can't read the 8 signs. 9 JOHN KAPPLA: Okay. From our perspective, it's 10 not a, it's not a financial issue. It's not one about 11 the cost to install. It is really about whether we 12 have a requirement that is now putting people in peril 13 when they have to service the elevator. And it 14 appears that, I think the statement was made that 15 there are no pit - no pit fires. I don't think that's 16 quite true; but I think the statement that was 17 intended was that there were none that involved 18 hydraulic fluids. So from our perspective, we do 19 believe - it - we ask that you support the amendment 20 that has been proposed. We think that that will help 21 us with OSHA regulations, and other requirements. 22 Thank you. 23 JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Microphone Number 24 Two, please. 25 ROLAND ASP: Hi. My name is Roland Asp. I'm</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 13</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018



1 representing the National Fire Sprinkler Association,  
2 and I'm speaking in opposition to this CAM. This will  
3 affect - as, as was stated, this will remove the  
4 longstanding requirement to install a sprinkler in the  
5 bottom of elevator pits. And yes, there is an  
6 allowance to remove this sprinkler if there is no  
7 hydraulic fluids. But debris and hydraulic fluids do  
8 tend to collect at the bottom of the pit, and the  
9 sprinkler there will control any fire there. I  
10 understand that the Annex note just talks about debris  
11 and stuff like that in the pit, and doesn't  
12 particularly talk about hydraulic fluids. But if that  
13 debris at the bottom of the pit does go on fire, and  
14 there is hydraulic fluids, I think there is a  
15 dangerous situation.

16 You know, when we were discussing this, a lot  
17 of comments came up that few fires start in elevator  
18 shafts. But the Committee didn't receive any data  
19 saying that there is not a fire risk in these elevator  
20 pits with combustible fluids. It was stated there is  
21 no supporting fire data, but that wasn't brought to  
22 the Committee at all. In order to remove the existing  
23 requirements for pit sprinklers, it's my belief that  
24 the proponents should supply supporting data that  
25 these sprinklers are not necessary because there are

Page 14

1 no fires here. I did a quick Google search. I know  
2 it's not scientific, and there are a lot of elevator  
3 shaft fires that you can find. I found a list of over  
4 30. I don't have all the data, whether it was  
5 hydraulic fluids or all that, but these fires do  
6 start, and I think the sprinkler in the pit is a  
7 prudent requirement.

8 I am sensitive to the life safety concerns for  
9 the, you know, the people who are - have to go down in  
10 that pit. But I'm also concerned about the life  
11 safety of the people in the entire building. And the  
12 sprinkler in the pit will keep it - keep the people  
13 safe, keep the building safe. And I urge everybody to  
14 support the Committee, and oppose this CAM. Thank  
15 you.

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

18 DAN FINNEGAN: Hi. Good after - good morning.  
19 My name is Dan Finnegan with Siemens Building  
20 Technologies. And I stand here in support of the CAM.  
21 I am also a former Fire Code official, a member of the  
22 AFAA Board of Directors. And more importantly, I'm  
23 also a fire alarm manufacturer. And I stand here, by  
24 supporting the CAM, with the primary purpose of making  
25 sure we eliminate, and delete the fire detection

Page 15

1 device that's going along with the fire sprinkler  
2 head. There is no documented data that shows that  
3 detection device is necessary. I do not see this, nor  
4 has it been shown to be a significant safety issue -  
5 other than the fact that when we have them in there,  
6 the safety issues that were pointed out by the  
7 proponent are very valid. People are getting injured;  
8 people are getting hurt by going in and having to  
9 maintain these fire detection devices.

10 So I stand, and ask you to support this CAM, to  
11 support the Fire Service, and move forward. Thank  
12 you.

13 JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Microphone Number  
14 Four, please.

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

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

25 ED KAMINSKI: This is Ed Kaminski from Clark

Page 16

1 County Building and Fire Prevention, but today,  
2 speaking for myself, not for the County. But this is  
3 - what, what, what's the --

4 JAMES QUITER: In favor, or against the motion?

5 ED KAMINSKI: My, my - I'm speaking in support  
6 of the motion. I would believe that it would be  
7 somewhat of an anomaly, if, if we would have a fire  
8 concurrent with a leak of - with the hydraulic fluid,  
9 which has a high flashpoint, somewhere in the order of  
10 600 degrees Fahrenheit. I know some of the other  
11 speakers have talked about elevator pit fires. These  
12 were not really sorted between hydraulic versus  
13 traction elevators. But with respect to the hydraulic  
14 elevators, I, I believe it would be somewhat if an  
15 anomaly to have the ignition at the same time as the  
16 leak, and the leak would be discovered because that  
17 elevator would be taken out of service. Thank you.

18 JAMES QUITER: Microphone Number Six, please.

19 LAWRENCE TAYLOR: Yes. My, my name is Lawrence  
20 Taylor, and I represent the National Elevator  
21 Industry, Incorporated, and I am the retired Chief  
22 Elevator Inspector from the sovereign state of Texas.  
23 I am speaking in support of this motion. There - do  
24 occasionally have fires in elevator hoist ways, but  
25 there isn't - 150 years of the use of flammable

Page 17

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

<p>1 hydraulic fluid, there is not one single documented 2 instance where any fire in the pit actually was 3 capable of igniting that fluid. And I support 4 everybody else who's made mention of the hazards. An 5 elevator pit is extremely hazardous. Multiple 6 elevator mechanics who are supposed to be skilled and 7 trained are killed in elevator pits every year - much 8 less people who have no training, no knowledge, no 9 awareness of the hazards that they're going to 10 encounter being in those pits. The debris that 11 everybody seems to be focused on generally is dirt - 12 dirt, a pack of cigarettes, some paper, gum, that if 13 it catches fire and burns - I'm not a fire engineer, 14 but I don't believe you could get enough heat out of 15 some dirt, toilet paper, cigarette packages, and candy 16 bar wrappers to ignite something that takes 600 17 degrees to ignite it. The hazards of being in that 18 pit far exceed any hazard to the public from having 19 that sprinkler removed out of there. And I would ask 20 for your support in that regard. Thank you. 21 JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Microphone Number 22 Two, please. 23 BOB UPSON: Bob Upson, NFSA, speaking in 24 opposition to the motion. I - as a retired 25 firefighter in a small town, I've had some experience</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 18</p>	<p>1 at this time. I call for a motion, to call for a 2 vote. 3 JAMES QUITER: I think you mean Call the 4 Question? 5 MALE SPEAKER: How do I say it, please? 6 MALE SPEAKER: Call the Question. 7 JAMES QUITER: Call the Question. Okay. There 8 is a motion from the floor to Call the Question. I 9 notice that there are a number of people remaining at 10 the microphones waiting to speak, but we'll proceed 11 with the vote on the Call of the Question. Do we have 12 a second? 13 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 14 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 15 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 16 JAMES QUITER: We do have a second. In order 17 to vote on this motion, please scroll down to the 18 bottom of the tablet to vote. If you wish to vote in 19 support of the motion, touch Yes. If you wish to vote 20 against the motion, touch No. Please record your 21 vote. The voting will be closed in five seconds. The 22 voting is closed. The results of the vote are: 437 23 in favor of calling the question; and 79 against the 24 motion to Call the Question. The motion has passed. 25 That then brings us back to the vote. Before</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 20</p>
<p>1 with elevator pits, and I can tell you that there is a 2 lot more debris than just dirt. And among that 3 debris, there was occasionally (unintelligible) pads 4 full of hydraulic fluid. So there, there is a, a 5 qualitative difference in what kind of rubbish you 6 find in hydraulic pits versus traction pits. And it 7 does warrant a higher level of protection. 8 With regard to the life safety of people 9 charged with servicing the, the alarm components, that 10 needs to be addressed in NFPA 72 - not in 13. We need 11 to protect these areas. They are sources of fires. 12 There is a hazard above and beyond what we find in 13 traction pits. Thank you. 14 JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Microphone Number 15 Three, please. 16 STEVEN LEWIS: Hello. My name is Steven Lewis, 17 and I represent Fire Life Safety Integrators. I'm 18 based in Northern California, and I'm for the motion. 19 And my whole purpose is, I have lost two co-workers 20 due to working in unsafe environments. And if we can 21 protect one life with that, I think that's very 22 important. So I'm in favor of it. 23 JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Microphone Number 24 One, please. 25 MALE SPEAKER: Oh. I'd like to call the vote</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 19</p>	<p>1 we vote, let me restate the motion. The motion on the 2 floor is to Reject Second Correlating Revision Number 3 Nine. To vote, touch the Vote button. If you wish to 4 vote in support of the motion, and recommend the text 5 on Screen One, touch yes. If you wish to vote against 6 the motion, and recommend the text on Screen Two, 7 touch No. Please record your vote. The voting will 8 be closed in five seconds. The voting is closed. The 9 results of the vote are 321 in support of the motion 10 and recommend the text on Screen One. 203 against the 11 motion, and recommend the text on Screen Two. 12 Therefore, the motion has passed. 13 MALE SPEAKER: Point of privilege? 14 JAMES QUITER: Go ahead. 15 MALE SPEAKER: If the Chair would entertain a 16 question, please? 17 JAMES QUITER: Go ahead. 18 MALE SPEAKER: Is it appropriate for the Chair 19 to entertain that a Call to Question is out of order? 20 JAMES QUITER: No. 21 MALE SPEAKER: There are lots and lots of 22 people who want to speak on something; it just seems 23 that -- 24 MALE SPEAKER: (unintelligible) 25 JAMES QUITER: Pardon?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 21</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

1 FEMALE SPEAKER: Question (unintelligible)  
2 JAMES QUITER: Yes, a Call the Question is in  
3 order at any time. It is not debatable. Okay. Let's  
4 proceed with the discussion on **Certified Amending**  
5 **Motion 13-7**. Okay.  
6 SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: I'm --  
7 JAMES QUITER: Microphone Number Three.  
8 SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: I'm Sagiv Weiss-Ishai with  
9 San Francisco Fire Department, and I withdraw  
10 Certified Amending Motion Number Seven.  
11 FEMALE SPEAKER: No?  
12 JAMES QUITER: Yeah, yeah. Okay. The motion  
13 on NFPA 13-7 appeared in our agenda. However, the  
14 authorized maker of the motion has notified us that he  
15 no longer wishes to pursue this motion. Therefore, in  
16 accordance with NFPA rules, Convention Rules at  
17 Section 2.7, the motion may not be considered by the  
18 assembly, and is removed from the agenda. We will now  
19 move on to the next motion.  
20 So let's now proceed with the discussion on  
21 **Certified Amending Motion Number 13-8**. Microphone  
22 Three, please.  
23 JIM PETERKIN: Jim Peterkin with TLC  
24 Engineering for Architecture. I'd like to move Motion  
25 13-8, to Reject Second Revision 429, and any related

Page 22

1 portion of First Revision 658.  
2 JAMES QUITER: Thank you. There is a motion on  
3 the floor to Reject Second Revision Number 429, and  
4 any related portions of First Revision Number 658. Is  
5 there a second?  
6 MALE SPEAKER: Second.  
7 MALE SPEAKER: Second.  
8 MALE SPEAKER: Second.  
9 JAMES QUITER: We do have a second. Please  
10 proceed with the discussion on the motion.  
11 JIM PETERKIN: Thank you. This provision  
12 that's been added to the 29 --  
13 JAMES QUITER: Go ahead, go ahead and state  
14 your name, and your --  
15 JIM PETERKIN: Sorry.  
16 JAMES QUITER: -- position again.  
17 JIM PETERKIN: Jim Peterkin of TLC Engineering  
18 for Architecture, speaking in favor of the motion.  
19 This provision that has been added to the 2019 edition  
20 of the - of NFPA 13 allows for the omission of  
21 automatic sprinklers in vestibules that are less than  
22 150 square feet of noncombustible, or limited  
23 combustible construction, and where there are no  
24 combustibles within the vestibule. The justification  
25 for this is that it can be difficult to route piping

Page 23

1 to the vestibule, and sprinklers in the vestibule are  
2 subject to freezing.  
3 While we appreciate the Committee's desire to  
4 reduce the probability of sprinklers freezing, and the  
5 difficulty of routing the piping, we see this as a  
6 continual policing issue, to try to keep combustibles  
7 out of the vestibule. For instance, you, you have a  
8 rainy day, and they put in the walk-out mats to reduce  
9 slipping, fall hazards. Now we've got combustibles in  
10 the vestibule. So we just think it's an issue that  
11 just - that doesn't make sense, and we think - feel  
12 sprinklers should be there. We've been sprinklering  
13 these areas for many, many years. Yes, it's  
14 difficult. Yes, you have to make - take provisions to  
15 prevent freezing. But it's been being done. Why  
16 can't we continue to do that? I urge your support of  
17 NFPA 13-8.  
18 JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Mr. Asp had  
19 submitted a similar CAM. However, I'm going to go to  
20 the Committee Chair, Mr. Linder, first, and then come  
21 to Microphone Six.  
22 KENNETH LINDER: I'm going to defer to the  
23 Technical Committee Chair, Ray Grill.  
24 RAY GRILL: Thank you.  
25 JAMES QUITER: Microphone Three.

Page 24

1 RAY GRILL: Thank you. Ray Grill from Air Up.  
2 I'm the Chair of the Insulation Committee of NFPA 13.  
3 The Committee debated, you know, these proposals at  
4 length. Ultimately, the, the vote was 25 in favor,  
5 seven against. I would recommend the membership to  
6 vote in favor of - against this motion, and with the  
7 Committee's action. Thank you.  
8 JAMES QUITER: Okay. Microphone Number Six.  
9 ROLAND ASP: Hi. I'm Roland Asp of the NFSA,  
10 and I'm in support of this motion. Vestibules should  
11 not be left unprotected, regardless of the size or  
12 construction type. The type - the fact that these  
13 vestibules may be part of the path of egress is a life  
14 safety concerns, and sprinklers need to be installed.  
15 In an emergency, people tend to exit the same way they  
16 entered the building, and it could be through this  
17 potentially unsprinklered entrance vestibule. I  
18 believe this is dangerous, and should not be  
19 permitted.  
20 Additionally, it would be difficult, if not  
21 impossible, to keep combustibles out of these  
22 vestibules. I've seen these vestibules with sofa, and  
23 other furniture; they're, they're often placed in  
24 these vestibules. And as we know, modern furniture is  
25 a significant fire load. Other combustibles, such as

Page 25

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

<p>1 vending machines, and packages, also tend to be placed 2 in this area. It would be an enforcement nightmare to 3 keep all combustibles out of the - this potentially 4 unsprinklered vestibule, and the enforcement of this 5 would fall onto the owners, and the Fire Marshal. I 6 urge everybody to support this CAM. Thank you. 7 JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Microphone Number 8 Two. 9 DAVE LOWREY: Dave Lowrey, Boulder Fire-Rescue, 10 also a member of the Installation Committee on NFPA 11 13. I support against the motion on the floor. This 12 was debated at length in the Installation Committee. 13 I, I am an enforcing authority. I don't see an issue 14 with trying to enforce the combustibles out of that. 15 I have experienced the sprinklers breaking, and taking 16 the whole system out of service now, for a time being. 17 It is difficult to route. I don't see a life safety 18 hazard. The people are mere steps away from getting 19 out of the building. I urge - spoke against this 20 motion. 21 JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Microphone Number 22 Three. 23 DAVE DAGENAIS: My name's Dave Dagenais, and 24 I'm speaking on behalf of the Healthcare Section, in 25 favor of the motion. At our annual business meeting,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 26</p>	<p>1 they're egressing from the building to the out, they 2 have the means of protective, means of egress. At 3 this point, as Mr. Asp has said, you know, more than 4 half of the people are going to exit out of the 5 vestibule they came in. As fire inspectors, and Code 6 officials, where do you find deadbolts, and where do 7 you find illegal locking devices? It's on these 8 vestibules. And we're taking the sprinklers out of 9 it. I think this is a bad idea. I think this does 10 not correlate with the means of egress that we find in 11 the, the Model Building Codes, and this is going in 12 the wrong direction. Vote green. 13 JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Okay. Also, 14 Microphone Number Six. 15 TERRY VICTOR: Yes, Terry Victor with Johnson 16 Controls, speaking in favor of the motion. I want to 17 address the issue that was made about installation of 18 sprinklers in these vestibules being difficult, and to 19 retain the freeze protection on these sprinklers in 20 vestibules. We've got technologies today that we can 21 install sprinklers in the vestibules, with heat 22 tracing on the branch line if it's necessary; or even, 23 we have, now have flexible, dry sprinklers that can be 24 routed into these areas and not be subject to freezing 25 from the piping full of water. It's not that</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 28</p>
<p>1 the Healthcare Section voted to support this motion. 2 From a healthcare perspective, we have challenges of 3 preventing things from entering these locations. By 4 eliminating this requirement, it will diminish the 5 level of safety that exists within a healthcare 6 facility. Healthcare is always - wants to have good 7 codes that support the cost associated with safety, in 8 reality, as we support this motion, and we ask that 9 you do not diminish this level of safety. 10 JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Microphone Number 11 Six. 12 JEFF HUGO: Thank you. Jeff Hugo with the 13 National Fire Sprinkler Association, in support of the 14 motion. We've got to look at what this vestibule is. 15 I mean, I think the intent is to have this appendage 16 vestibule on the outside of a building. But what if 17 the vestibule was underneath the protected building? 18 Could we eliminate sprinklers out of there? According 19 to this text, we could. What about if we have a - a 20 sprinkler - parking garage, and we have an entrance 21 into a - a mercantile occupancy? That's a - that 22 would be considered a vestibule. We could eliminate 23 sprinklers out of there. 24 Keep in mind, while every occupant in the means 25 of egress is protected from the point of wherever</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 27</p>	<p>1 difficult to protect these areas. It is a life safety 2 issue. There's people that will exit these 3 vestibules, and they desire, they need adequate 4 protection during egress in a fire event. I speak in 5 favor of the motion to delete this allowance to 6 eliminate sprinklers. Thank you. 7 JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Microphone Number 8 Three. 9 TIM ADAMS: Hello. My name is Tim Adams, and 10 I'm speaking on behalf of the American Hospital 11 Association. We urge passing of this motion, from a 12 standpoint of safety of those who are in buildings, 13 knowing that it can be, once a building is built, 14 difficult to assure that there will never be a 15 combustible item in that area. So we would urge 16 passing of this motion. 17 JAMES QUITER: And Microphone Number Two. 18 DAVE LOWREY: Dave Lowrey, City of Boulder 19 Fire-Rescue, speaking against the motion. I, I guess 20 when you, when you look at this, it's for a very small 21 vestibule; kind of the idea of the Committee was the, 22 the vestibule that kind of sticks out from the rest of 23 the building, typically made of glass, noncombustible, 24 very little items in there. If a particular industry, 25 maybe like it's been pointed out, with the healthcare</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 29</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

<p>1 industry, wants to install a sprinkler in their 2 vestibule - install the sprinkler in the vestibule. 3 It's not prohibiting a design that says, 'You shall 4 not install that.' It's just saying that for very 5 small vestibules that are noncombustible, and don't 6 contain combustibles, it's not needed. That was the 7 intent that we were looking at. 8 JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Microphone Number 9 Three. 10 MARTY HUIE: Marty Huie, Jacobs Engineering, 11 representing myself. If that was the intent, let's 12 write it in there. 13 JAMES QUITER: Are you for or against the 14 motion? 15 MARTY HUIE: Speaking for the motion. If that 16 was the intent, for a 150 square foot appendage to the 17 building that's glass - that should have been written 18 into the Code. As it was spoken earlier, Energy Code 19 requires vestibules for anything greater than 4,000 20 square feet. So we'll have many, many vestibules 21 within the building throughout many of our healthcare 22 entrances and exits. So all these vestibules could be 23 removed, much of them, much of them greater or less 24 than 150 square feet, following you in the 25 requirement. If it was an appendage, glass, let's</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p>	<p>1 The other piece that I have in contrast is, the 2 way the language is written, it - should this motion 3 be defeated, is it specifically prohibits me as the 4 AHJ from requiring them to put it in there, because 5 the language does say, 'Shall not be required within 6 the entrance.' It doesn't give me the flexibility to 7 say, 'You know, I think you need to put it in there.' 8 It's telling me, 'No, you can't put it in there.' 9 Thank you. 10 JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Is there any further 11 discussion on Section, on Motion 13-8? If not, Mr. 12 Linder, do you have any further comment? 13 KENNETH LINDER: My only comment is - we 14 debated this long and hard. It is a small space, 150 15 square foot maximum, or less, no combustibles. It's 16 there. People inspect their sprinklers. They inspect 17 their buildings. I don't think it's that big a deal 18 to, to make sure that there aren't combustibles in 19 these areas. And I think I would ask you to support 20 the Committee, and vote No. 21 JAMES QUITER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Before we 22 vote, let me restate the motion. The motion on the 23 floor is to Reject Second Revision Number 429, and any 24 related portions of First Revision Number 658. To 25 vote, touch the Vote button. If you wish to vote in</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p>
<p>1 write it. The other argument that we heard earlier 2 was having a parking garage with a vestibule. There 3 was a - somebody reported recently in, in a discussion 4 about this, where a car ran into the vestibule, and 5 the extinguisher inside the vestibule actually helped 6 put out the fire. So I, I urge you not to - I urge 7 you to support this document. 8 JAMES QUITER: Okay. And also Microphone 9 Number Three. 10 MATTHEW MERTENS: Matthew Mertens, North Shore 11 Fire, speaking in favor of the motion; also a Fire 12 Marshal who does deal with this issue quite a bit. 13 When you start placing combustibles and other things 14 in a path of egress, that's a daily occurrence for us, 15 a daily policing. And I guess that - if people want 16 to have flexibility to move forward, and do 17 construction and design methods, those are things that 18 need to be handled at the point of construction. But 19 the majority of our life in the Fire Service is 20 dealing with buildings after they have their C of O - 21 how you maintain that. No one's going to remember 22 that they're not supposed to put combustibles in that, 23 after they're gone, after the general contractor is 24 gone, and the documents are put in the file. All 25 right?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p>	<p>1 support of the motion and recommend the text on Screen 2 One, touch Yes. If you wish to vote against the 3 motion and recommend the text on Screen Two, touch No. 4 Please record your vote. The voting will be closed in 5 five seconds. The voting is closed. Thank you. The 6 results of the vote are 427 in support of the motion, 7 and recommend the text on Screen One; 96 against the 8 motion, and recommend the text on Screen Two. The 9 motion has passed. Is there any further discussion on 10 NFPA 13? Seeing none, we will move on to the next 11 document. 12 Here to present Part Two of the Committee 13 Report is Correlating Committee Chair Kenneth Linder, 14 Swiss Re, of Stafford Springs, Connecticut. The 15 Committee Report, that is the First and Second Draft 16 Reports, is located on the Document Information Page 17 for NFPA 13D, on the NFPA website. All Certified 18 Amending Motions are contained in the NFPA Technical 19 Meeting (Tech Session) Agenda, and will be displayed 20 behind me on the screen as they are under debate. We 21 will now proceed with the motion as included in the 22 Agenda. Mr. Linder. 23 KENNETH LINDER: The second part of the 24 Committee's Report is on NFPA 13D. The Technical 25 Committee has published a First, and a Second Draft</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 33</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

<p>1 Report consisting of revisions to NFPA 13D, Standards 2 for the Installation of Sprinkler Systems in One and 3 Two Family Dwellings, and Manufactured Homes. These 4 reports were submitted to letter ballots of the 5 responsible Correlating and Technical Committee. The 6 reports and ballot results can be found on the Next 7 Edition tab of the Document Information Page for NFPA 8 13D at www.NFPA.org/13Dnext.</p> <p>9 JAMES QUITER: Thank you, Mr. Linder. Let's 10 now proceed with the discussion on the Certified 11 Amending Motions on NFPA 13D. Microphone Six, please.</p> <p>12 ROLAND ASP: My name is Roland Asp, 13 representing the National Fire Sprinkler Association, 14 and I'm - and I would like to move <b>Motion 13D-1</b> to 15 Reject Second Revision Number Seven.</p> <p>16 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 17 MALE SPEAKER: Second.</p> <p>18 JAMES QUITER: There, there is a motion, and a 19 second on the floor to Reject Second Revision Number 20 Seven. Please proceed with discussion on the motion, 21 and identify yourself again, please.</p> <p>22 ROLAND ASP: Hi. My name is Roland Asp. I 23 represent the NFSA, and this - this motion seeks to 24 Reject Second Revision Number Seven which would permit 25 sprinklers to be omitted from attached, enclosed</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p>	<p>1 living area. This would make the pool area 2 indistinguishable from the living area. As SR-7 would 3 allow this area to be, you know, have - to have no 4 protection, you would have half the living area with 5 sprinklers and half without this - without it. So I 6 urge everybody to vote in support of this CAM.</p> <p>7 JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Mr. Linder, would 8 you like to offer the Committee's position?</p> <p>9 KENNETH LINDER: I will defer the - to Ken 10 Isman, Chair of the Technical Committee.</p> <p>11 JAMES QUITER: Go ahead.</p> <p>12 KEN ISMAN: Thank you. My name is Ken Isman, 13 and I'm with the University of Maryland, and I'm the 14 Chair of the Committee on Residential Sprinkler 15 Systems. So the Committee considered this carefully, 16 and we looked at the, the situation with the pool, and 17 the situation with the tennis courts a little bit 18 differently. In the case of the swimming pool, you've 19 got the difficult problem of the corrosion issues in 20 the chlorine environment, and the concern that a 21 homeowner is not going to be able to really recognize 22 the corrosion concerns involved with maintaining a 23 sprinkler in that environment. And when you look at 24 that environment, and you think about just what the 25 fire load really is in the pool, the Committee</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p>
<p>1 swimming pools and tennis courts, provided there is at 2 least one exit door to the exterior. The 3 substantiation for omitting sprinklers in these areas 4 includes the assertion that these areas have no, or 5 limited fire loading. Providing a blanket exemption 6 for sprinklers in this area is not a good idea for 7 several reasons. There's nothing in this section that 8 would specifically prohibit living spaces above this 9 pool or tennis court, and the cited lack of 10 combustibles is certainly not assured. These areas 11 tend to be used to store all sorts of combustibles and 12 pool furniture; and pool furniture, just like any 13 other modern furniture, is a significant fire load. 14 These spaces also tend to be used for entertainment, 15 and this could lead to a source of ignition, such as 16 heaters.</p> <p>17 Additionally, the possibility exists that a 18 floor can be installed over the pool, which would 19 allow an increased occupant load. This is actually 20 quite common. There's many, many websites - you can 21 buy these pool covers that you can, you know, walk on. 22 I've worked on - I have also worked on 13D systems 23 with attached, enclosed pools, and have seen these 24 equipped with disappearing walls. The entire wall 25 just folds up, and it becomes, in effect, part of the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p>	<p>1 considered that to be a reasonable place to leave 2 sprinklers out so that you could end up with a, a, 3 a well maintained sprinkler system in the rest of the 4 dwelling.</p> <p>5 With the tennis courts, the issues there are 6 the potential damage of a tennis ball impacting a 7 sprinkler, and the knowledge that the indoor tennis 8 court needs to be a, a fairly high structure. So you 9 get to the question of, are residential sprinklers, 10 which are the only type of sprinklers permitted by 11 NFPA 13D - are they appropriate for use in really high 12 spaces? Not really, and again there's the issue of 13 the fuel load in this tennis court. And so the 14 Committee decided that due to concerns of the damage, 15 and due to concerns about the, the wrong sprinkler 16 being in the space, that it would be better just to 17 leave the sprinklers out.</p> <p>18 In both cases, in order to leave the sprinklers 19 out, there have to be direct egress from the, the 20 space to the outside. So the Committee considered 21 this reasonable protection, under the guidance of NFPA 22 13D.</p> <p>23 JAMES QUITER: Thank you. I'm - lost my place 24 on the Agenda. Okay. With that, we will open up 25 debate on the motion. Please provide your name,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

<p>1 affiliation, and whether you are speaking in support 2 of, or against the motion. Microphone Eight, please. 3 WILLIAM FISKE: Thank you, Chairman. My name 4 is William Fiske, and I'm speaking for myself, in 5 support of the motion. Now, a swimming pool really 6 can't be very much multi-use. But it's awfully easy 7 to make a tennis court multi-use. And one of the 8 things that comes to mind, for example, would be a 9 wrestling room. Now, you've got, you know, these foam 10 mats on the floor of what, what is normally a tennis 11 court, and they are highly flammable. Thank you. 12 JAMES QUITER: Microphone Number Three, please. 13 MATTHEW MERTENS: Matthew Mertens, North Shore 14 Fire, speaking for the motion. Again, this is a 15 situation where the use of the space is really coming 16 into play. There's a lot of things that I don't think 17 are being addressed as part of this very simple text 18 that's being provided. It's not addressing, again, 19 the tennis courts, which I've seen filled with bouncy 20 houses and everything else for a winter's - a party, 21 filled with kids, combustibles, and materials. 22 There's nothing in a residential situation that gives 23 most areas the ability to even regulate any of that. 24 Also, pool houses often become large storage 25 facilities in our area in the winter. The other thing</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 38</p>	<p>1 discussion on Motion 13D-1, to Reject Second Revision 2 Number Seven? 3 FEMALE SPEAKER: At three. 4 JAMES QUITER: Number three. 5 CECIL BILBO: My name is Cecil Bilbo. I 6 represent the Academy of Fire Sprinkler Technology, 7 and I rise in favor of the motion. One of the things 8 that I don't know that many folks have seen, but is 9 becoming more and more popular with - for pools that 10 are within, or attached and enclosed at the home - is 11 that they - whenever they're empty; whenever there's 12 maintenance; whenever it's cold - they tend to build 13 platforms over top of these pools, and host 14 entertainment, and host - I mean, you may have 15 heaters, food trays that are heated, and - by fuel; 16 and also, they do the same thing in tennis courts. 17 Tennis courts are ideal for banquets, and having 18 combustibles brought in for entertainment purposes. 19 JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Microphone Number 20 Four, please. 21 BOB CAPUTO: Thank you. Bob Caputo, Fire and 22 Life Safety America, speaking against the motion. I'm 23 not privileged enough to live in a home that has an 24 indoor pool or tennis court, but one of the basic 25 tenets of NFPA 13 is affordable fire and life safety,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 40</p>
<p>1 that's not addressed is 13D is also used in some cases 2 for small healthcare, residential CBRF uses, depending 3 on what your health authority and your state will 4 allow you to do. And you may have people that are 5 incapable of self-preservation. The exiting does not 6 have anything to do in the language, with being to 7 grade. A lot of these are up on platforms with 8 retaining walls. They have stairs going to the 9 outside. They may have access, but there's nothing in 10 the language about that access needing to be at grade 11 for people who are incapable of self-preservation, due 12 to disability or age, to move forward out of the 13 space. I encourage you to support the motion. 14 JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Microphone Number 15 Three, please. 16 JACK THACKER: My name is Jack Thacker. I'm a 17 contractor, and I'm for the motion. I've got two 18 homes going in California right now, and I don't 19 understand the, the verbiage here. It says enclosed 20 and attached. My swimming pool is below the bedrooms, 21 so I guess that's enclosed, but I'm not sure I should 22 eliminate sprinklers there. Well, I'm not sure what 23 this thing says. And I'm, I, I issue - or I would 24 suggest you vote green, as (unintelligible). 25 JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Is there any further</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 39</p>	<p>1 and tenability in the room of origin for the occupants 2 of the home. As indicated by Mr. Isman, residential 3 sprinklers are inappropriate for these to begin with, 4 for these spaces to begin with. But we talked earlier 5 about the cost and impact of sprinklers in mudrooms or 6 vestibules, and the benefit thereof. So how in the 7 world are we going to protect against freezing of 8 these particular attached and enclosed structures that 9 are probably not very well insulated, not constructed 10 the way the home is constructed. And I think this is 11 going to add significant cost - although if you have a 12 home with an indoor tennis court and swimming pool, I 13 probably don't care what it costs you to protect it; I 14 just don't think this is aligned with the intent of, 15 and, and the purpose of NFPA 13D, Fire Sprinkler 16 Systems. So I urge to vote against the motion, and I 17 thank you. 18 JAMES QUITER: Okay. Seeing no further comment 19 - Mr. Linder. 20 KENNETH LINDER: I, I think I'd like to remind 21 everybody that - as many people have - these are for 22 one and two family dwellings. They're, they're small 23 places. We have tried to keep the protection 24 economical, so that we can continue to get them 25 supported and, and put in more homes, and more places</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 41</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

<p>1 than they are today. And I'd urge you to support the 2 Committee in their effort. 3 JAMES QUITER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Before we 4 vote, let me restate the motion. The motion on the 5 floor is to Reject Second Revision Number Seven. To 6 vote, touch the Vote button. If you wish to vote in 7 support of the motion, and recommend the text on 8 Screen One, touch Yes. If you wish to vote against 9 the motion and recognize the text on Screen Two, touch 10 No. Please record your vote. The voting will close 11 in five seconds. The voting is closed. The results 12 of the vote are 377 in support of the motion, and 13 recommend the text on Screen One; and 135 against the 14 motion, and recommend the text on Screen Two. 15 Therefore, the motion has passed. Is there any 16 further discussion on NFPA 13D? Seeing none, we will 17 move on to the next document. 18 MALE SPEAKER: (unintelligible) 19 JAMES QUITER: Thank you. Mr. Linder. I would 20 like to make an announcement, and remind you that we 21 will only be taking 15 minute breaks throughout the 22 session today. We will not be breaking for lunch. We 23 encourage you to leave to get snacks or lunch at your 24 convenience. There's a food court at the bottom of 25 the escalators, and a food cart immediately outside</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p>	<p>1 on. The Report of the Technical Committee on 2 Respiratory Protection Equipment is presented for 3 adoption, and can be found in the First Draft Report, 4 and in the Second Draft Report of the 2018 Annual 5 Revision Cycle. The Technical Committee has published 6 a First and Second Draft Report consisting of 7 revisions to NFPA 1981. This is the Standard on open 8 circuit, self-contained breathing apparatus, or SCBA, 9 for emergency services. These reports were made - 10 these reports were submitted to a letter ballot of the 11 responsible Correlating and Technical Committee, and 12 the reports and ballot results can be found in the 13 next edition of tab - at the tab for Document Info 14 Page of NFPA 1981, NFPA.org/1981next. That is my 15 report, Chair. 16 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Mr. Rossos. Let's 17 now proceed with the discussion on <b>Certified Amending 18 Motions on NFPA 1981</b>. Microphone Number Eight. 19 JUDGE MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, my name is Judge 20 Morgan with Scott Safety, 3M. I'd like to make a 21 motion to Reject Revision Numbers 4, 7, and 22, and 22 Second Correlation Revision Number 3, and any relating 23 portions of First Revision Number 18, which returns 24 Section 6.6 to (unintelligible) text. 25 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Okay. There is a motion on</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p>
<p>1 this ballroom. Before we begin the debate on the next 2 standard, I would like to introduce Daniel O'Connor, 3 member of the Standards Council, who will be the 4 Presiding Officer for motions before the membership on 5 the next three Standards. 6 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Jim. Good 7 morning, or what's almost afternoon - but let's 8 continue on. We're making good progress. 9 The next report under consideration is that of 10 the Technical Committee on Respiratory Protection 11 Equipment. Here to present the Committee Reports is 12 Technical Committee Chair, Daniel Rossos of the Oregon 13 Department of Public Safety Standards and Training, 14 Estacada, Oregon. 15 The Committee Report, that is the First and 16 Second Drafts Report, is located in Document 17 Information Page for NFPA 1981, on the NFPA website. 18 All Certified Amending Motions are contained in the 19 NFPA Technical Meeting Agenda, and will be displayed 20 behind me on the screen as they are under debate. 21 FEMALE SPEAKER: (unintelligible). 22 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Mr. Rossos. 23 DANIEL ROSSOS: Thank you, very - very much, 24 Mr. Chairman. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'll read the, 25 the Chair Report. But first, I have to get my glasses</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p>	<p>1 the floor to Reject Second Revisions Number 4, 17, and 2 22; Second Correlating Revision Number 3; and any 3 related portions of First Revision Number 18, 4 resulting in returning Section 6.6 to previous edition 5 text. Is there a second? 6 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 7 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 8 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Okay. We have a second. 9 Please proceed with the discussion on the motion. 10 Yes, at Microphone Eight, please. 11 JUDGE MORGAN: Okay. Again, my name is Judge 12 Morgan. I am representing 3M, Scott Fire Safety. The 13 current emergency breathing system, known as EBSS, has 14 existed for more than 20 years in the Fire Service, 15 and is simply a manifold and hose that allows 16 firefighters to connect SCBA together, to share 17 breathing air in emergency situations, where one 18 firefighter is running out of air. The new universal 19 EBSS as proposed in 2018 edition Standard, is 20 established to mandate a common connection type used 21 on all SCBA, regardless of manufacturer, to allow 22 firefighters from different departments to connect in 23 EBSS mode in emergency situations. 24 3M Scott supports the concept of a universal 25 EBSS to improve firefighters' safety. However, what</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018



<p>1 the proposed Standard, as interpreted by the Committee 2 Chairman, creates and actually makes worse is the very 3 situation it was intended to correct. It does not 4 provide a universal EBSS, but rather provides a 5 universal connector, and will create a safety issue on 6 the fire ground. The standardized connector will only 7 allow new, 2018 compliant SCBAs to interconnect. By 8 implementing this change, it will immediately render 9 older SCBA from previous Standards incompatible. 10 So in essence, the universal EBSS requirement 11 as proposed will provide a universal connection for 12 all SCBA moving forward, but it fails to consider 13 those SCBA that are already in the service. For 14 departments that need to replace damaged SCBA, or 15 perhaps acquire a new fire truck equipped with SCBA, 16 those new SCBA, specifically the EBSS connection, will 17 be incompatible with their fleet of SCBA. To put it 18 more simply, they will no longer be compatible within 19 their own department. In addition, from neighboring 20 departments that supply mutual aid services to one 21 another, and currently have the same manufacturer 22 SBCA, which is typical in many cities and counties, 23 there are compatibility issues that arise, as well. 24 If one of those departments buys a new 2018 compliant 25 SCBA, even from the same manufacturer, they will have</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 46</p>	<p>1 multiple fittings. We can put those things together 2 all we want to in the daylight, in a classroom; but as 3 soon as we're under stress and we put them together, 4 they become very, very difficult. And what we've 5 found is when we have multiple fittings, that - what, 6 what happens in real life is you make the 7 (unintelligible). If it's, if it's difficult, you 8 reject it and go to the next one. 9 When we passed the EBSS standard in 2013, one 10 of the primary issues that our Committee wanted to 11 deal with was the issue of universal fitting. We 12 simply didn't have time to vet that fitting out in 13 2013, so we brought it up again in 2018. There was a 14 task group assigned. Not only was our Committee 15 committed to that, but the Correlating Committee gave 16 us a correlating note to make a universal fitting. 17 The intent would be that when you found a - found a, 18 a downed firefighter, that you would not have to 19 determine what SCBA they had, what vintage SCBA they 20 had, what jurisdiction they were from - if they were a 21 mutual aid or not - you'd have one fitting, and you'd 22 be able to rescue that firefighter. That was the 23 intent of our Committee. That was the intent of the 24 Correlating Committee. 25 We have an option to go back and retrofit; or,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p>
<p>1 lost compatibility with their neighboring department 2 for mutual aid. For these reasons, 3M Scott filed the 3 NITMAM to prevent this unintended safety issue from 4 being propagated into the new 2018 Standard. It is on 5 these ground of unintended safety issues that Scott 6 recommends that the paragraph 6.6 of the proposed 7 Standard be modified to revert to the original 8 language of the 2013 edition. Thank you. 9 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you. Mr. Rossos, would 10 you like to offer the Committee's position? 11 DANIEL ROSSOS: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. 12 You know, this is a critical, a critical issue. As a 13 firefighter and a fire officer, I've been with the 14 Fire Service over 30 years. We've seen in, in real 15 live situations, the, the, the difficulty we face in 16 rescuing our self. We're, we're trained in rescuing 17 citizens. But unfortunately, sometimes we're put in 18 positions of rescuing our self. We have two means of 19 doing that now. One is through the RIC fitting that 20 we established in 2002, the RIC UAC that delivers air 21 to the breather. The other is through the EBSS. And 22 the EBSS was just approved for 2013. 23 One of the primary issues that we deal with as 24 firefighters, especially with fittings, trying to 25 deliver air to each other, is, is the complexity of</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p>	<p>1 or the manufacturers offer a retro kit to bring all 2 those things that we have identified as critical to 3 the new standard, and have allowed them to come back 4 and retrofit that. Our intent is not to have any 5 firefighter without this fitting; that it would cross 6 all jurisdictional boundaries, as well as 7 manufacturers. And with that, I would encourage you 8 to support the Committee's action. This is a very 9 critical issue, and deals with firefighters rescuing 10 them self, and I thank you very much. 11 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Mr. Rossos. And 12 with that, we will open up debate on the motion. 13 Again, please be careful to provide your name, 14 affiliation, and whether you are speaking in support 15 of, or against the motion. Microphone Number Seven. 16 WILLIAM HASKELL: Yes, thank you. I'm William 17 Haskell from the National Institute for Occupational 18 Safety and Health. I'm speaking against the motion, 19 as the Chairman and Representative for the NFPA 20 Correlating Committee on Fire and Emergency Services, 21 Protective Clothing and Equipment. Chairman Rossos' 22 Technical Committee on Respiratory Protection 23 Equipment falls under this Technical Committee. At 24 our Correlating Committee, 1981 Standards Second Draft 25 Meeting, we voted overwhelmingly, the members did, to</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 49</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

1 support this Technical Committee with the performance  
2 and design requirements for a universal EBSS fitted.  
3 In our subsequent Correlating Committee letter ballot,  
4 the membership voted overwhelmingly affirmative to  
5 forward and process the 1981 document, as developed  
6 under the NFPA process by the Technical Committee. I  
7 want to note, on that Correlating Committee ballot,  
8 there were no negative votes, including by the member  
9 of the Technical Committee that made the motion.  
10 As a matter of firefighter safety, and speaking  
11 for the Correlating Committee, I'm voting against the  
12 motion.  
13 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. Let's go to  
14 Microphone Number Eight again.  
15 BILL PARSON: Bill Parson, with 3M Scott, and  
16 I'm speaking for the motion. I would make the point  
17 that the concept of the universal EBSS is a solid  
18 concept, and I think the Chairman's points around that  
19 were very well made. The concern is around the tens  
20 and hundreds of thousands of SCBA that are in the, in  
21 the marketplace right now. The reality is, the - for  
22 departments that run mutual aid, or active aid and  
23 support each other, they've been able to address the  
24 concerns and the issues that the Chairman pointed out,  
25 by having similar manufacturer - similar

Page 50

1 manufacturers, and addressing the EBSS issue.  
2 What the new Standard and the verbiage, as  
3 interpreted, provides is really no compatibility back  
4 to those tens and hundreds of thousands of SCBA that  
5 are already in the marketplace. A solution for this  
6 is really to allow the manufacturers to include an  
7 option for the AHJ to choose to have a third fitting,  
8 in addition to the universal fittings, that would  
9 allow backwards compatibility if that department  
10 needed that for either departments that they ran  
11 mutual aid, or for compatibility within the department  
12 itself.  
13 When the 3M Scott representatives on the  
14 Committee voted in favor for this, that was exactly  
15 what we expected. When we discussed with our  
16 certifying agency this as our proposal for the, the  
17 SCBA that we would put forward for the new Standard,  
18 the certifying agency engaged the Chairman, and was  
19 provided an interpretation that that would not be  
20 allowed. That's the reason for the NITMAM that we  
21 filed, to make the motion to remove this. Our, our  
22 choice would be to have the universal fitting so that  
23 going forward we would have the compatibility for all  
24 manufacturers, but also allow the AHJ the latitude to  
25 be able to add a fitting that would allow

Page 51

1 compatibility with those SCBA that they may have,  
2 either within their department or within the  
3 departments that they run mutual aid for. So I would  
4 encourage a vote in favor of the motion.  
5 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you. I would like to  
6 go to Microphone Number Four next.  
7 ROBIN GAINEY: My name's Robin Gainey. I'm  
8 representing the International Association of  
9 Firefighters.  
10 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Are you for --  
11 ROBIN GAINEY: I'm a voting member of the  
12 Committee.  
13 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Are you for, or against the  
14 motion, Sir?  
15 ROBIN GAINEY: I am definitely against the  
16 motion, without a question.  
17 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you.  
18 MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.  
19 ROBIN GAINEY: I'm on the Committee with Dan,  
20 and some other gentlemen in here. I'm also a  
21 frontline firefighter. I work in a city that we  
22 respond 12,000 times last year with potential SCBA  
23 use. I started in the Fire Service 40 years ago, when  
24 we were using low pressure hoses, and the elephant  
25 trunks, and the stuff that we have fortunately gone

Page 52

1 long past, with zero opportunity to do what is needed.  
2 I understand the value of this proposed  
3 Standard change first hand. The entire Committee  
4 debated this, and I will add my affirmation to the  
5 fact that the debate was thorough, and insightful, and  
6 very overwhelming. I stand here representing over  
7 300,000 professional firefighters that have long  
8 awaited this proposed Standard - what it affords us -  
9 the opportunity for us to save our brothers and  
10 sisters by ensuring that one connection in the dark,  
11 in the heat, is there, that you can give lifesaving  
12 air to those in need.  
13 Many of us began our Fire Service in the last  
14 century. We remember wishing for something like this  
15 for so many decades. NIOSH has approved this  
16 technology, making it able - safe, reliable, and easy  
17 to use. And the only issue became the selection of  
18 one single type connection. That selection was made,  
19 debated, and identified as being acceptable to all  
20 manufacturers.  
21 It - the question of mutual aid is critical,  
22 and that, that occurs - but I will tell you in the  
23 dark and the heat, multiple types of connections are  
24 not the answer. One single connection is always the  
25 answer. It's not a matter of if, but when you need to

Page 53

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

<p>1 help - firefighters need to help their brothers and 2 sisters. 3 Each edition of our SCBA Standards takes years 4 to overcome, and if we vote yes to this, it'll be 10 5 to 15 years before general use of this connection is 6 found in the Fire Service for us, the firefighters 7 that are crawling up and down the hallways, in the 8 dark and in the heat. Let's not let that occur. 9 Short term drawbacks to this is, is, is short term, 10 and easily overcome by technology and moving forward. 11 I stand very strongly, very strongly against this 12 motion. Let's move forward, and save firefighters in 13 the future, starting today. 14 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir - with three 15 seconds to spare. Very good. Microphone Number 16 Seven, please. 17 STEVE WEINSTEIN: My name is Steve Weinstein, 18 with Honeywell. I'm speaking against the motion. I'm 19 the Secretary of the NFPA Technical Committee on 20 Respiratory Protection Equipment. I've been a member 21 of the Committee since 1985. Scott's motion states 22 that without being able to retain the pre-2018 23 fittings, along with the new 2018 fitting, logistical 24 and safety issues could arise if new SCBAs with 2018 25 fittings are added to a fleet of SCBAs with pre-2018</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 54</p>	<p>1 product, and a fire department could face 2 incompatibility, either with neighboring departments, 3 or internally, if they add new units to old units 4 without upgrading the old units. But that has always 5 been the case, and the industry not only accepts it, 6 they demand it. 7 The Fire Service always has driven, and always 8 will drive changes to NFPA 1981, because equipment 9 continually has to improve to keep up with changes, 10 and firefighting conditions, and techniques. 11 Firefighter safety is not threatened by 12 standardization, as Scott's motion would have you 13 believe; it is enhanced. I urge you to vote against 14 the amendment. 15 MALE SPEAKER: Thank you. 16 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. I'm going to 17 go to Microphone Number Eight, and then we will come 18 back to the gentlemen at Two. Number Eight, please. 19 BOB HINALL (phonetic): My name is Bob Hinall. 20 I'm with 3M Scott Safety, and I'm in favor of the 21 motion. I think it's mischaracterization to say that 22 we're opposed to the universality. Unfortunately, 23 procedurally we were trapped, and this was the only 24 action we could take after we received the 25 interpretation that a third fitting is not going to be</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 56</p>
<p>1 fittings, creating incompatibility within the fire 2 department itself, and with neighboring jurisdictions. 3 There's a simple answer to that - upgrade. Change the 4 pre-2018 fittings on the older SCBAs to the 2018 5 fittings. SCBA manufacturers can submit upgrade kits 6 for certification, to allow a 2013 NFPA compliant SCBA 7 to be upgraded to 2018 certification. They don't even 8 have to wait for upgrade kits to be certified. Scott 9 has had almost 10 months since they filed their NITMAM 10 to submit the 2018 fittings as an extension of 11 approval to their 2013 SCBA. There's nothing 12 preventing them, or any other SCBA manufacturer from 13 doing that. The fittings would be listed on their 14 2013 NIOSH and NFPA approval matrices, as alternate 15 fittings. Then, when their 2018 NFPA compliant SCBA 16 is certified, a department with 2013 compliant SCBAs 17 that has changed over to the new fittings would be 18 immediately compatible. 19 Scott's motion essentially challenges the idea 20 of standardization. They're saying that because full, 21 industry-wide standardization cannot be achieved 22 immediately, it shouldn't happen at all. If you - if 23 you vote in favor of Scott's motion, you're saying 24 that NFPA Standards should never be changed because 25 the new product will be different from the old</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 55</p>	<p>1 allowed. Regardless of how this vote comes out, and 2 how the Standard comes out, we intend to submit a TIA 3 so that the universal fitting stays in place, but also 4 gives users an option for a third fitting. 5 A couple points I'd like to counter. I, I 6 understand that a multiple connection is not as good 7 as a single connection, but I'm guessing that in a 8 fire situation, having some connection available beats 9 having no connection, and that's what we're doing. 10 We're setting up users of 2018 packs that have no 11 connection with 2013. I agree that upgrade kits are 12 possible, and that would be an easy answer if all the 13 fire departments had unlimited funds, including all 14 the small volunteer departments that use a lot of 15 equipment - but that's just not the case. So in an 16 ideal world, everybody would upgrade immediately; we 17 could instantly go to the universal connection. But 18 we - unfortunately, we don't live in the ideal world, 19 and, and we're trying to address that. Thanks. 20 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you. Now, over to the 21 gentleman at Microphone Two. 22 DAVID FISHLER (phonetic): David Fishler, 23 speaking against the motion. I'm a retired -- 24 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Your, your affiliation, Sir? 25 DAVID FISHLER: Myself.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 57</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

1 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Okay. Thank you.  
2 DAVID FISHLER: I'm a retired fire chief, 29  
3 years career Fire Service; 43 years in the Volunteer  
4 Fire Service. I've been involved over my career with  
5 multiple firefighter fatalities. Some of them were  
6 involved in trying to extract them from a hazardous  
7 environment. This motion - it, it should be defeated.  
8 We need to be able to supply the lifesaving, life  
9 safety air to our members while they're trying to be  
10 extracted. We've been - I've been there where we've  
11 tried to find bottles, moving SCBA bottles because  
12 that was the only way you could make a connection to  
13 keep these people breathing. So this is a critical  
14 item. We are losing too many firefighters every year,  
15 and if - we can really make a difference for the fire  
16 department, for the firefighters, for their  
17 communities by opposing this motion. So please, I  
18 urge everyone here, on behalf of all the firefighters  
19 of this country, oppose this motion.  
20 MALE SPEAKER: Thank you.  
21 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. Microphone  
22 Number Seven.  
23 CAPTAIN ALBERT YANAGISAWA: My name is Captain  
24 Albert Yanagisawa, affiliated with the Los Angeles  
25 County Fire Department. I'm here to oppose the

Page 58

1 motion. I'm against the motion. Our fire department  
2 has 3100 first responders who may or may not use SCBAs  
3 on any case where we might have a firefighter down.  
4 MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.  
5 CAPTAIN ALBERT YANAGISAWA: I understand the,  
6 the requirement for a universal EBSS. We believe that  
7 at some point, we have to start standardizing and  
8 making a universal EBSS, so - because of all of the  
9 mutual aid, automatic aid agencies that we respond  
10 with within Los Angeles County. The current standard  
11 within our department may not - our, our EBSS may not  
12 work with other agencies. But if we don't establish  
13 the Standard moving forward at some point, we'll never  
14 have that Standard. I think the option of a third  
15 connector is - is - is a bad option. And the reason  
16 why is when you're in a situation where somebody runs  
17 out of air, you're usually in a, in a dark  
18 environment; you're in a very high stress environment;  
19 and trying to find a third connector and make that  
20 work would - is non-tenable.  
21 Again, as a member of our Department,  
22 representing Los Angeles County Fire Department, we  
23 urge you to consider firefighters' safety - we want to  
24 have this universal EBSS - by doing a vote against  
25 this motion. Thank you.

Page 59

1 MALE SPEAKER: Thank you.  
2 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. I'm going to  
3 move to Microphone Number Four.  
4 DAVE BURNSWOG (phonetic): Dave Burnswog,  
5 member of the Technical Committee, and a firefighter  
6 in Columbus, Ohio. I rise against the motion. To  
7 give you some perspective of, of this issue and why it  
8 came up in the Committee - this problem wasn't about  
9 compatibility within the department. It was  
10 compatibility with mutual aid, which is the norm in  
11 the Fire Service. And so the Committee rightfully  
12 addressed the issue and, and wants universal inter-  
13 operability with, with regard to emergency  
14 connections. And we do it with other emergency  
15 connections on the SCBA. It was the desire of the  
16 Fire Service to have this, and this is - this is why  
17 we made the changes.  
18 Using the logic of the submitter, we could  
19 never really move forward with new, with new  
20 technologies, with new requirements, and safer  
21 technologies if it didn't automatically integrate with  
22 the past. And that, that just doesn't make any sense.  
23 There is a mechanism to address backwards  
24 compatibility. It's actually pretty simple. It  
25 doesn't even require a complete upgrade. It, it

Page 60

1 really is as simple as the manufacturer submitting  
2 for, for approval - a new fitting, and you can have  
3 the new fitting replaced as, as just an upgrade to  
4 that part or that piece. It wouldn't require a  
5 complete upgrade to the, to the 2018 edition.  
6 I'll just close with basically, the edition or,  
7 or the rejection of this is, is, is really important.  
8 I urge you to oppose the motion. If it, if it wasn't  
9 - the real, the real safety - or the real threat to  
10 our firefighters is having multiple, multiple  
11 fittings. That's what we're trying to avoid. Thank  
12 you.  
13 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you. And I will move  
14 now to Microphone Number Seven.  
15 STEVE WEINSTEIN: Steve Weinstein again, from  
16 Honeywell. I'm speaking against the motion once  
17 again. Something that I, I think should be brought  
18 out. When Scott filed their NITMAM, it was a shock to  
19 the members of the Technical Committee, because in the  
20 17 days of the eight meetings of the TC on Respiratory  
21 Protection Equipment that were held over the four-year  
22 period between the issuance of NFPA 1981, 2013  
23 Edition, and the release from the TC of the Second  
24 Revision of NFPA 1981, 2018 Edition, Scott never once  
25 mentioned the issue they raised in their motion. They

Page 61

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

<p>1 never brought it up for discussion by either the Task 2 Group on EBSS, or the full Committee. They never 3 submitted their objection as a public proposal, nor 4 did they submit their objection as a public comment. 5 In fact, they voted in favor of adopting the 6 standardized EBSS fitting in their ballot on the 7 ballot on the Second Revision of the Standard, with no 8 additional comments. 9 The first time anyone on the TC on Respiratory 10 Production Equipment knew about Scott's so-called 11 safety issue was when the NITMAM was filed. 12 Apparently, Scott had been asleep at the wheel for 13 four years, but finally woke up after the Standard had 14 been put to bed. 15 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. 16 MALE SPEAKER: (unintelligible) 17 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Is there any further 18 discussion on Motion 1981-1, to Reject Second 19 Revisions Numbers 4, 17, and 22, Second Correlating 20 Revision Number 3, and any - any related portions of 21 First Revision Number 18, resulting in returning 22 Section 6.6 to previous edition text? Mr. Chair, do 23 you have any final comments? 24 DANIEL ROSSOS: I do. I think you've heard a 25 number of different comments made by the Fire Service.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p>	<p>1 I'll return to you, Mr. Chair. 2 DANIEL ROSSOS: Thank you very much. Again, I 3 think we've had many, many statements made. This is a 4 critical issue. I think what, what becomes more 5 important is when you hear the voice, and the heart of 6 the firefighters. We're, we're the ones - we're, 7 we're the ones this was made for. And, and one thing 8 we need to keep in mind regarding our Committee. Our 9 primary focus is the protection of firefighters. 10 Firefighters very seldom get to choose what they put 11 on their back. 12 MALE SPEAKER: Yeah. 13 DANIEL ROSSOS: A decision is typically made by 14 somebody in a purchasing department, or somebody in 15 some other bureau that is making their decisions. We 16 very, very carefully vet these processes out, and 17 these changes, because we know there's going to be 18 impact. And when it becomes serious enough, and it's 19 a life safety issue, we make the decision that we make 20 it a requirement. That then takes it out of the 21 budgets. It takes it out of those purchasing agents, 22 if you will. I'm not trying to make them some evil 23 person. I'm just saying the reality is, firefighters 24 very seldom get to make that decision about what they 25 wear. I would urge you to support the Committee, and</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p>
<p>1 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Oh -- 2 DANIEL ROSSOS: Oh? 3 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Excuse me, Mr. Chair. 4 DANIEL ROSSOS: Sure. 5 DANIEL O'CONNOR: If you don't mind, somebody 6 is back at the mike, at -- 7 DANIEL ROSSOS: Oh. 8 DANIEL O'CONNOR: -- Microphone Number Eight. 9 DANIEL ROSSOS: Go right ahead. 10 DANIEL O'CONNOR: I didn't see him there, and - 11 - 12 DANIEL ROSSOS: Go right ahead. 13 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Yes. Microphone Number 14 Eight. 15 DANIEL ROSSOS: Yes. 16 JUDGE MORGAN: Judge Morgan with Scott Safety 17 again, 3M. Just to - I'd like to comment on rebuttal 18 to Mr. Weinstein. We did have discussions. Maybe it 19 wasn't clear that we were looking for - exactly what 20 we were looking for, but we did have discussions for 21 options, and not limiting ourselves to a EBSS fitting 22 as it was provided today. Thank you. 23 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Okay. Thank you, Sir. 24 Again, is there any further discussion on Motion 1981? 25 I see no one at the mikes, on the floor. So again,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p>	<p>1 in so, supporting the Fire Service, and the 2 firefighters. I thank you very much. 3 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Before 4 we vote, let me restate the motion. The motion on the 5 floor is to Reject Second Revision Numbers 4, 17, and 6 22; Second Correlating Revision Number 3, and any 7 related portions of First Revision Number 18, 8 resulting in returning Section 6.6 to previous edition 9 text. 10 To vote, touch the Vote button. If you wish to 11 vote in support of the motion, and recommend the text 12 on Screen One, touch Yes. If you wish to vote against 13 the motion, and recommend the text on Screen Two, 14 touch No. Please record your vote. The voting will 15 be closed in five seconds. The vote is closed. Thank 16 you. The results of the vote are 25 in support of the 17 motion and recommend the text on Screen One; and 360 18 against the motion, and recommend the text on Screen 19 Two. The motion has failed. 20 So we - thank you, Mr. Chair. 21 DANIEL ROSSOS: Thank you very much. Thank you 22 all for -- 23 DANIEL O'CONNOR: We'll move to the next report 24 under consideration. 25 MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

<p>1 DANIEL O'CONNOR: And that is the report of the 2 Technical Committee on Firefighter Professional 3 Qualifications. Here to present the Committee's 4 report is Technical Committee Chair, John Cunningham, 5 of Nova Scotia Firefighters School, Waverley, Nova 6 Scotia. The Committee's Report, that is the First and 7 Second Draft Reports, is located on the Document 8 Information Page for NFPA 1001, on the NFPA website. 9 All Certified Amending Motions are contained in the 10 NFPA Technical Meeting Agenda, and will be displayed 11 behind me on the screen as they are under debate. 12 I would like to make an announcement before we 13 start, though, today. NFPA staff contacted the 14 submitters of the motions of NFPA 1001-1, and 1001-3, 15 and asked to reorder the motions, and they have - that 16 has been agreed to. Motion 1001-3 will be heard 17 first, followed by Motion 1001-1, and the final motion 18 to be heard on NFPA 1001 will be Motion 1001-2. Mr. 19 Cunningham. 20 JOHN CUNNINGHAM: Mr. Chair, ladies and 21 gentlemen, the report of the Technical Committee on 22 Firefighter Professional Qualifications is presented 23 for adoption, and can be found on the First Draft 24 Report, and in the Second Draft Report for the 2018 25 Annual Revision cycle. The Technical Committee has</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p>	<p>1 started in the Fire Service in 1975 as a volunteer 2 firefighter; ended it as Fire marshal in Portland, 3 Oregon, and Vancouver, Washington. I now serve, as I 4 said, as Project Manager for Vision 20/20; a past 5 President of the International Fire Marshals 6 Association. I've been involved with NFPA since the 7 80s. 8 What we are proposing here is a simple 9 understanding of community risk reduction. What is 10 that? When a fire starts, and it's unchecked, it gets 11 bigger. When you respond to it, and check it, you are 12 mitigating that risk, you are improving the risks, the 13 community risks for your community. But you can also 14 get there by building compartmentalization fire 15 sprinklers, alarm systems, public education. That is, 16 in essence, community risk reduction, all of them 17 integrated together. Don't you think that a 18 firefighter, any firefighter, ought to understand that 19 - that there is more than one tool in the toolkit 20 here, from Day One, the emergency response is not the 21 only solution to the problem. That's what we're 22 asking. And we have free, online training available 23 through our partner, IFSTA ResourceOne, that you can 24 get that training, that overview, in one hour. 25 We are also asking for some basic public</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 68</p>
<p>1 published a First and Second Draft Report consisting 2 of revisions to NFPA 1001, Standard on Firefighter 3 Professional Qualifications. These reports were 4 submitted to letter ballot of the responsible 5 Correlating and Technical Committee. The reports and 6 ballot results can be found on the Next Edition tab of 7 the Document Information Page for NFPA 1001, at 8 www.nfpa.org/1000next. 9 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Let's 10 now proceed with the discussion on <b>Certified Amending 11 Motion 1001-3</b>. Microphone Three. 12 JIM CRAWFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My 13 name is Jim Crawford. I'm Project Manager for Vision 14 20/20. I'm moving CAM 1001-3 to Accept Public Comment 15 Number 17. 16 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you. There's a motion 17 on the floor to Accept Public Comment Number 17. Do I 18 hear a second? 19 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 20 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 21 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 22 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you. We do have a 23 second. Please proceed with a discussion on the 24 motion, Sir. 25 JIM CRAWFORD: Thank you. My background - I</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 67</p>	<p>1 education skills. Don't you think a firefighter ought 2 to be able to recognize common home hazards, and how 3 to correct them, and to be able to answer questions 4 from the community in that regard, to be able to 5 install a smoke alarm when they're called upon to do 6 so by the AHJ, who says we are going to be in a home, 7 and doing home safety visits. We feel like that is 8 appropriate. And again, you can get that free, 9 online, anywhere, any computer with an internet 10 connection, through IFSTA ResourceOne. All of that 11 training is paid for by grant funds. 12 We think all of that is reasonable. And with 13 respect, and I mean that sincerely, we've proposed 14 this before to the Committee; they don't agree. We 15 know that the National Volunteer Fire Council is 16 opposed to this. I have a letter of support from the 17 International Fire Marshals Association - an email, 18 rather; another one from the National Fallen 19 Firefighters Foundation. I believe you're going to 20 hear from some others today. But we think we're being 21 reasonable in this regard. Four hours of training is 22 not unreasonable, and we're asking your support of 23 this motion. Thank you. 24 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. Mr. 25 Cunningham, would you like to offer the Committee's</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 69</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

<p>1 position?</p> <p>2 JOHN CUNNINGHAM: Yes. Thank you. The</p> <p>3 Committee discussed this at length. And while we</p> <p>4 believe in the community risk reduction concepts, we</p> <p>5 just don't feel that Firefighter One is the</p> <p>6 appropriate area for this to be put in. The</p> <p>7 Firefighter One is the entry level position, and it is</p> <p>8 operating under the direct supervision of another,</p> <p>9 more senior firefighter or officer, and the community</p> <p>10 risk reduction would be better placed in a different</p> <p>11 section, such as 1021, where it's already been added</p> <p>12 to all four levels of officer.</p> <p>13 DANIEL O'CONNOR: With that - thank you,</p> <p>14 gentlemen, we will open up debate on the motion.</p> <p>15 Please provide, again, your name, your affiliation,</p> <p>16 and whether you are speaking in support of, or against</p> <p>17 the motion. Microphone Number Three.</p> <p>18 NANCY TRENCH: Thank you. I'm Nancy Trench</p> <p>19 from Oklahoma State University, and I speak in favor</p> <p>20 of this motion. It's commonly accepted that the</p> <p>21 culture of the Fire Service does not value prevention.</p> <p>22 Really? Why do you think that is? We only train them</p> <p>23 to suppress fires. To impact the Fire Service</p> <p>24 culture, firefighters, when they would engage in</p> <p>25 prevention - it's because Firefighter One duties</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 70</p>	<p>1 basic training. And I'll remind you, all of this is</p> <p>2 now online, available for everyone, at no cost - takes</p> <p>3 about four hours. I ask that you vote in favor of</p> <p>4 this motion.</p> <p>5 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you very much. I think</p> <p>6 I'm going to move to the far side of the room, at</p> <p>7 Microphone Number One.</p> <p>8 KELLY NICOLELLO: Kelly Nicoletto, representing</p> <p>9 Underwriters Laboratories, in support of the motion.</p> <p>10 Firefighters are often conducting home fire</p> <p>11 inspections, and need to know about proper smoke alarm</p> <p>12 types, and placement. It is important that basic</p> <p>13 community risk reduction provisions are taught to the</p> <p>14 new firefighters to provide consistent and up to date</p> <p>15 information to the public. It's as simple as that.</p> <p>16 Thank you.</p> <p>17 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you. Sir, the</p> <p>18 gentleman at Microphone Number Two.</p> <p>19 KEN FONDO (phonetic): My name's Ken Fondo.</p> <p>20 I'm with the National Volunteer Fire Council. I've</p> <p>21 served as the Chairman of the Health, Safety, and</p> <p>22 Training Committee --</p> <p>23 DANIEL O'CONNOR: For or against the motion,</p> <p>24 Sir?</p> <p>25 KEN FONDO: And I'm against the motion.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 72</p>
<p>1 include fire prevention, knowledge, and skills.</p> <p>2 So there's three things this motion will</p> <p>3 achieve. Number one, it's the first step to change</p> <p>4 the culture of the Fire Service to accept the value of</p> <p>5 prevention, and that entry level firefighters will</p> <p>6 accept their role as the member of a community risk</p> <p>7 reduction team. Second of all, firefighters need to</p> <p>8 know how to install smoke alarms in homes, including</p> <p>9 their own home. And number three, there is no better</p> <p>10 occupational safety and health for firefighters than</p> <p>11 when they respond to a house fire, that family's</p> <p>12 waiting outside, because the smoke alarms that fire</p> <p>13 station installed, or maybe even those responding</p> <p>14 firefighters, alerted the family to a fire, and they</p> <p>15 are waiting outside when the fire department arrives,</p> <p>16 eliminating the need for an interior search.</p> <p>17 Community risk reduction makes firefighters safer.</p> <p>18 So three things. Let's change the culture.</p> <p>19 Let's know about home safety and installing smoke</p> <p>20 alarms. And let's make firefighters safer across</p> <p>21 America at every community. We will have little</p> <p>22 impact on firefighters accepting prevention and</p> <p>23 mitigation, on firefighters accepting community risk</p> <p>24 reduction, if we don't make it part of the</p> <p>25 Professional Qualifications Standard, part of their</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 71</p>	<p>1 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you.</p> <p>2 KEN FONDO: I also am a principle member of the</p> <p>3 1001 Committee, as well, and I'm a, an alternate on</p> <p>4 1021 and 1700. And in my career, I also served as</p> <p>5 State training in Louisiana, and have taught thousands</p> <p>6 of firefighters their basic skills. And I don't</p> <p>7 believe that adding CRR to the basic skills of a entry</p> <p>8 level firefighter is appropriate.</p> <p>9 So I would like to read to you a letter from</p> <p>10 the Chairman of the Fire Council, Kevin Quinn. The</p> <p>11 following is an open letter from NVFC Chair, Kevin</p> <p>12 Quinn, on the NVFC position. 'On behalf of the</p> <p>13 National Volunteer Fire Council, which represents the</p> <p>14 interests of the nation's volunteer fire, EMS, and</p> <p>15 rescue services, I am writing in opposition to</p> <p>16 Certified Amending Motion 1001-1, and 3, which would</p> <p>17 add language related to community risk reduction,</p> <p>18 public education delivery, and smoke alarm</p> <p>19 installation to the NFPA 1001 document. To be clear,</p> <p>20 the NVFC strongly supports, and actively promotes CRR.</p> <p>21 We simply do not believe that the proposed language is</p> <p>22 appropriate for the NFPA 1001 document, which</p> <p>23 identifies minimum job performance requirements for</p> <p>24 career and volunteer structural firefighters. The</p> <p>25 purpose of the 1001 document is to ensure that people</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 73</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

<p>1 meeting the requirements of the Standard are qualified 2 to fight fire. Public education, and smoke alarm 3 installation are critical services that many fire 4 departments deliver, but they are not baseline skills 5 that every firefighter needs to have. Adding this 6 language to the document would add unnecessary time 7 and expense to basic firefighter training, and make it 8 harder for people to get certified. 9 MALE SPEAKER: (unintelligible) 10 KEN FONDO: There are already skills related to 11 public education in the 1001 document, for personnel 12 who are trained to the Firefighter Two level. The 13 NFPA 1035 document identifies the minimum JPRs for 14 public life, fire and safety educators. NFPA 13 - 15 1300, which is the NVFC is helping to develop, will 16 establish the standards on the community risk 17 assessment, and community risk reduction. There is 18 language dealing with CRR in, in 1021, the 19 Professional Qualification for Fire Officers, and new 20 language that has been proposed to be added to the 21 revision cycle.' Ding - ding? 22 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. Okay. I 23 think there's a number of people at the mike. I'm 24 going to go to this side of the room, to Microphone 25 Number Four, then I'll come - I'll start to circulate</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 74</p>	<p>1 available, thus mitigating one of the principle 2 concerns related to implementation as it relates to 3 cost. Additionally, the reason it belongs in this 4 Standard is because risk reduction is not isolated to 5 the supervisory level, and should be part of a entry 6 firefighter level's skill set. Thank you. 7 DANIEL O'CONNOR: And Sir, you were - I'm not 8 sure if I caught that. You were for the motion. 9 THOMAS BREYER: Yes, Sir, I was for the motion. 10 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Okay. Microphone Number 11 Three. 12 DAN FINNEGAN: Good afternoon. My name is Dan 13 Finnegan, and I stand here in support of the motion, 14 and I stand as a representative, and speaking for the 15 Board of Directors of the International Association of 16 Fire Chiefs, Fire Life Safety Section. The topics of 17 community risk reduction and public safety education 18 are very important for the overall public safety, and 19 firefighters' safety. It is important to understand 20 that successful community risk reduction begins with 21 emergency response, but may integrate other protection 22 systems and strategies. Firefighters only need to 23 understand there is more than one way to solve a 24 public safety problem, and the importance of an 25 integrated approach. Please support the Fire Service,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 76</p>
<p>1 back to the gentleman - the gentleman at the green 2 stands. So Number four, please. 3 BILL FISKE: Thank you, Chairman. My name is 4 Bill Fiske, and I'm speaking for myself, in opposition 5 to this motion, because it is much too sweeping. It 6 seems to assume that there is only one kind of 7 community in which a firefighter works. But there are 8 many different kinds of communities, and this - this 9 is probably fine for a bedroom community. But if the 10 community in which the firefighter works is an 11 industrial plant, say, a semiconductor fab, or a 12 pharmaceutical plant, this totally breaks down. 13 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. I think I 14 will jump back to Microphone Number Eight, and then 15 we'll come back to Three here, in the front. 16 THOMAS BREYER: Thank you, Sir. My name is 17 Thomas Breyer. I'm with the International Association 18 of Firefighters. I'm in support of the motion. The 19 IFF is in support of incorporating the language 20 related to community risk reduction into NFPA 1001. 21 The practice of reducing the risk of fire, and fire 22 related injuries and deaths to firefighters and the 23 public is a core responsibility of all fire 24 departments, from volunteer to career. As earlier 25 referenced, the free standardized online program is</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 75</p>	<p>1 and please support CAM 1001-3. Thank you. 2 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you. I'll move to 3 Microphone Number Six. 4 BOB UPSON: Bob Upson, speaking for myself as a 5 retired firefighter and fire marshal. I speak in 6 favor of the motion. It's been pointed out that many 7 of these, many of these requirements are associated 8 with officer level training, or with people 9 specifically assigned to public education duties. I'd 10 like to submit to you that firefighters, despite their 11 long hours, spend most of their time off duty. 12 There's over 1.1 million firefighters in this country, 13 and they all know people. They talk to their 14 neighbors. They are role models. These are the 15 people who need, from the Day One, to have the basic 16 fundamentals of risk reduction and public education 17 instilled from the beginning of their training. The 18 overview of, of training that's being requested in 19 this motion would provide only a small fraction of 20 their training, but it will lay the underpinnings for 21 the entire purpose for a firefighter's duties in the 22 fire department as part of a unified system, of not 23 just putting wet stuff on the red stuff, but in 24 preventing fires, and reducing risk in general. 25 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you. I am going to go</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 77</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018



<p>1 to Microphone Number Two, and then following that, I'm 2 going to go back to Eight. The gentleman's been 3 waiting at Eight for a while, so we'll go to -- 4 KEN FONDO: I'm Ken Fondo, National Volunteer 5 Fire Council. And the crux of the issue is, is this a 6 basic Firefighter One skill? The -- 7 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Sir, could I interrupt you - 8 for or against the motion? 9 KEN FONDO: Against the motion -- 10 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. 11 KEN FONDO: -- Mr. Chair. The Technical 12 Committee has addressed -- 13 MALE SPEAKER: Thank you. 14 KEN FONDO: -- this issue many times, and the 15 consensus of the Committee has been to reject this. 16 Both representatives of the IAFF and IAEC were 17 present, or they voted, and you know, there was no 18 consensus to go forward with the motion. Our basis 19 has not changed. This is not a basic Firefighter One 20 skill. I have, as Chief of Training, participated in 21 a smoke alarm program. Our firefighters worked 22 directly under the supervision of their company 23 officers. They did not need to know how to install 24 these; they were told how to do it. We really believe 25 that adding this to the basic skill level just becomes</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 78</p>	<p>1 need to do for risk reduction, and it's - needs to 2 start somewhere. Four hours of training, online, free 3 - training is knowledge. Thank you. 4 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. Microphone 5 Number Three. 6 TONY APFELBECK: Tony Apfelbeck, Fire Marshal 7 and Building Official with the City of Altamonte 8 Springs, and I'm speaking for the motion. Whether we 9 call it community risk reduction, or we don't; or 10 whether we include it in this Standard, or we don't - 11 CRR activities are at the core of the services 12 provided by firefighters, and we are conducting them 13 today. From an emergency response, to conducting a 14 home safety survey, to performing public education, or 15 performing a smoke alarm installation, our job is to 16 reduce risk. These types of tasks are absolutely 17 integral to the environment we should be promulgating 18 in our communities. The reality is that the 21st 19 century firefighter performing CRR activities - it's 20 an integral aspect of their job function, as is an 21 emergency response. Approving this motion ensures 22 that our entry level recruits understand the totality 23 of the environment of risk reduction that they 24 function within, and it gives them some of the basic 25 tools to be able to perform in that environment. I</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 80</p>
<p>1 more encumbered, and burdensome for the basic 2 firefighter. Agreed, CRR is very important to 3 reducing the fire risk in the US, and changing the 4 culture, which is the number one initiative in the 5 life safety, is certainly very, very prominent amongst 6 what we do. But I'm not sure that this is the best 7 way to accomplish that. Teaching them the basic 8 firefighter skills to be able to protect themselves, 9 protect the citizens in an emergency, is the job of a 10 baseline firefighter. Thank you. 11 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. Microphone 12 Eight. 13 VINCENT QUINTERNO: Vincent Quintero, in favor 14 of the motion. As a Community Risk Reduction Officer, 15 a Training Officer for the Rhode Island State Fire 16 Marshals Office Training Academy, I, myself, train all 17 types of firefighters - Firefighters One, and 18 Firefighters Two. In today's day, firefighters have a 19 multidisciplinary job, which may not be requiring 20 putting the wet stuff on the red stuff. It may be 21 requiring them to do injury and fire prevention 22 messaging within their own community, whether they 23 work in a facility that has a semiconductor plant, or 24 whether they have a farm or rural community. So it's 25 a community that everybody needs to know what they</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 79</p>	<p>1 ask that you approve this motion. Thank you. 2 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. I'm going to 3 move to Microphone Number Seven. 4 JERRY PERRITY (phonetic): My name is Jerry 5 Perrity. I'm speaking for myself. Call for the 6 question. 7 MALE SPEAKER: Okay. 8 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Okay. 9 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 10 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 11 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 12 DANIEL O'CONNOR: The question has been called. 13 It's a, a privileged motion. So there's a motion from 14 the floor to Call the Question. I would like to note 15 there were some people still at the microphones, 16 waiting to provide their commentary, and waiting to 17 speak. But we will proceed with the vote on the call 18 of the question. I did have the second, so - in order 19 vote on this motion, please scroll down to the bottom 20 of the tablet to vote. Give you a second to do that. 21 Okay. Again, you need to be at the bottom of the 22 tablet. So if you wish to vote in support of the 23 motion -- 24 FEMALE SPEAKER: No, the call of the motion. 25 It's different --</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 81</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

<p>1 DANIEL O'CONNOR: What? 2 MALE SPEAKER: (unintelligible). 3 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Yeah. Right. If you, if you 4 wish to, to vote in support of the motion to Call the 5 Question, touch Yes. If you wish to vote against the 6 motion, touch No. Please record your vote. The 7 voting will be closed in five seconds. The voting is 8 closed. Okay. The vote is in favor, 411 to Call the 9 Question, and 30 against calling the question. So we 10 will move to the vote on this matter. 11 Okay. That's one. I (unintelligible) to get 12 back to my page. 13 FEMALE SPEAKER: (unintelligible) 14 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Before we vote, let me 15 restate the motion. The motion on the floor is to 16 Accept Public Comment Number 17. To vote, touch the 17 Vote button. If you wish to vote in support of the 18 motion, and recommend the text on Screen One, touch 19 yes. If you wish to vote against the motion, and 20 recommend the text on Screen Two, touch No. Please 21 record your vote. The voting will be closed in five 22 seconds. The vote is closed. Thank you. The results 23 of the vote are 377 in support of the motion, and 24 recommend the text on Screen One; and 73 against the 25 motion, and recommend the text on Screen Two. The</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 82</p>	<p>1 further discussion on Motion 1001-1, to Accept Public 2 Comment Number 66? Mr. Chair, anything? No? 3 JOHN CUNNINGHAM: No. 4 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Seeing none, we will move to 5 the vote. Before we vote, let me restate the motion. 6 The motion on the floor is to Accept Public Comment 7 Number 66. To vote, touch the Vote button. If you 8 wish to vote in support of the motion, and recommend 9 the text on Screen One, touch Yes. If you wish to 10 vote against the motion, and recommend the text on 11 Screen Two, touch No. Please record your vote. The 12 vote will close in five seconds. The vote is closed. 13 Thank you. The results of the vote are 270 in support 14 of the motion, and recommend the text on Screen One; 15 and 11 against the motion, and recommend the text on 16 Screen Two. The motion has passed. 17 So let's now proceed with the discussion on 18 <b>Certified Amending Motion 1001-2</b>. Is Mr. Phillip Jose 19 in the room? No? Okay. No? No Mr. Jose? Okay. 20 Seeing that the maker of the motion, nor an identified 21 designated representative has approached to make the 22 motion on 1001-2, in accordance with NFPA Convention 23 Rules in Section 2.7, the motion may not be considered 24 by the assembly, and is removed from the Agenda. We 25 will now - we will now move on.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 84</p>
<p>1 motion has passed. 2 Let's now proceed with discussion on <b>Certified</b> 3 <b>Amending Motion 1001-1</b>. Microphone Three. 4 NANCY TRENCH: I'm Nancy Trench from Oklahoma 5 State University, and I submitted this Certified 6 Amending Motion, and I recommend that we Accept Public 7 Comment Number 66, and I'm in favor of that motion. 8 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Okay. There's a motion on 9 the floor to Accept Public Comment Number 66, and we 10 do have a second. So please proceed with the 11 discussion on the motion, Ma'am. 12 NANCY TRENCH: This motion takes a definition 13 of community risk reduction, and puts it in Chapter 14 Three of the 1001 Standard. 15 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Mr. Cunningham, would you 16 like to offer the Committee's position? 17 JOHN CUNNINGHAM: With the passing of the 18 previous motion, this would be in order, and we would 19 recommend that this be accepted, to include that 20 definition in the Standard. 21 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Mr. Cunningham. 22 With that, we will open up debate on the motion. 23 Please provide your name, affiliation, and whether you 24 are speaking in support of, or against the motion. 25 I'm not seeing anybody at the mikes. Is there any</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 83</p>	<p>1 FEMALE SPEAKER: Take a break. 2 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Okay. I have been informed 3 that we will be taking a 15 minute break, and then we 4 will return to the next document. Thank you. 5 MALE SPEAKER: All right. 6 [BREAK] 7 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Another couple minutes, 8 folks. We want to get started here. 9 [BREAK CONTINUES] 10 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Ladies and gentlemen, we are 11 going to get started here in about 30 seconds. I'll 12 give you about 30 seconds to get back to your seat, 13 and your voting. 14 (BACKGROUND VOICES) 15 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Okay, ladies and gentlemen, 16 we're going to get started. Glad to see you back from 17 the break. I have a little - just a bit of business 18 to clean up on NFPA 1001. I ended just a tad 19 abruptly, so I need to ask - is - was there any further 20 discussion on NFPA 101? 21 FEMALE SPEAKER: One thousand -- 22 MALE SPEAKER: One thousand -- 23 MALE SPEAKER: Hey. 24 MALE SPEAKER: 1001. 25 FEMALE SPEAKER: 1001.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 85</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

<p>1 DANIEL O'CONNOR: 1001, yes. 1001. Okay - 2 what's a zero? Okay. 3 (laughter) 4 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Okay. 5 MALE SPEAKER: (unintelligible) 6 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Okay. Seeing none, then, we 7 will move on to the next document. The next report 8 under consideration is that of the Committee on Fire 9 Prevention Organization and Deployment. Here to 10 present the Committee Report is Committee Chair Ronald 11 Farr of Plainwell Fire Department, Otsego, Michigan. 12 The Committee Report, that is the First and Second 13 Draft Reports, is located on the Document Information 14 Page for NFPA 1730 on the NFPA website. All Certified 15 Amending Motions are contained in the NFPA Technical 16 Meeting Agenda, and will be displayed behind me on the 17 screen as they are under debate. We will now proceed 18 with the first, first motion (unintelligible), except 19 that I need to clarify that there is a, a Motion 20 Clarification and, and, and a second here. But we 21 will - we will proceed with the Agenda. Mr. Farr, can 22 you give us your report? 23 RONALD FARR: Mr. Chair, ladies and gentleman, 24 the report of the Technical Committee on Fire 25 Prevention, Organization, and Deployment is presented</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 86</p>	<p>1 Marshal and Building Official with the City of 2 Altamonte Springs, Florida, regarding Motion 1730-2, I 3 make a motion to Accept Public Comment Number One. 4 FEMALE SPEAKER: Second. 5 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 6 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Okay. There is a motion on 7 the floor to Accept Public Comment Number One. We do 8 have a second. Please proceed with the discussion on 9 the motion, Sir. 10 TONY APFELBECK: Ladies and gentlemen, as you 11 observed by my testimony earlier today, supporting an 12 inclusion of community risk reduction in NFPA 1001, I 13 strongly support the concept of community risk 14 reduction and assessment. However, sometimes our 15 desires for advancement outpaces our current 16 knowledge. This motion addresses one of those 17 circumstances where this has occurred. In the last 18 cycle for NFPA 1730, the TC inserted new language to 19 allow community risk assessment to substitute for the 20 prescriptive existing occupancy inspection frequencies 21 in NFPA 1730. In concept, I agree, this is an 22 excellent idea. However, the evidence shows that 23 we're not ready for this leap yet. While it is easy 24 for the 1730 document to appoint a user, QSCRA, in 25 order to create an existing occupancy inspection</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 88</p>
<p>1 for adoption, and can be found in the First Draft 2 Report, and then in the Second Draft Report for the 3 2018 Annual Revision Cycle. The Technical Committee 4 has published a First and Second Draft Report 5 consisting of revisions to the NFPA 1730 Standard on 6 Organization and Deployment of Fire Prevention 7 Inspection and Code Enforcement, Plan Review, 8 Investigation, and Public Education Operations. These 9 reports were submitted to letter ballot of the 10 responsible Technical Committee. The reports and 11 ballots results can be found on the Next Edition tab 12 of the Document Information Page for NFPA 1730, at 13 www.nfpa.org/1730. 14 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Mr. Chair. A 15 little bit of a clarification here. The next <b>motion</b> 16 <b>on NFPA 1730-1</b> appeared on our Agenda. However, 17 the authorized maker of the motion has notified NFPA 18 that he no longer wishes to pursue this motion. 19 Therefore, in accordance with NFPA rules, the 20 Convention Rules at Section 2.7, the motion may not be 21 considered by the assembly, and is removed from the 22 Agenda. 23 We will now move onto the next motion. Let's 24 now pursue discussion on <b>Certified Amending Motion</b> 25 <b>1730-2</b>. Microphone Number Three. TONY APFELBECK: Tony Apfelbeck. I am the Fire</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 87</p>	<p>1 frequency, the document fails to provide any direction 2 on methodology, or how to conduct such a review; nor 3 does it provide examples of such an assessment in the 4 Annex text. 5 Both of these approaches were requested by this 6 writer in public inputs, and rejected by the Technical 7 Committee. I also submitted a public input to NFPA 8 1300 on this same issue, Standard on Community Risk 9 Assessment, and Community Risk Reduction Plan 10 Development. The Standard is intended to specify how 11 users shall, quote, "Develop the process to conduct 12 community risk assessment and reduction programs." 13 End quote. The TC's response to including this type 14 of methodology in 1300 was, 'NFPA 1300 does not cover 15 inspections of existing occupancies.' 16 So what we're left with here is we have an 17 option for a user to use a CRA, in NFPA 1300, but no 18 methodology or guidance in the NFPA Standard on CRAs 19 to begin to implement this goal, or ensure integrity 20 of an approach to developing such a, a conclusion. 21 It's important to note that both the 1300 22 document and the 1730 document are the same Technical 23 Committee. As a result of this lack of detail to the 24 user, we now have an approach before us that would 25 result in 10 different AHJs receiving the exact same</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 89</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

<p>1 data, and developing 10 completely different existing 2 occupancy inspection frequencies in a CRA. That's not 3 science or evidence based decision making. It is 4 pseudoscience. Once a methodology is developed to 5 accurately create an existing occupancy inspection 6 schedule as part of a CRA, and we adopt it within the 7 Standard, I will be the first to stand here and 8 support this language as being appropriate. Until 9 then, we need to step back, let the science be 10 developed to guide us in making good decisions in this 11 area.</p> <p>12 In conclusion, I ask that you support this 13 motion, and give the Technical Committee the 14 opportunity to go ahead and do the research on this 15 issue, through maybe a Code Fund project with the Fire 16 Protection Research Foundation, or other 17 opportunities, and put language in the Standard, and 18 examples in the Annex. Thank you very much.</p> <p>19 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. Mr. Farr, 20 would you like to offer the Committee's position? 21 RONALD FARR: 1730 Committee rejected the 22 public comment, based upon the purpose of the 23 community risk assessment to establish service 24 delivery levels, based on the risks that are specific 25 to the community. Establishing minimum inspection</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 90</p>	<p>1 frequencies is based on data, and demonstrated risk 2 that is unique to each community. Requiring a 3 specific inspection schedule is contrary to the major 4 purpose of the Standard. The Committee's rejection of 5 the proposal emphasizes the importance of a community 6 risk assessment, and allows the AHJ to make the 7 determination on the level of acceptable risk 8 tolerance of the community, address the most critical 9 risk faced, and use objective data to, to support 10 their efforts, rather than a generic, broad statement 11 that may not address an existing risk at all.</p> <p>12 The community that develops the 1730 Standard 13 is the same Technical Committee that is currently 14 developing the 1300 Standard on the community risk 15 assessment and risk reduction plans. They have 16 spelled out the process in 1300, to conduct that risk 17 assessment to support the fire prevention efforts 18 outlined in 1730.</p> <p>19 The decision to deny the original public 20 comment was done with the understanding that it would 21 clear process to conduct the risk assessment, 22 providing the objective data to support a specific 23 inspection schedule based on the actual risk. It's 24 forthcoming in the 1300 Standard. Please support the 25 Committee's action to provide the guidance for the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 92</p>
<p>1 frequencies in the absence of a community risk 2 assessment is a reasonable alternative. However, the 3 Committee risk assessment is the objective process by 4 which committees - or communities, excuse me, can 5 identify, and prioritize their risk. For this 6 Standard to require existing occupancies to be 7 inspected and established inspection frequency may not 8 be the most effective and efficient use of resources, 9 based upon the community's risk. For example, a high 10 risk occupancy may have an aggressive internal fire 11 inspection and safety program, an in house emergency 12 response brigade, and comprehensive set of built-in 13 fire protection systems. With this proposal, this 14 type of facility would still need to be inspected, and 15 on an annual basis, even if their history of losses 16 are insignificant, and they're - manage their own 17 risks in house. Conducting a risk assessment, the 18 process of which is being fully developed by the NFPA 19 1300 Committee, Community Risk Assessment, and 20 Community Risk Reduction Planning document, provides 21 the AHJ with the data to make objective decisions on 22 which to deploy resources, or identify resources needs 23 in order to mitigate specific risks of the community. 24 This process, when done, when properly, minimizes 25 judgment, and its determination of inspection</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 91</p>	<p>1 inspection frequencies, based on a community risk 2 assessment, in rejecting the Amending Motion that is 3 presented here today.</p> <p>4 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you. Thank you, 5 gentlemen. With that, we will open up debate on the 6 motion. Please provide your name, affiliation, and 7 whether you are speaking in support of, or against the 8 motion. Microphone Number Three.</p> <p>9 TONY APFELBECK: Tony Apfelbeck, Fire Marshal 10 and Building Official, City of Altamonte Springs. 11 Again, there, there is no objective language in 1300. 12 I tried to go ahead and submit a PI to go ahead and 13 put that language in there so we can go ahead and 14 refer to that, and create an inspection schedule as a 15 result of that, based on consistent data. And the, 16 the Committee did not go ahead and accept it.</p> <p>17 The - my other concern with this is as I called 18 out in the Public Comment on this issue. The NFPA 19 Manual of Style has very specific language that is 20 intended to protect the integrity of the Standards 21 development process, by mandating the provisions of 22 Codes and Standards shall not contain requirements 23 that are, quote, "...unenforceable, and vague." End 24 quote. Shall not create, quote, "...multiple levels of 25 safety." End quote. And shall, quote, "... minimize</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 93</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

<p>1 judgment by the user." End quote. Just as the Manual 2 of Style would not allow Code language in NFPA 101, 3 that states an AHJ shall conduct a community risk 4 assessment to determine if a fire alarm system, or 5 fire sprinkler system shall be installed in the 6 building, we should oppose creating vague user 7 judgments, unenforceable terminology, and multiple 8 levels of safety in NFPA 1730. 9 The, the - a Manual Style is in place to ensure 10 the integrity of the Codes and Standards process, and 11 that's why that language is in there, and it's 12 specific to go ahead and prohibit and of - these types 13 of vague and unenforceable provisions, without 14 supporting methodology. Thank you. 15 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Sir, would you just clarify 16 for us that you were for or against the motion? 17 TONY APFELBECK: For the motion. Thank you. 18 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. I will go to 19 Microphone Number Seven. 20 MATTHEW MERTENS: Matthew Mertens, North Shore 21 Fire, speaking against the motion, to support the 22 Committee action. The language that's in here, while 23 Mr. Apfelbeck can argue that it, it doesn't meet form, 24 it does in the fact that it's based on the whole 25 concept of this Standard is about deployment. And to</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 94</p>	<p>1 I, I have to commend the Committee for the foresight 2 of including a community risk assessment as an 3 alternative to a prescriptive schedule, but I agree 4 with Mr. Apfelbeck. There is no provided methodology, 5 and the proposed language in 1300, which is still an 6 unreleased Standard, is vague. It provides only the 7 most subjective guidelines, saying, 'Go out, collect 8 some information, analyze it, and make your 9 decisions.' There's no framework for analysis. 10 There's no basis for an objective, an objective 11 decision. The concept is good. It's just not quite 12 ready for prime time. 13 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Microphone Number Four, 14 please. 15 VINCENT QUINTERNO: Vincent Quintero, voting 16 against the motion. As a Community Risk Reduction 17 Officer, like most people in this room, or that are 18 AHJs - we wear multiple hats. To say - give us a 19 schedule and say, 'You're going to be doing this 20 here,' when that may not be a priority, when I may be 21 doing juvenile fire setting, is the priority at that 22 time. So give me a schedule, and I may not be able to 23 adhere to it. So I'm, I'm opposed to the motion. 24 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Microphone Number Three. 25 TONY APFELBECK: Tony Apfelbeck, Fire Marshal,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 96</p>
<p>1 think that communities, and chiefs, and fire marshals 2 aren't making these community assessments every day on 3 how they're going to deploy their resources is - it's 4 an illusion. We have to. We are constantly short 5 staffed. We have to address our highest risks. Fire 6 Service is risk mitigation. So a lot of times, 7 whether that's on the fire ground, or whether that's 8 doing prevention, we need to put our resources, our 9 boots on the ground, where they belong, and where 10 they're going to be the most effective and have the 11 greatest impact, which is really what this Standard is 12 about, is trying to provide some of that guidance. 13 Taking that language out of there for people to 14 actually start to recognize that they need to look at 15 this as a more formal process of doing risk assessment 16 while they're trying to figure out where to develop 17 and put their, their resources, is just moving us 18 backwards. We're going down this direction. It's a 19 recognition of where we're going; it's what needs to 20 be moved forward. Please support the Committee 21 action. 22 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you, Sir. I will move 23 to Microphone Number Six. 24 BOB UPSON: Bob Upson, speaking on my own 25 behalf. I have to speak in, in favor of the motion.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 95</p>	<p>1 Building Official, Altamonte Springs, for the motion. 2 Just in rebuttal to some of the previous testimony, 3 the, the fact that a local community may have other 4 priorities - let's create a methodology that includes 5 that. I have no objection to that whatsoever. But 6 let's go ahead and look at that, and create a an 7 objective methodology that gives guidance to us as 8 AHJs so we can then go sell this to the people, and 9 our policy makers that are going to go ahead and say, 10 'Well, how did you develop this?' 'Well, you know, I 11 just went ahead and, and pretty much made it up.' 12 'Well, is there a standard methodology, within the 13 standard of care within the - in the NFPA process?' 14 If we have one, yes. Then we can go ahead and point 15 to that, and it gives the credibility for this 16 process, because if we move forward, credibility and 17 the integrity of this process is important, and we 18 have the tools to create this. 19 John Hall with the Fire Protection Research 20 Foundation created the first inspection schedule 21 recommendations that are in - in 1730. There's no 22 reason we can't go ahead and move towards a 23 performance based aspect of that, to incorporate local 24 needs in that, and move forward. Thank you. 25 DANIEL O'CONNOR: For the motion, Sir, right?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 97</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

<p>1 TONY APFELBECK: Yes, for the motion. 2 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Thank you. I am going to 3 move to Microphone Number Five in the back of the 4 room. 5 KEN DUNCAN (phonetic): How you doin' today? 6 Ken Duncan, Performance Design Technologies. The 7 National Fire Protection Association -- 8 DANIEL O'CONNOR: For or against the motion? 9 KEN DUNCAN: -- against the motion -- several 10 years ago, through the Research Foundation, actually 11 issued a guideline on incorporated risk methodologies 12 into NFPA Standards. I don't know that enough people 13 have actually looked at that, but it sets up a 14 framework that allows us to do more risk informed 15 decisions. And while we may not have a single 16 methodology, or a preferred methodology, the option of 17 staying with the prescriptive is perfectly acceptable 18 to those who don't want to do the risk assessment, but 19 it provides the option to advance risk based decision 20 making. So I, I am against the motion. 21 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Okay. Microphone Number 22 Four, please. 23 MALE SPEAKER: Call the Question. 24 MALE SPEAKER: Question (unintelligible). 25 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Well - okay. There's a</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 98</p>	<p>1 Yes. If you wish to vote against the motion, and 2 recommend the text on Screen Two, touch No. Please 3 record your vote. The voting will close in five 4 seconds. The voting is closed. Thank you. And the 5 vote, results of the vote are - 276 in support of the 6 motion, and recommend the text on Screen One; 154 7 against the motion, and, and recommend the text on 8 Screen Two. The motion has passed. 9 Is there any further discussion on NFPA 1730? 10 Seeing none, we will move on to the next document. 11 Thank you, Mr. Farr. 12 Before we begin the next Standard, I would like 13 to introduce to you, James Golinveaux, member of the 14 Standards Council, who will be the Presiding Officer 15 for motions before the membership on the next, and 16 final two Standards today. James. 17 (applause) 18 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Good afternoon. The next 19 report under consideration - this is out of the 20 Committee on Emergency - Committee on Emergency Power 21 Supplies. Here to present the Committee Report, and 22 the - and Committee Member James Gregory of the 23 Florida Agency for Healthcare Administration, 24 Tallahassee, Florida. The Committee Report, that is 25 the First and Second Draft Reports, is located on the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 100</p>
<p>1 motion from the floor to Call the Question, and I 2 thought I had - saw somebody at the mike, but maybe 3 they sat down. So I don't see anybody at the 4 microphones right now. So do we have a second to Call 5 the Question? 6 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 7 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Okay. We have a second. In 8 order to vote on this motion, again, you need to 9 please scroll down to the bottom of your tablet, to 10 vote. So I'll give you a second to do that, find 11 that. If you wish to vote in support of the motion to 12 Call the Question touch Yes. If you wish to vote 13 against the motion, touch No. Please record your 14 vote. 15 FEMALE SPEAKER: (unintelligible). 16 DANIEL O'CONNOR: Voting will close in five 17 seconds. The vote is closed. Okay. The, the 18 question of calling the, the - the motion to Call the 19 Question passes 419 to 17. 20 We will move to vote on the motion on 13 - on 21 1730-2. Before we vote, though, let me restate that 22 motion. The motion on the floor is to Accept Public 23 Comment Number One. To touch - to vote, touch the 24 Vote button. If you wish to vote in support of the 25 motion, and recommend the text on Screen One, touch</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 99</p>	<p>1 Document Information Pages, Information Page on NFPA 2 110, on the NFPA website. All Certified Amending 3 Motions are contained in the NFPA Technical Meeting 4 (Tech Session) Agenda, and will be displayed behind me 5 on the screen as they are under debate. We will 6 proceed in the order of the motions as included in the 7 Agenda. Mr. Gregory. 8 JAMES GREGORY: Thank you. Mr. Chair, ladies 9 and gentlemen, the report of the Technical Committee 10 on Emergency Power Supplies is presented for adoption, 11 and can be found in the First Draft Report, and the 12 Second Draft Report for the 2018 Annual Revision 13 Cycle. The Technical Committee has published a First 14 and Second Draft Report consisting of revisions to the 15 NFPA 110 Standard for Emergency and Standby Power 16 Systems. These reports were submitted by letter 17 ballot to the responsible Correlating and Technical 18 Committee. The reports and ballots results can be 19 found on the Next Edition tab of the Document 20 Information Page for NFPA 110, at 21 www.nfpa.org/110next. 22 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you, Mr. Gregory. 23 And to proceed with the discussion on the <b>Certified</b> 24 <b>Amending Motions on NFPA 110</b> - Mr. Ron Bourgault 25 hasn't checked in yet. Mr. Bourgault, are you here?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 101</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

1 RON BOURGAULT: Yes, I'm here.  
2 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Okay. So you are here. So  
3 proceed with the Certified Amending Motions of NFPA  
4 110. Mr. Bourgault.  
5 RON BOURGAULT: Thank you.  
6 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Microphone Three.  
7 RON BOURGAULT: My name is Ron Bourgault. I'm  
8 with Mazzetti Engineering. And I make a motion to  
9 Accept Public Comment Number Three.  
10 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Is there a  
11 second?  
12 MALE SPEAKER: Second.  
13 MALE SPEAKER: Second.  
14 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Mr. Gregory - or Mr.  
15 Bourgault, present your position, please.  
16 RON BOURGAULT: Yes. Thank you. So the  
17 addition of this to NFPA 110 really is adding fuel  
18 cells to, to be an allowable source of, of energy for  
19 emergency systems. This, what this really is doing -  
20 it is aligning NFPA 110 with NFPA 70, the National  
21 Electric Code, and NFPA 99. In NFPA 70, Section 517  
22 on healthcare, fuel cells are allowed, as well as in  
23 Section 701 that allow fuel cells - that's in the  
24 Emergency Standards. Also in NFPA 99, in Section Six,  
25 emergency - or electrical systems, fuel cells are

Page 102

1 allowed, as well.  
2 So what's being proposed here isn't anything  
3 new. It's already accepted in the two other  
4 Standards. So this just brings all the Standards  
5 together, Standards and Codes together, that allows  
6 the, the use of fuel cells.  
7 A little bit about fuel cells. As I've been  
8 working on these, some people ask a lot of questions.  
9 Really, a fuel cell is a - is an energy converter.  
10 It's like a battery. It's got an anode and a cathode,  
11 and it creates energy. So it doesn't store energy,  
12 but it - yeah, so that's the difference between a  
13 battery.  
14 So the reason this was initially rejected was  
15 that - two items. One was that fuel cells would not  
16 be able to start up in the allowable 10 seconds as is  
17 required, as the way generators do. Well, fuel cells  
18 operate all the time. There is no need for them to  
19 start up. They're constantly online, so there are no  
20 issues with that. It does meet it. And the other,  
21 the other item for rejection was that they cannot -  
22 they will not maintain the load. If there's a large  
23 load that's switched in, like a chiller, the fuel  
24 cells can't handle it. That's incorrect, as well. A  
25 fuel cell system is designed to - for the specific

Page 103

1 system it's going in. It would have storage  
2 capacitors in it. So any load that switch into it, it  
3 will certainly work just fine. So the reasons for  
4 rejection are incorrect, and they, they shouldn't have  
5 been used.  
6 A couple other things. NFPA 110 is a, is a  
7 Standard for emergency power supply systems. It's not  
8 dedicated strictly to generators. It's - it's for  
9 emergency power supply systems. So it talks about  
10 ATS's and parallel equipment. So this is certainly  
11 appropriate to put in this section.  
12 And finally on maintenance and operation of  
13 fuel cells - they don't have to be maintained in the  
14 same way that generators are maintained, because  
15 generators sit idle for long periods of time. Fuel  
16 cells are online seven - seven days a week, 24 hours a  
17 day, and they are constantly monitored. So whenever  
18 there's an issue with the fuel cell, it's picked up  
19 right away. You don't have to test it - it's always  
20 under test. Thank you.  
21 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Mr. Gregory,  
22 would you like to offer the Committee's position?  
23 JAMES GREGORY: Yes. Thank you. In addition  
24 to the Committee's published statement that fuel cells  
25 cannot provide the required start time of 10 seconds

Page 104

1 required for energy converters, and need to be proven  
2 to be capable of starting all types of loads, such as  
3 large motors - the Committee had no choice but to  
4 reject this comment, because it does not meet the  
5 scope of the Standard. The scope of NFPA 110  
6 Standard, in part, reads as follows: 'This standard  
7 covers installation, maintenance, operation, and  
8 testing requirements as they pertain to the  
9 performance of the emergency power supply system.'  
10 NFPA 110 provides specific requirements that all power  
11 supply systems must meet to be utilized as an  
12 emergency power source for Level I and Level II  
13 emergency power systems. Simply referencing NFPA 853,  
14 a Standard whose purpose - to protect facilities from  
15 possible fire events caused by the use and storage of  
16 hydrogen gas used in fuel cells - does not achieve the  
17 goal of NFPA 110, and - nor NFPA 111. The  
18 requirements in NFPA 110 are to assure the safe  
19 operation of emergency power supply systems that are  
20 protecting human life, because no - because NFPA 110  
21 was developed around the use of rotating supply  
22 equipment, the existing requirements cannot and do not  
23 pertain to power supply such as fuel cells.  
24 Fuel cells are already permitted in NFPA 99,  
25 and in NFPA 70 Codes, without any reference to the

Page 105

<p>1 Standard, NFPA 110. Therefore, there is no 2 prohibition against their use. Thank you. 3 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. With that, we'll 4 open up the debate on the motion. Please provide your 5 name, affiliation, and whether you're speaking in 6 support, or against the motion. Microphone Three, 7 please. 8 DAVE DAGENAIS: Yes. My name's Dave Dagenais, 9 and I'm speaking on behalf of myself, in favor of the 10 motion. I am also a member of the 110 Committee, and 11 it is my opinion - and I want to reiterate - my 12 opinion; I am not speaking on behalf of the Committee 13 - that we not, did not give the fuel cell technology 14 thorough thought as we went through the process. 15 During the input phase, the Committee responded with a 16 Reject/Resolve, with the comment saying, 'Currently, 17 fuel cells do not meet all of the performance 18 requirements within 110.' After that, the - the 19 opposer of the, of the motion submitted additional 20 information, and it was brought forward to the 21 Committee. When it reached the comment phase, the 22 Committee then stated in its rejection, 'Fuel cells 23 cannot meet the 10 second startup time.' We've 24 already heard from the, from the proposer of the 25 motion, and in the next CAM, they'll be some specific</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 106</p>	<p>1 Committee gave it - in my opinion, the Committee did 2 not give it adequate thought. For that, I will take 3 personal ownership, but the - it's time to make the 4 change here. So I urge the members to support this 5 motion, which will answer the question, does it be 6 belong In the scope, or is it in the scope; and more 7 importantly will set the stage for the development of 8 an emerging technology that could, in fact, over time 9 prove to be more reliable than a generator. Thank 10 you. And I urge to vote in forward of the - for this 11 motion. 12 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone Five, 13 please. 14 KEITH WATERS (phonetic): Yes, Mr. Chair. My 15 name is Keith Waters, and I'm speaking for myself, and 16 I rise in opposition to the motion. So while the 17 National Electric Code does permit the use of fuel 18 cells, it is an installation document, not a 19 performance document, as in 110. Inclusion into 110 20 needs further vetting by the Technical Committee, with 21 the appropriate parameters as part of that evaluation. 22 Thank you. 23 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone 24 Three, please. 25 JOHN WILLIAMS: John Williams, Washington State</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 108</p>
<p>1 requirements that will indicate that that 10 second 2 criteria is not relevant, because these things are 3 operational 24/7. 4 There were some additional concerns from the 5 Committee that stated that fuel cells need to provide 6 the capability for the loads necessary. If and when 7 fuel cells are included in this document, there is an 8 expectation that you meet all the requirements of that 9 document, which will address the issue of capacity of 10 load. So that also is not relevant, from a 11 Committee's perspective. 12 Another concern the Committee had was - does 13 fuel cells fit into the scope of the document. We 14 heard the scope of the document. Fuel cells - this, 15 this question is addressed very easily. Fuel cells is 16 a technology that's emerging; it's reliable; and it's, 17 and it's - and in some cases, might even be better. 18 NFPA 99 already acknowledges it, and recognizes it for 19 this type of an installation, and NFPA 70 does the 20 same. There's an argument - if those documents have 21 it in it, why does this one need it? Well, often when 22 AHJs are looking to enforce these types of emergency 23 power systems, the very first document they go to is 24 110. 25 So I would reiterate, I don't think the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 107</p>	<p>1 Department of Health; in this case, representing the 2 Healthcare Section, the NFPA Healthcare Section. The 3 Healthcare Section Board and membership met on June 4 13th, and voted to support this motion. We realize 5 that other codes permit these installations, and the 6 connection of this reference Standard on fuel cells is 7 an important linkage that might otherwise be 8 overlooked when facilities are installing, designers 9 are designing, and we as AHJs are enforcing these 10 systems. We urge the membership to consider this 11 option, and support the motion. 12 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone Four, 13 please. 14 MARVIN HUIE: Yes. Marvin Huie, Jacobs 15 Engineering Group, representing myself. I think, I 16 think -- 17 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Are you speaking -- 18 MARVIN HUIE: -- part of the -- 19 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: -- for or against? 20 MARVIN HUIE: Speaking against, against the 21 motion. 22 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. 23 MARVIN HUIE: Let's look back on - the 24 Committee rejected this proposal for several reasons, 25 one of which hasn't been really stated - is they only</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 109</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018



1 submitted installation. Do we allow that to happen?  
2 I mean, it has no operational issues. It has no  
3 maintenance requirements, and it has no testing  
4 requirements associated with it. Additionally,  
5 generators - let's look back at history a brief  
6 moment. Generators used to have a testing requirement  
7 of only 30 minutes. It's been moved now to four  
8 hours. Why is that? Well, in the north, a major city  
9 has a - a Level 1 trauma center hospital, and they had  
10 a major ice storm. They did all the testing and  
11 requirements for 30 minutes, as required by NFPA. And  
12 through the major ice storm, electrical wires started  
13 breaking all over the city, and people were being  
14 brought to the hospital. Eventually, the lines going  
15 to the hospital broke, and all the generators came on  
16 as planned, and worked perfectly. And they ran past  
17 the 30 minutes, up to three hours. And at three  
18 hours, even though they were M-plus one, being a Level  
19 1 trauma center, the generators started failing after  
20 three hours, because they hadn't been tested and ran  
21 long enough for them to know what's going on.  
22 Is it going to take loss of life, with these  
23 fuel cells in line, for the Committee and the body to  
24 understand that we need testing, and maintenance, and  
25 understand fully how this new technology, all support

Page 110

1 of it - this new technology is going to keep us safe?  
2 Do you want to be on an operating table when this has  
3 not been tested and vetted appropriately, and the  
4 proper requirements in place?  
5 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone  
6 Three, please.  
7 TIM ADAMS: Hello. Tim Adams, speaking on  
8 behalf of the American Hospital Association. A couple  
9 of the --  
10 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Are you speaking for or  
11 against?  
12 TIM ADAMS: I'm speaking for this motion, in  
13 favor of this motion. A couple of the items that have  
14 been mentioned are going to be addressed in the next  
15 motion, 110-2. That includes that these fuel cell  
16 units would have an M-plus one redundancy; that there  
17 is normal utility power available - assuming the, the  
18 fuel cell is operating full time and supplying power  
19 to the facility; there is a backup of utility power in  
20 the case of a, a failure of that fuel cell; and also  
21 that there'd be a diesel connection available for the  
22 life safety loads, if that fuel cell is being used in  
23 this mode.  
24 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. And returning to  
25 Microphone Three, please.

Page 111

1 JOHN WILLIAMS: John Williams, Washington State  
2 Department of Health, speaking for myself. Just to  
3 rebut the question --  
4 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: And are you speaking --  
5 JOHN WILLIAMS: Oh.  
6 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: -- for or against --  
7 JOHN WILLIAMS: Sorry.  
8 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: -- the motion?  
9 JOHN WILLIAMS: Speaking in support of the  
10 motion. Just to rebut, and offer the membership some  
11 perspective on routine maintenance and operation. I  
12 think that's one of the things that - reasons why we  
13 need this in 110. 110, in Chapter Eight, provides us  
14 with some direction on routine maintenance and  
15 operation, including, '...routine maintenance and  
16 operation, testing shall be based on all of the  
17 following: Manufacturers' requirements, instruction  
18 manuals, minimum requirements of this chapter, and the  
19 authority having jurisdiction.' I would argue, as an  
20 authority having jurisdiction, I've got a lot of  
21 experience in the maintenance and testing of these  
22 particular types of devices. And as we go through  
23 Chapter Eight, some of the requirements are based on  
24 diesel generator sets, but many are not. And, and I  
25 think when we look at that and, and, and we get the

Page 112

1 opportunity to look at these in, in this context - and  
2 we've got plenty of options and, and background on how  
3 to make sure that these are tested in a way that they  
4 can perform reliably. I urge you, support the motion.  
5 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Returning to  
6 Microphone Three.  
7 DAVE DAGENAIS: Dave Dagenais, speaking on  
8 behalf of myself, in favor of the motion. I want to  
9 just emphasize that all this motion is doing is  
10 recognizing fuel cell technology as an alternative  
11 power source. All the comments that were made about  
12 whether it's safe, reliable - that is all taken care  
13 of through all the Codes that currently exist. The  
14 reality is, it will have to meet all of those same  
15 provisions that a generator would, or a battery would.  
16 It's just saying there's one more option in the  
17 industry to achieve this. So it will not cause any  
18 risk; it will not - it's not an issue of whether or  
19 not it's reliable or not. It's really just saying is  
20 this an acceptable alternative power supply; and if  
21 so, it must meet all the safety requirements of 99,  
22 NFPA 70, and NFPA 110. It's adding one more thing to  
23 the party. I urge you to support this.  
24 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone  
25 Three, please.

Page 113

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

<p>1           RON BRIGEL: Ron Brigel with Mazzetti, in 2 support of the motion. I heard some comments about 3 generators and their failures. The thing with these 4 fuel cells, they're online all the time, and they 5 will, as, as it was just mentioned, there will be 6 redundancy in the systems. So if there's a failure, 7 it's going to switch over to the backup anyway. So we 8 don't have to test them four hours a, four hours a 9 month, or eight hours a month. They're under test 10 constantly. These are far more reliable systems than 11 generator systems are. So I'd - it's a system that 12 allows us really to work towards a micro grid process, 13 which is really where the industry's going to, and 14 this is the first step. And it does - it is just 15 combining with the other Standards to allow it. And 16 if you do look in the testing section, Section Eight 17 of 110, most of those items will apply to the fuel 18 cell, other than one or two of the minor items. You 19 can apply those tests to a fuel cell system, just as 20 you apply them to a generator system. Thank you.</p> <p>21           JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone Four, 22 please.</p> <p>23           MARTY HUIE: Marty Huie, Jacobs Engineering 24 Group, speaking against the motion. I guess it goes 25 back to why was this not submitted? Why was the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 114</p>	<p>1           a simple issue. If we were going to install a brand 2 new generator today, we would have to size that 3 appropriately for the loads that are there. It is no 4 different with, with this - it's the same thing. So I 5 - so all the arguments around loading, 10 second ramp- 6 up time, maintenance - those are all items that are 7 addressed in, in - more importantly in the next CAM 8 we're going to bring forward. So please, I urge you, 9 vote in favor of this motion.</p> <p>10           JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Okay, thank you. Is there 11 any further discussion on Motion 110-1, to Accept 12 Public Comment Number Three? Seeing none, Mr. 13 Gregory, do you have any final comments?</p> <p>14           JAMES GREGORY: Yes. Thank you. Let me just 15 remind you that this NFPA 110 is a Standard, not a 16 Code. The Committee action is not entirely about fuel 17 cells, or any other proposed emergency power supply 18 that would be - become of, of NFPA 110. The Committee 19 action is about revising the Standard in accordance 20 with its established scope. It is hard to understand 21 why a new emergency power supply is trying to be 22 injected into this Standard, without providing the 23 necessary requirements for the safe, reliable 24 operation, maintenance, and testing that that 25 particular power supply requires. Not only does this</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 116</p>
<p>1           testing, and maintenance, and operational not 2 submitted? We keep hearing it's, it's inline, it 3 works simultaneously, it works continuously. Has all 4 that been tested when a major load gets applied 5 instantaneously? The catastrophic event that happened 6 that caused generators to go from 30 minute test to a 7 four hour - they also had M-plus one, just like we 8 heard this is M-plus one. They had loss of life to 9 cause us to go to four hour testing. What - I don't 10 even know what the testing is. I don't think anybody 11 understands what the testing requirements are for fuel 12 cells. Let's figure it out; let's get it in place. 13 It's already in the Annex, folks. And we don't need 14 this in this section. It's in the Annex. It can be 15 used today as an alternative, in line. It's - it - it 16 - it's not a proper Code to be in this section at this 17 time.</p> <p>18           JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone 19 Three, please.</p> <p>20           DAVE DAGENAIS: Dave Dagenais, speaking on 21 behalf of myself, in favor of the motion. The fact 22 that it is in the Annex acknowledges that it has some 23 validity to be in the document itself - so that it 24 eliminates the question of whether or not it belongs 25 in the document. The issue associated with loading is</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 115</p>	<p>1           not meet the scope of this Standard, it will lead to 2 misunderstanding and confusion in the use of NFPA 110. 3 I urge you to stand with the Technical Committee; vote 4 the color on your badge, against the motion. 5           (laughter)</p> <p>6           JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you, Mr. Gregory. 7 Before we vote, let me restate the motion. The motion 8 on the floor is to Accept Public Comment Number Three. 9 To vote, touch the Vote button. If you wish to vote 10 in support of the motion, and recommend the text on 11 Screen One, touch Yes. If you wish to vote against 12 the motion, and recommend the text on Screen Two, text 13 No - touch No. Please record your vote. Voting will 14 close in five seconds. The voting is closed. The 15 results are 238 in favor of the motion; 137 against 16 the motion. The motion passes.</p> <p>17           Now let's proceed to the discussion on 18 <b>Certified Amending Motion 110-2</b>. Microphone Three, 19 please.</p> <p>20           RON BRIGEL: Thank you. Ron - Ron Brigel with 21 Mazzetti. I make a motion to Accept Public Comment 22 Number Four.</p> <p>23           JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. There is a 24 motion on the floor to Accept Public Comment Number 25 Four. Is there a second?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 117</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

1 MALE SPEAKER: Second.  
2 MALE SPEAKER: Second.  
3 MALE SPEAKER: Second.  
4 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: We do have a second. Please  
5 proceed with the discussion on the motion.  
6 RON BRIGEL: Thank you. This motion is the  
7 second part of the first motion that allows fuel cells  
8 to be used. This gets into the details that were  
9 discussed earlier, as well as some of the concerns  
10 that were mentioned. There are three - there are  
11 three parts to this. First is, the fuel cells would  
12 be an M-plus one configuration. Fuel cells run in a  
13 parallel manner, so if one of them were to fail, the  
14 system continues to deliver power. So it's just like  
15 having a bunch of car batteries in parallel - one  
16 fails, you're - it's still going to work, so that's  
17 not a problem. So fuel cells are inherently in  
18 parallel, just to allow that so if there is a failure  
19 of one of the cells, the system keeps operating.  
20 The second is that there will be utility power  
21 available. The way these systems will work is,  
22 whether it's a healthcare facility or anywhere else,  
23 the fuel cell is providing the power to the emergency  
24 systems, and the normal systems. It's a much more  
25 efficient way to provide, to power a facility. And

Page 118

1 then the backup to the fuel cells will be the utility  
2 power. So there's always utility power. It's always  
3 there. It's always available. And so if there is  
4 some kind of failure with the fuel cells, the utility  
5 is available.  
6 And lastly, there's another opportunity for  
7 backup - kind of a belt and suspenders - where we have  
8 a - availability to connect a, a generator to the  
9 system. So there is a - there's a transfer switch  
10 outside, and you can connect a, a generator to the  
11 system. So there's a lot of, lot of things built into  
12 it that will keep the system safe, and it covers the  
13 safeguards that people have mentioned before about not  
14 being available. But it is - it is an available  
15 system, and these are the things that are built into  
16 it to allow that to happen. Thank you.  
17 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Mr. Gregory,  
18 would you like to offer the Committee's position?  
19 JAMES GREGORY: Yes. Thank you. Yes - once  
20 again, we are presented with fuel cells coming into a  
21 establish Standard without the necessary components  
22 that are required for that Standard. We just looked  
23 at three installation requirements. But there are  
24 also maintenance requirements, operation requirements,  
25 and testing requirements. There are none in NFPA 110

Page 119

1 for fuel cells. There is no possible way that fuel  
2 cells can use generator testing and operation  
3 requirements. I urge you to reconsider. Thank you.  
4 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. With that, we'll  
5 open up the debate on the motion. Please provide your  
6 name and affiliation, and whether you're speaking in  
7 support, or against the motion. Microphone Three,  
8 please.  
9 DAVE DAGENAIS: Dave Dagenais, speaking on  
10 behalf of myself, in favor of the motion. This is  
11 Step Two of the previous motion, with the passing of  
12 the first motion, and this - this allows all those  
13 expectations that I was mentioning earlier around  
14 redundancy, and actually redundant, redundant systems.  
15 So I urge you to pass this, because it will close the  
16 loop, and give a much more reliable system with these  
17 in there.  
18 In response to the testing and maintenance, we  
19 have the expectation within 110 anyways that you test  
20 anything per manufacturer's recommendations. So that  
21 is not as big of an issue that exists that, that some  
22 people may say. So this is Step Two of really  
23 incorporating this fuel cell concept. I think it's  
24 essential we include this, to put those safeguards in  
25 place. It allows for those redundancies and, and

Page 120

1 backup systems that - that in my opinion have the  
2 potential to be better than generators. Please vote  
3 for this motion. Thank you.  
4 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone  
5 Seven, please.  
6 MARTY HUIE: Marty Huie, Jacobs Engineering  
7 Group, speaking in opposition. We just heard the  
8 submitter of the motion make a comment, 'when this  
9 fails' or, 'when/if one fails'. How we - how do we  
10 know that M-plus one works, that M-plus on-e is  
11 suitable. Should it be M-plus two? We don't know  
12 that, because the proper testing is not in place. I  
13 think this is a good step, but at the same time, we  
14 still don't know what it is. And I certainly don't  
15 want to put my body, or a loved one's body on a table,  
16 knowing this is in place.  
17 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone  
18 Three, please.  
19 JIM PETERKIN: Jim Peterkin, speaking -  
20 speaking on behalf of the Healthcare Section, in favor  
21 of the motion. The Healthcare Section Board and  
22 membership met yesterday and voted to support this  
23 motion. I think the arguments pretty much have  
24 already been made. I think this second part is  
25 necessary, since we've already accepted the previous

Page 121

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

<p>1 motion; and I won't take up any more of your time. 2 Thank you. 3 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone 4 Three, please. 5 DAVE DAGENAIS: Dave Dagenais, speaking on 6 behalf of myself, in favor of the motion. I just want 7 to address those comments around failure. I've been 8 in - I've been in healthcare for over 28 years, and I 9 have multiple generators within my facility; and any 10 given day, that generator could fail. That is just as 11 much as a risk as a fuel cell technology, except the 12 fuel cell technology gives me redundancies, and it 13 operates 24/7. So the reality is, is I don't have to 14 worry about whether it's going to start during a power 15 failure, because it's already running. It will 16 provide a much quicker, has the potential to provide a 17 much faster transfer, much more reliable, and this 18 also indicates you also have to have the ability to 19 have a, a, another means of, of backup - like a diesel 20 generator. So the redundancy and the failure rate is 21 not an issue. This is more reliable than generators. 22 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Is there any 23 further discussion on Motion 110-2, to Accept Public 24 Comment Number - oh, excuse me. Microphone Three. 25 RON BRIGEL: Ron Brigel with Mazzetti, for the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 122</p>	<p>1 have any final comment? 2 JAMES GREGORY: Thank you. I believe I've made 3 the position of the Technical Committee clear, and I 4 don't need to say anything else. Thank you. 5 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Okay. Thank you. Before we 6 vote, let me restate the motion. The motion on the 7 floor to is - is to Accept Public Comment Number Four. 8 To vote, touch the Vote button. If you wish to vote 9 in support of the motion, and recommend the text on 10 Screen One, touch Yes. If you wish to vote against 11 the motion, and recommend the text on Screen Two, 12 touch No. Please record your vote. The voting will 13 be closed in five seconds. The voting is closed. The 14 result of - the results of the vote is 331 in favor of 15 the motion; 45 against the motion. The motion passed. 16 Is there any further discussion on NFPA 110? 17 Seeing none, we'll move on to the next document. 18 Thank you, Mr. Gregory. 19 The last report under consideration that is of 20 the Committee on Signaling Systems for the Protection 21 of Life and Property. Here to present the Committee 22 Report is Correlating Committee Chair Merton Bunker, 23 of Lewis Berger, Stafford, Virginia. 24 The Committee's Report, that is the First and 25 Second Draft Report is located on the Document</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 124</p>
<p>1 motion. One thing I didn't mention before is, these 2 three items, they're actually in alignment with -- 3 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Oh -- 4 RON BRIGEL: -- NFPA -- 5 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: -- excuse me. I'm sorry, 6 for or against the motion? 7 RON BRIGEL: For - yeah, for the motion. 8 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Okay. 9 RON BRIGEL: These three items are, are in 10 alignment with NFPA 70, and NFPA 99. They're not 11 straying from them whatsoever. So obviously, I got, 12 I got ticked on the 'when they fail' - this is when, if 13 there is an internal failure of one of the cells, the 14 system is always online. Generators often fail. They 15 fail to start. They don't - they can't even serve the 16 load. The fuel cells are serving the load from Day 17 One, and they're always serving your emergency load. 18 It's a very different system. If, if there is a 19 failure in, in one of the cells, it's already backed 20 up. It's, it's just - there's no way it's going to 21 have the same issues that generators have in trying to 22 get started. Thank you. 23 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Is there any 24 further discussion on Motion 110-2, to Accept Public 25 Comment Number Four? Seeing none, Mr. Gregory, do you</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 123</p>	<p>1 Information Page for NFPA 72, on the NFPA website. 2 All Certified Amending Motions are contained in the 3 NFPA Technical Meeting (Tech Session) Agenda, and will 4 be displayed behind me on the screen as they are under 5 debate. 6 We have four Chairs of the Signaling System 7 Committees that due to tenure policy, will be stepping 8 down as Chairs. They are Lawrence Delair (phonetic), 9 Chair of the Single and Multiple Station Alarms and 10 Household Systems; Daniel O'Connor, Chair of the 11 Initiating Devices for Fire Alarm and Signaling 12 Systems; Warren Olsen, Supervisor - Supervising 13 Station Fire Alarm and Signaling Systems; and J. 14 Jeffrey Moore, Chair of the Testing and Maintenance of 15 Fire Alarm and Signaling Systems. I'd like to express 16 our thanks to these gentlemen for their leadership of 17 these committees. We will proceed in the order of the 18 motions as included in the Agenda. Mr. Bunker. 19 MERTON BUNKER: Thank you. Mr. Chair, ladies 20 and gentlemen, the Report of the Committees on 21 Signaling Systems for the Protection of Life and 22 Property is presented for adoption, and can be found 23 in the First Draft Report and in the Second Draft 24 Report for the 2018 Annual Revision Cycle. The 25 Technical Committees have published a First and Second</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 125</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

<p>1 Draft Report consisting of revisions to NFPA 72, 2 National Fire Alarm and Signaling Code. These reports 3 were submitted to letter ballot of the responsible 4 Correlating and Technical Committees. The report and 5 ballots can - results can be found on the Next Edition 6 tab of the Document Information Page for NFPA 72 at 7 www.nfpa.org/72next. 8 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Now, let's 9 proceed with the discussion on <b>Certified Amending</b> 10 <b>Motions on NFPA 72</b>. I'm looking for - Microphone Three, 11 please. 12 SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: Thank you. I'm Sagiv 13 Weiss-Ishai, with the San Francisco Fire Department, 14 and my - I move to Accept Public Comment Number 386 15 and 387, as a Group Amended Motion. 16 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. There's a motion 17 on the floor to Accept Public Comments Number 386 and 18 387. Is there a second? 19 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 20 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 21 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: We do have a second. Please 22 proceed with a discussion on the motion. 23 SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: Okay. So the intent of 24 this motion is basically - it's the body of the Code, 25 Section 18.4.2.1, and the Annex to this section,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 126</p>	<p>1 to say that when we have an evacuation, we need to 2 have a Temporal-3 code, because people are leaving the 3 building. When we have a relocation, people do not 4 leave the building, and they just relocate within the 5 building to a different area. 6 Therefore, there should be different tones for 7 these two signals. The intent of this motion is to 8 fix the conflict. Now, if a certain AHJ wants to 9 require to have Temporal-3 tone on an evacuation 10 message, or on a relocation message, that's okay, but 11 that's moved to the Annex. So that's why we group 12 these two section - section - the, the, the body, and 13 the Annex into one motion, and it has a permissive 14 language in the Annex for a specific AHJ on a case by 15 case, to require Temporal-3 for relocation, but not in 16 the body of the Code. Thank you. 17 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Mr. Bunker, 18 would you like to offer the Committee's position? 19 MERTON BUNKER: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 20 I'd like to call on Mr. Lowrey, Chairman of the 21 Technical Committee on Notification Appliances to give 22 us some insight from the Committee. 23 DAVE LOWREY: Dave Lowrey, Technical Chair of 24 Chapter 18 Notification. The Committee rejected this 25 at Committee meeting, basically on the fact that the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 128</p>
<p>1 A.18.4.2.1. Right now there is a conflict within the 2 document. NFPA 72 has a conflict between Chapter 18 3 and Chapter 24, and the intent of this motion is to 4 fix this motion - this - to fix this conflict. The 5 conflict is like that - Chapter 18 right now, 6 currently, has the language that says if we have a 7 alarm signal, the alarm audible signal pattern used to 8 notify building occupants of the need to evacuate, 9 (leave the building, or relocate) - and it says from 10 one area to another - which means when they're 11 relocating, they don't leave the building; they just 12 relocate within the building - then it says, 'shall be 13 the standard alarm evacuation signal considered of 14 three (unintelligible) temporal pattern.' So Chapter 15 18 requires - it choose the words 'shall be' - 16 Temporal-3 tone for both evacuation, and relocation 17 messages. When you go to Section 24.4.8.3 -- 18 MALE SPEAKER: Yeah. 19 SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: -- this is the conflict 20 right there. It says, 'Under a fire condition where 21 the system is used to transmit relocation instruction, 22 or other fire emergency, known evacuation messages, a 23 one-second to three-second alert, and followed by the 24 message, shall be provided.' 25 So this is a conflict right now. The intent is</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 127</p>	<p>1 Temporal-3 is designated by ANSI as a Leave the Area 2 signal, and it's specifically allowed for relocation. 3 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. With that, we'll 4 open up the debate on the motion. Please provide your 5 name and affiliation, and whether you're speaking in 6 support, or against the motion. Microphone Two, 7 please. 8 L.J. DELAIR (phonetic): Thank you. My name is 9 L.J. Lair. I'm the Fire Marshal at the Architect of 10 the Capitol, and I'm speaking against the motion. 11 Temporal-3 pattern is a recognizable signal for 12 evacuation due to fire. In addition, the reality is 13 that fire alarm systems are often used to effect other 14 emergency actions from threats other than fire. 15 Strategies for building egress often include 16 relocation from one area to another. Fire alarm 17 systems, particularly those using notification 18 appliances other than loudspeakers, normally have only 19 one option for a notification signal. By deleting the 20 text related to the relocation, designers, building 21 owners, and emergency planners would be limited in 22 their evacuation and relocation options. This would 23 pose particular challenges in existing facilities. If 24 owners are unable to afford to upgrade their fire 25 alarm system to provide a unique signal, they would</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 129</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

1 have their options for modifying emergency plans  
2 restricted. Furthermore, providing additional signals  
3 would complicate occupant emergency training.  
4 Providing a signal notification signal for occupation  
5 - occupants to evacuate or leave an area simplifies  
6 and reinforces emergency training and education. I  
7 urge you to reject the motion.  
8 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone  
9 Seven.  
10 RAY GRILL: Ray Grill with Air Up, Fire  
11 Protection Engineer, and I'm a long time member of  
12 Notification Appliances, Chapter 18, and a past Chair.  
13 I also serve on Chapter 24 Emergency Communication  
14 Systems. So to reinforce what Mr. Delair (phonetic)  
15 just noted - the reason we incorporated that --  
16 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Excuse me.  
17 RAY GRILL: -- a Temporal-3 --  
18 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Are you speaking for, or  
19 against the motion?  
20 RAY GRILL: I'm speaking against the motion.  
21 Yeah. Thank you.  
22 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Yeah.  
23 RAY BRILL: The reason the, the Committee - one  
24 of the reasons the Committee incorporated the  
25 Temporal-3 tone as a pre-alert for even a relocation

Page 130

1 is to get people moving. You know, we want people to  
2 get trained in the standard evacuation signal. And  
3 when people hear that signal, we want people to start  
4 moving, start evacuating the area- so that, that's  
5 really the biggest reason.  
6 Regarding the conflict in Chapter 24, I don't  
7 disagree with Sagiv on that. I think Chapter 24  
8 should be fixed.  
9 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone  
10 Three, please.  
11 SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: Sagiv Weiss-Ishai, San  
12 Francisco Fire Department. I'm speaking in favor of  
13 the motion. So to answer Ray and the other person -  
14 so the Annex allows a specific AHJ which has an old  
15 system, to, to have a Temporal-3 for relocation. Most  
16 of the new system have the option to either have  
17 relocation with a, with a steady tone; or the, or to  
18 have a Temporal-3. That's not the issue. The issue  
19 is that when the Committee responds that relocation  
20 means leave the area, this is not correct, or it's not  
21 complete, because you don't just leave the area - you  
22 staying in the building. This is different than  
23 leaving the building to the outside of the building.  
24 This must be solved. There is a conflict in the Code  
25 right now, and the motion will fix the problem - just

Page 131

1 in Chapter 18. You don't need to do anything to  
2 Chapter 24. If we accept this motion today, this  
3 problem will be resolved. Again, for the person that  
4 spoke before - if you have an issue in a specific  
5 building with an old system that doesn't have the  
6 capability, that's okay. For that building, you can  
7 have a Temporal-3. But you don't have to do it for  
8 all the system that have the capability to do that.  
9 Thank you.  
10 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone One,  
11 please.  
12 JOHN KEPUS: John Kepus with Coffman Engineers,  
13 speaking on behalf of myself, and in support of the  
14 motion. I agree with Sagiv on this, for a number of  
15 measures. One, we're talking about requirements for  
16 existing buildings versus new buildings. We're  
17 referring to a general tone, which as we've seen when  
18 we talk about CO alarm evacuation, we're expecting  
19 people to count four pulse Temporal-4 to evacuate,  
20 versus Temporal-3. I think the key here is to ensure  
21 that we have the right signals for the right  
22 application; and whether or not it's - relocation is  
23 different from evacuation. And then we get into the  
24 signaling, or the pre-signals, when we are combining  
25 this with mass notification. On those bases, I vote

Page 132

1 in support of this motion.  
2 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone  
3 Three, please.  
4 STEVEN LEWIS: Yes. My name is Steven Lewis.  
5 I also serve on Chapter 18, but I'm representing  
6 myself today. Been in the industry over --  
7 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Are you speaking for --  
8 STEVEN LEWIS: -- 20 --  
9 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: -- or against the motion?  
10 STEVEN LEWIS: For the motion. Thank you.  
11 Been in the industry 25 years, and I agree with John,  
12 and also Sagiv, and having seen buildings evacuate,  
13 and they - and what happens, I - it's confusing, and I  
14 think this is the way to go to prevent issues.  
15 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Is there any  
16 further discussion on the Motion 72-1, to Accept  
17 Public Comments 386 and 387? Not seeing any - Mr.  
18 Chair, do you have any final comments?  
19 MERTON BUNKER: I stand by the work of the  
20 Committee. Otherwise, I have no comment. Thank you.  
21 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Before we vote,  
22 let me restate the motion. The motion on the floor is  
23 to Accept Public Comments Number 386 and 387. To  
24 vote, touch the Vote button. If you wish to vote in  
25 support of the motion, and recommend the text on

Page 133

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

1 Screen One, touch Yes. If you wish to vote against  
2 the motion, and recommend the text on Screen Two, vote  
3 No - touch No. Please record your vote. The voting  
4 will be closed in five seconds. The voting is closed.  
5 The results of the vote are 262 in favor of the  
6 motion; 176 against the motion. The motion passed.  
7 Now, let's proceed with the discussion on  
8 **Certified Amending Motion 72-2.** Microphone Three,  
9 please.  
10 SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: Thank you. Sagiv Weiss-  
11 Ishai, with San Francisco Fire Department. I move to  
12 Accept Public Comment Number 388.  
13 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. There is a  
14 motion on the floor to Accept Public Comment Number  
15 388. Is there a second?  
16 MALE SPEAKER: Second.  
17 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: We do have a second. Please  
18 proceed with the discussion on the motion.  
19 SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: Okay. So the - this  
20 motion, the intent is to prohibit automatic cutoff of  
21 fire alarm evacuation signal. This is unsafe. It is  
22 unsafe to have fire alarm signal going for a, a pre-  
23 assigned time, in this case, 186 - 180 seconds, and  
24 then automatically shut down. This is unsafe. What  
25 happens when people are evacuating the building, they

Page 134

1 go to the outside of the building, and the - and the  
2 evacuation time is unknown. All kinds of things can  
3 happen during the evacuation. So even if you set the  
4 time - you do an analysis, said, 'This building should  
5 evacuate within five minutes,' and you said the fire  
6 alarm signal will stop after five minutes  
7 automatically, it might not happen. People might be  
8 still evacuating, and the people that - who are  
9 already evacuated and staying outside, waiting for the  
10 Fire Department to arrive, they might come back into  
11 the building when the system stop the signal. This is  
12 unsafe.  
13 So the proposal is to say, to eliminate the -  
14 to, to eliminate the, this automatic cutoff from the,  
15 from the Code, and basically said only the  
16 firefighter, or the response - or the responding  
17 emergency personnel can manually reset the system and  
18 silence the system when they've verified that  
19 everything is safe. Now, if a specific AHJ, on a  
20 specific jurisdiction, would like to have an automatic  
21 cutoff after whatever time, for whatever reason,  
22 that's okay. Do it on a, on a case by case basis, on  
23 a specific whatever. But in the body of the Code that  
24 we are approving, or we are publishing, the safest  
25 condition needs to be. And this is not to allow an

Page 135

1 automatic cutoff of fire alarm evacuation signal.  
2 Thank you.  
3 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Mr. Bunker,  
4 would you like to offer the Committee's position?  
5 MERTON BUNKER: I'd like to call on Mr. Lowrey.  
6 DAVE LOWREY: Dave Lowrey, Technical Chair,  
7 Chapter 18, Notification. So this proposal was  
8 rejected at the Committee at the, at the meeting  
9 stage. This is - I don't know how long this has been  
10 in the document. It has been there a very long time.  
11 I didn't trace it back all the way. This is basically  
12 a design option that basically says that your fire  
13 alarm has to run for 180 seconds. It is allowed to  
14 shut off after that, depending on if it's, if,  
15 basically that's the design option, and approved by  
16 the authority having jurisdiction. It's like he said  
17 - if the authority says, 'You can't shut it off after  
18 180 seconds. It must run until we show up,' then  
19 that's what it has to do. But it's simply a design  
20 option that's been in there that allows for certain  
21 occupancies to say after three minutes we can go ahead  
22 and have it silence itself. And, and as said, if  
23 that's acceptable through the authority having  
24 jurisdiction, then, then it can happen.  
25 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. With that, we'll

Page 136

1 open up the debate on the motion. Please provide your  
2 name, affiliation, and whether you're speaking in  
3 support, or against the motion. Microphone One,  
4 please.  
5 JOHN KEPUS: John Kepus with Coffman Engineers,  
6 representing myself on this, and speaking for the  
7 motion. I'd like to get a little history behind this.  
8 In 1996 and 1999 editions of NFPA 72, we had similar  
9 language regarding a five minute duration for alarm  
10 notification appliances. In the 2002 edition, that  
11 five minute cutoff was eliminated. The substantiation  
12 for accepting the proposal included that this could  
13 cause the occupants to perceive that they have been  
14 exposed to a nuisance alarm, and not take action to  
15 evacuate. And I suggest that the Committee members  
16 refer to Comment 72-100, in the A-2002 ROP and ROC for  
17 Comments; and the Committee Action on 1-5.4.8. Alarm  
18 signal deactivation was addressed again in the 2002  
19 edition, under Section 4.4.3.7, leading to debate  
20 regarding the fundamentals, or in the Fundamentals  
21 Committee, regarding the age old argument of disabling  
22 the audible, and keeping the visual appliances active.  
23 We know where that led to.  
24 In the 2007 edition of this Code, the section  
25 was further modified to include Section 4.4.3.7.2,

Page 137

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

1 which states that when an alarm signal deactivation  
2 means is actuated, both audible and visual appliances  
3 shall be simultaneously deactivated. Annex material  
4 further stated that the intent of both visual and  
5 audible appliance are to shut off when the signal  
6 silence feature is activated on the fire alarm control  
7 unit. There was no changes in 2010; and in 2016 - if  
8 there is a need to shut off the notification  
9 appliances, then the intent was to have something on  
10 the exterior of the building.  
11 But let's go back to 4.4.3.7 initially, and it  
12 provided a means to manually do this, not an automatic  
13 shutoff. It is therefore - I agree with Sagiv on this  
14 - it is an unsafe condition to do an automatic  
15 shutoff. The Code already has the provisions in it  
16 for manual means to control this activation. Thank  
17 you.  
18 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone  
19 Three, please.  
20 DAN FINNEGAN: Hi. Good afternoon. Dan  
21 Finnegan of Siemens Building Technologies; also a  
22 member of the AFAA Board of Directors, and former Fire  
23 Code official, speaking for myself. And I'm speaking  
24 in support of the motion. And I'm not going to repeat  
25 the Code references that we just heard. That was a

Page 138

1 good, historic statement. I'm going to leave us with  
2 the message of - please support this CAM, because it's  
3 the right thing to do. Nowhere in our history of fire  
4 life safety with a fire alarm system have we ever  
5 designed anything to automatically shut off. We need  
6 to have personal interface, and personal action to  
7 take place. So this idea of an automatic shutoff of  
8 an alarm signal is a bad move to take. If this CAM  
9 corrects that, then we're in good shape. Please  
10 support the CAM. Thank you.  
11 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone  
12 Three, please.  
13 SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: Sagiv Weiss-Ishai, San  
14 Francisco Fire Department, speaking in favor of the  
15 motion. So I just wanted to say - to, to state what  
16 the Committee response was when they rejected the  
17 proposal. They said that the intent is to allow a  
18 system to be designed and accepted by the AHJ, even an  
19 automatic cutoff provided, it repeats at least for at  
20 least 180 second. This allows the AHJ to review and  
21 approve or reject such plan. If the AHJ requires that  
22 only emergency personnel stop the notification  
23 appliance, they should reject and propose automatic  
24 cutoff, and pass a law or regulation stating the  
25 requirement for their jurisdiction. I'm an AHJ, and I

Page 139

1 don't want to do that. I don't want to pass a law  
2 regulation to - not about this. I want the Code to  
3 have the safest language. If an AHJ would want to do  
4 an automatic cutoff, they need to pass the law or  
5 regulation to allow that. So I want to reverse the  
6 logic of the Committee. Thank you.  
7 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone  
8 Three, please.  
9 STEVEN LEWIS: Yes, my name is Steven Lewis,  
10 serve on Chapter 18, but speaking on behalf of myself  
11 today. And I'm for the motion.  
12 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you.  
13 STEVEN LEWIS: And let me just state, living in  
14 San Francisco with all the multi-culturalists we have,  
15 and the people, and all the different communities, I  
16 can see this is a real issue, having been in a number  
17 of these high rise buildings, and seeing how buildings  
18 have - is evacuated. I think it completely needs to  
19 be up to the authority having jurisdiction, and, and  
20 not put restraints on, on time. Thank you.  
21 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Okay. Thank you. Is there  
22 any further discussion on Motion 72-2 to Accept Public  
23 Comment Number 388? Mr. Chair, any final comments?  
24 MERTON BUNKER: I have nothing, Sir.  
25 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Before we vote, let me

Page 140

1 restate the motion. The motion on the floor is to  
2 Accept Public Comment Number 388. To vote, touch the  
3 Vote button. If you wish to vote in support of the  
4 motion, and recommend the text on Screen One, touch  
5 Yes. If you wish to vote against the motion, and  
6 recommend the text on Screen Two, touch No. Please  
7 record your vote. The voting will close in five  
8 seconds. Voting is closed. The results of the vote  
9 are 396 in favor of the motion; 42 against the motion.  
10 The motion passes.  
11 Now, let's proceed with the discussion on **Certified**  
12 **Amending Motion 72-3**; and Microphone Three, please.  
13 SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: Sagiv Weiss-Ishai, San  
14 Francisco Fire Department. I move to Accept Public  
15 Comment Number 389.  
16 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. There is a  
17 motion on the floor to Accept Public Comment Number  
18  
19 389. Is there a second?  
20 MALE SPEAKER: Second.  
21 MALE SPEAKER: Second.  
22 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: We do have a second. Please  
23 proceed with the discussion on the motion.  
24 SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: Okay. The intent of this  
25 motion is - it's - I can say, pretty procedural; like,

Page 141

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018



<p>1 NFPA, throughout the document, using the, the language 2 of - let me see - of a - an enforcing agency and other 3 regulation, and all that stuff. So what happened on 4 this, on this motion is within this Section, 5 18.4.11.3, which is related to ADSes, they basically, 6 they took the AHJ out of this requirement. They said 7 basically ADS - AHJs are not allowed to determine if a 8 specific ADS is intelligible or not. 9 And the following section, right after this 10 section, has the language that AHJ is allowed to 11 assign ADSes. So it's kind of inconsistent, the 12 language today, and I don't understand the intent, why 13 an AHJ - why I cannot say if a specific area ADS in 14 the building will be intelligible or not intelligible, 15 or require to be intelligible, or not intelligible. 16 If other governing laws, or codes, or whatever can 17 allow it, also the AHJ should be allowed to determine 18 if a specific AHJ - if a specific ADS will be 19 intelligible, or not. So I encourage you to vote in 20 favor of this motion to put the AHJ language back, 21 back in the Code. 22 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Mr. Bunker, 23 would you like to offer the Committee's position? 24 MERTON BUNKER: I'd like to call on Mr. Lowrey 25 once again.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 142</p>	<p>1 voting will close in five seconds. The voting is 2 closed. The results of the vote are 166 in favor, 265 3 against. The motion fails. 4 Now let's proceed with the discussion on 5 <b>Certified Amending Motion 72-4</b>. Microphone Three, 6 please. 7 SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: Sagiv Weiss-Ishai, San 8 Francisco Fire Department. I move to Accept Public 9 Comment Number 155 and 156, as a Group Amending 10 Motion. 11 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. There is a 12 motion on the floor to Accept Public Comment Numbers 13 155 and 156. Is there a second? 14 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 15 MALE SPEAKER: Second. 16 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: We do have a second. Please 17 proceed with the discussion on the motion. 18 SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: Okay. So this motion is 19 basically to remove and delete Section 18.11 from the 20 body of the Code, and also its associated Annex, 21 A.18.11. So what happen is that in the 22 (unintelligible) Committee, there is a Section 21.5. 23 21.5 is a section for Fire Service Access Elevator. 24 This, under the 2016 edition, this was the only 25 section in the entire document that refers back to</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 144</p>
<p>1 DAVE LOWREY: Dave Lowrey, Technical Chair, 2 Chapter 18, Notification. So the, the Committee felt 3 that the requirement for intelligibility should follow 4 on the adopted codes and standards within that 5 jurisdiction, and then fall in line with the design 6 documents. The, the - the - Sagiv is right, that the 7 next section down then allows the AHJ to either 8 approve that acoustically distinguishable space of 9 having - having intelligibility or not having 10 intelligibility. 11 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. With that, we'll 12 open up the debate on the motion. Please provide your 13 name, and affiliation, and whether you're speaking in 14 support, or against the motion. I am not seeing 15 anybody at a microphone. Is there any further 16 discussion on Motion 72-3 to Accept Public Comment 17 389? I'm going to move straight to the vote. I don't 18 think there's any reason for final comments. 19 So before we vote, let me restate the motion. 20 The motion on the floor is to Accept Public Comment 21 Number 389. To vote, touch the Vote button. If you 22 wish to vote in support of the motion, and recommend 23 the text on Screen One, touch Yes. If you wish to 24 vote against the motion and recommend the text on 25 Screen Two, touch No. Please record your vote. The</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 143</p>	<p>1 Section 18.11. And basically it says if you have a, 2 if you have a Fire Service access elevator, you need 3 to have a standard interface annunciator, in 4 accordance with 18.11. Now, for two cycle of the 5 Codes previously to the 2016 edition, there was an 6 associated Standard, SB-30 for standard interface 7 annunciator. However, nobody knew what it was; nobody 8 saw the product that has this incorporated elevator 9 features, and fire alarm features, and it just 10 confusing the AHJ. Therefore, the SB-30 reference in 11 the Annex was removed from the Code. However, 18.11 12 still stand in the Code, with no associated Standard. 13 What we did in the 2019 edition to fix that, we 14 eliminated the reference that goes back from Fire 15 Service elevator annunciator, back to 18.11. So that 16 got removed. So right now, if you look in the 2019 17 edition, there is no reference in any section of the 18 entire Code that goes back to Section 18.11. 19 Therefore, this section should be deleted, should be 20 removed, including its associated Annex. It will 21 prevent confusion, and help AHJ to enforce the new 22 21.5 requirement. Thank you. 23 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Mr. Bunker, 24 would you like to offer the Committee's position? 25 MERTON BUNKER: I'm going to call on Mr. Lowrey</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 145</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

1 one last time.  
2 DAVE LOWREY: Thank you.  
3 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: MR. Lowrey, please.  
4 DAVE LOWREY: You knew my name?  
5 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: I did.  
6 DAVE LOWREY: All right. Dave Lowrey,  
7 Technical Chair, Chapter 18, Notification. So the  
8 Committee rejected this, just based on the fact that  
9 it's - the authority having jurisdictions, which could  
10 be the owner or a facility complex, chooses to have a  
11 standard interface, meaning they could - they could  
12 pick a particular brand if they wanted to; they could  
13 - a specific control unit; maybe a, a specific  
14 interface. It's intended for the user of those  
15 interfaces. It was not - this section now has kind of  
16 evolved. It's not intended to mandate or establish a  
17 standard interface in the industry.  
18 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you, Mr. Lowrey. With  
19 that, we'll open up the debate on the motion. Please  
20 provide your name, and affiliation, whether you're  
21 speaking in support or against the motion. I'll start  
22 with Microphone Three, please.  
23 DAN FINNEGAN: Hi. Good afternoon. Dan  
24 Finnegan of Siemens Building Technologies, and at this  
25 time, I'm also speaking as a member of NIMA 3SB, and

Page 146

1 past Chair of the Manuals Committee, who was involved  
2 in the creation of what was the SB-30 document, I'm  
3 speaking in support of the CAM.  
4 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: All right. And --  
5 DAN FINNEGAN: And --  
6 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: I was going to get you there  
7 --  
8 DAN FINNEGAN: Yeah.  
9 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: -- one way or another.  
10 DAN FINNEGAN: Let's get that all out  
11 correctly. But yes, we were - the NIMA Organization  
12 created that SB-30 document, and that is where the  
13 need for this, you know, standard emergency system  
14 interface, came from, and why it was all put together.  
15 That SB-30 document no longer exists. It's been  
16 pulled out of this, of the Code, as Sagiv has  
17 mentioned, and we've seen that this reference has  
18 caused more confusion than it's caused value, when it  
19 comes popping up in there, because the requirements  
20 and the things it calls for here - there is no longer  
21 a Standard for anybody to build their manufacturer to.  
22 So I ask everyone to please support the CAM. Thank  
23 you.  
24 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Is there any  
25 further discussion on Motion 72-4, to Accept Public

Page 147

1 Comments Number 155 and 156? Mr. Bunker, do you have  
2 any final comments?  
3 MERTON BUNKER: No, Mr. Chairman, I can't add  
4 anything to that. Thank you.  
5 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Before we vote,  
6 let me restate the motion. The motion on the floor to  
7 - is to Accept Public Comments Number 155 and 156. To  
8 vote, touch the Vote button. If you wish to vote in  
9 support of the motion, and recommend the text on  
10 Screen One, touch Yes. If you wish to vote against  
11 the motion, and recommend the text on Screen Two,  
12 touch No. Please record your vote. The voting will  
13 close in five seconds. The voting is closed. The  
14 results of the motion are 357 in favor of the motion;  
15 70 against the motion. The motion has passed.  
16 Now let's proceed to the discussion of **Certified**  
17 **Amending Motion 72-5**.  
18 MALE SPEAKER: At your service, Sir.  
19 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Microphone Three, please.  
20 SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: Hi. Sagiv Weiss-Ishai, San  
21 Francisco Fire Department. I move to Accept Public  
22 Comment Number 458, and I promise this is the last one  
23 for today - mine.  
24 (laughter)  
25 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: I will hold you to that

Page 148

1 promise. There's a motion on the floor to Accept  
2 Public Comment Number 458. Is there a second?  
3 MALE SPEAKER: Second.  
4 MALE SPEAKER: Second.  
5 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: We do have a second. Please  
6 proceed with the discussion on the motion.  
7 SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: Okay. So this NITMAM is  
8 for Section 24.48.31, which is basically very, very  
9 similar, almost identical to the one that we just did  
10 before with the automatic cutoff of the 180 second.  
11 So this is almost identical concept. What Section  
12 24.48.31 is saying, that if you have a voice message -  
13 so if I have a voice fire alarm system, even an  
14 automatic, prerecorded voice message, so there is a -  
15 the cycle of the message is basically, it's the pre-  
16 alert tone, either the Temporal-3, or the other tones,  
17 and then the pre-recorded message. What's this  
18 section is saying, that this sequence has to continue  
19 at least three times; but basically, after three  
20 cycles, what - what you can see from this section  
21 today, after three cycles, potentially, you can  
22 automatically shut down the, the, the announcement.  
23 And this is wrong. Again, it's the same as like the  
24 180 second. We don't want to allow for an automatic  
25 shutdown of an evacuation signal. This is unsafe.

Page 149

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

1 So with that, the, the proposal is to eliminate  
2 this at least three time, and have only the responding  
3 firefighters to have, to allow them to - to manually  
4 silence or reset the system, but don't have this  
5 automatic option - very similar to the one, to the one  
6 with the 180 second; this is just for a voice system.  
7 So I urge you to vote for this motion. Thank you.  
8 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Mr. Bunker,  
9 would you like to offer the Committee's position?  
10 MERTON BUNKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The  
11 Chair of the Committee, Mr. Coffwell (phonetic) is  
12 unable to be here, so I'm going to ask the Secretary  
13 of the Committee, Dan Finnegan, to please come up and  
14 explain what the Committee has done. Thank you.  
15 DAN FINNEGAN: Thank you, Sir. Yes. The  
16 Technical Committee for Chapter 24 did review this,  
17 and voted against the action at that time, and felt  
18 that there really wasn't substantial clarification on  
19 an issue that needed to be resolved. Thank you.  
20 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. With that, we'll  
21 open up the debate on the motion. Please provide your  
22 name, affiliation, and whether you're speaking in  
23 support, or against the motion. Oh, I'm sorry. You -  
24 Microphone Five.  
25 PETE LARIMER: Yes. Thank you. My name's Pete

Page 150

1 Larimer. I'm with the Department of Veterans Affairs,  
2 and I'm against the motion. In, in hospitals, we use  
3 this provision all the time. So we generate a tone  
4 alert to notify staff, and then we initiate a message  
5 to the staff. Actually, in the zone of alarm, we use  
6 the temporal pattern so that the staff only has to  
7 listen to the message to know that the fire is in  
8 their alarm, and they should be starting to evacuate  
9 patients. However, we also send out simultaneously,  
10 an alert message to the other folks in the building to  
11 let them know where the fire is, and that they would -  
12 should respond to that location to help assist in  
13 relocating patients. There's no reason to continue to  
14 make noise that interferes with the staff  
15 communications, when they're trying to help other  
16 folks in, in that assistance.  
17 This is for relocation. It's not for  
18 evacuation of the building. So the reason that you  
19 can shut it down after three times is because staff  
20 has already been alerted, and then they perform their  
21 functions that they're supposed to be doing. There's  
22 no reason to continue to have noise in the background  
23 that will interfere with what they're supposed to do.  
24 Thank you.  
25 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone

Page 151

1 Three, please.  
2 TED LEVENTHAL: Okay. My name is Ted  
3 Leventhal. I am a member of 24, but I'm speaking,  
4 being - on, on my own behalf. I think this type of  
5 control --  
6 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: And are you speaking for or  
7 against the --  
8 TED LEVENTHAL: Oh --  
9 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: -- motion?  
10 TED LEVENTHAL: -- for - I'm sorry. I thought  
11 I mentioned that. I think this should remain non-  
12 automatically shut off. In the situation that was  
13 just brought up, which is hospital, they're a unique  
14 being on their own, and the requirements may have to  
15 be addressed, and the AHJ can address that with the  
16 facility. So again, I am for the motion as presented.  
17 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone Four,  
18 please.  
19 TOM PARRISH: Tom Parrish, Putnam Township Fire  
20 Department. I'm also a member of the Committee, but  
21 I'm speaking for myself right now. And if you read  
22 the text on the screen, which is the same text in the  
23 Code, it --  
24 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Are you speaking for or  
25 against the motion?

Page 152

1 TOM PARRISH: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm speaking  
2 against the motion. It says that it must be repeated  
3 at least three times. It doesn't say three times and  
4 stop. I've done many systems where we've had,  
5 actually, have voice in multiple languages, and we  
6 want to make sure that it got repeated enough times in  
7 each language to convey the message. A lot of times,  
8 you'll have the alert tone, and then, you know - think  
9 about overhead messages in a lot of retail places, how  
10 many times do you tune it out, and maybe you need to  
11 hear it a second or third time until you can actually  
12 understand, 'I've got to listen to it this time.' So  
13 there's nothing in the provision or Code that says  
14 it's going to play three times and stop. It says it's  
15 going to play at least three times. And this will  
16 also keep somebody who could possibly be standing in  
17 front of a panel or an annunciator from hitting  
18 Silence immediately, before they even have time to  
19 investigate whether or not there is an issue there.  
20 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone  
21 Three, please.  
22 SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: Sagiv Weiss-Ishai, San  
23 Francisco Fire Department, speaking in favor of the  
24 motion. So I want to answer Peter, and the last  
25 speaker. NFPA 72 is not a Code for a healthcare, or

Page 153

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

<p>1 for a, a hospital. It's for any facility. And again, 2 if you want to do something on a specific jurisdiction 3 or in specific facility, just do it. But you can't 4 make it for everything. This is unsafe. 5 To answer to the last speaker, is the Code 6 right now said at least three times. So it can be 7 five time, or six time. But you can be ever sure that 8 everybody evacuated the building - let's say you 9 predetermined five times. Per the Code today is you 10 can shut down the message after five cycles, because 11 it says at least three times. So you can shut it down 12 after five cycles, automatically, because that's what 13 you determined. But you can never be sure that the 14 building completely evacuated. You can never be sure 15 that the people that are waiting outside for the Fire 16 Department will not come back in the building that 17 might be on the fire. This is unsafe condition. Only 18 the Fire Department should come, and manually reset 19 the panel after they made sure that the building is 20 safe. Thank you. 21 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone Four, 22 please. 23 MICHAEL PALLET (phonetic): Hello. Michael 24 Pallet, speaking against the motion, from Telecore 25 Incorporated, and also a member of the ECS Technical</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 154</p>	<p>1 on Chapter 18, but I am speaking on my, behalf of 2 myself, and I'm for the motion. 3 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. 4 STEVEN LEWIS: Again, I have to go back. We 5 had two motions before, very similar. I, I just hate 6 to see any control put into the Code. I would, I 7 would like to see this left up to the authority having 8 jurisdiction, emergency personnel. I just think if 9 one person was left in the building - we, we just 10 don't know. And I just don't want to see restrictions 11 put on this. 12 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone Five, 13 please. 14 PETE LARIMER: Thank you. Pete Larimer with 15 the VA again. I, I just want to make sure everybody 16 understands - this is not for evacuating. The message 17 that you're going to hear - this is under 24.4.8. 18 This is for partial relocation, or relocation within 19 the building. The message that you actually hear over 20 the system doesn't even tell anybody to evacuate. 21 And, and, and in our case, it might just be a Code 22 Red, or we often use, 'Nurse Blaze, please report to 23 Zone, Southeast on One,' - whatever it is. But it's 24 not going to tell anybody to leave the building. So 25 you can have it ringing all you want, or sounding all</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 156</p>
<p>1 Committee. The, the, the, the language that's being 2 proposed seems to suggest that this - the signal's 3 going to be continuous. That also presents problems 4 in areas other than hospitals - for example, schools, 5 where you have children that need to be organized to, 6 to successfully do the evacuation, or, or relocation. 7 There's also members of the disabled community - in 8 particular, people with autism that have an extremely 9 difficult time to get their bodies to do what they 10 need to do in the midst of loud, continuous signals 11 and, and instructions. 12 So I believe that in repeating the instructions 13 three times, that the occupants of the building, and 14 particularly the occupants of the building that are 15 responsible for helping others evacuate the building, 16 will understand the conditions. I think that we could 17 improve the language in the future to make sure that 18 it's clear to the authorities across the nation that 19 the intent isn't to continuously bombard the occupants 20 with verbal commands, without any reprieve in order to 21 organize themselves or others, to assist or help them 22 to evacuate, or relocate. Thank you. 23 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone 24 Three, please. 25 STEVEN LEWIS: Thank you. Steven Lewis, serve</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 155</p>	<p>1 you want, but the message won't tell anybody to leave 2 the facility. This has been used only to notify, as 3 it says, direct occupants, or to inform staff. So to 4 have it ring forever and ever, thinking that you're 5 going to make it safer because it's going to tell 6 people to evacuate the building - it's just not going 7 to happen. It's very different than what we were 8 talking about before - we were, where we were trying 9 to evacuate the building, and not stop the signal. We 10 are not evacuating the building with this message. 11 Thank you. 12 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. I'm going to go 13 to Microphone One, please. 14 JOHN KEPUS: John Kepus with Coffman Engineers, 15 speaking on my own behalf, for the motion. I think 16 the arguments that we've heard here are all related to 17 applications for private mode notification. That is 18 different than applications where it's public mode 19 notification. The importance of any message that has 20 an alert tone, followed by a message, repeating cycles 21 - what we don't want to see happen is it just stop, or 22 just have the alert tone play, and not the message. 23 Yes, for private mode, those people know what to do, 24 and maybe provisions need to be added into the Code 25 for private mode notification. But in cases for</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 157</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

1 relocation, or partial evacuation, it is important to  
2 continue to give those instructions until such time  
3 that those occupants that are capable of self-  
4 preservation have been able to go out and do what they  
5 need to do. So again, I vote in support of this  
6 motion. Thank you.  
7 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone  
8 Seven, please.  
9 TODD VANGORDER: Thank you. My name's Todd  
10 VanGorder with Silco Fire and Security, speaking  
11 against the motion. I'd like to point out a  
12 consideration that this Section 24 is, is dealing  
13 specifically with voice systems. These systems are  
14 going to be in hospitals, schools, places where  
15 continual instruction might need to be given.  
16 However, there's also the very real possibility that  
17 in an emergency situation, that building may be losing  
18 power. And if the system has been set up to just  
19 continually blare messages out, it could exhaust its  
20 backup power supply, and so by the time that the  
21 authorities get there, and then maybe need to use the  
22 microphone to make a special announcement, there's no  
23 longer power in the system to do so, because it's just  
24 been set to go over, and over, and over again. So I  
25 would urge consideration for accepting this, and

Page 158

1 actually would recommend going against the motion.  
2 Thank you.  
3 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone  
4 Three, please.  
5 SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: Sagiv Weiss-Ishai, San  
6 Francisco Fire Department, speaking in favor of the  
7 motion. Just to answer the gentleman who spoke before  
8 me - we have 900 high rises in San Francisco. Most of  
9 them have voice systems. This section that you see on  
10 the screen right now doesn't say relocation or partial  
11 evacuation. It talks about the sequence. So to  
12 answer Michael Pallet (phonetic), it - the sequence is  
13 the alert tone, and the pre-recorded message.  
14 MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.  
15 SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI: That's the sequence. It's  
16 not a continuous tone. It's a sequence of a, a tone,  
17 plus the message. And right now, this thing that you  
18 see on the screen allows you for, after three cycles,  
19 to shut it down automatically. Now, what we talking  
20 about? We talking about something that it's maybe a  
21 burden, maybe it's not a good feeling, versus  
22 something safe. So if the message plays, what's, -  
23 what's wrong with the message keep playing? The  
24 message keep playing. So some people, with the -  
25 burden them, or they feel unsafe, or whatever. It's -

Page 159

1 the - this is not the safest condition, because if you  
2 stop the message while people are evacuating or  
3 moving, and even if some people already outside the  
4 building, and you stop the message automatically, this  
5 is unsafe. The people who might be evacuate and  
6 relocate, they might stop; and the people that are  
7 already evacuated or moved, they might go back,  
8 because it stopped. This is unsafe. Making it burden  
9 so to - that they, they will not hear it for five  
10 minute, it might be burden them - that's okay.  
11 Firefighter will come after 10 minutes; they will take  
12 action; and they will reset the system if everything  
13 is safe. Thank you.  
14 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone Two,  
15 please.  
16 MARK PAVIKA (phonetic): Thank you. My name is  
17 Mark Pavika, a Product Manager for Siemens Fire  
18 Safety. So I'm a manufacturer's rep, and I'm here to  
19 say something against the motion. And I don't  
20 disagree with the idea that it's a bad idea to shut  
21 off notification. You're right. If you're still  
22 walking out of the building and things stop, people  
23 go, 'Was that a drill?' and they turn around, and they  
24 walk back.  
25 But let me convey something that some of my

Page 160

1 customers have expressed to me that they do. They  
2 often will ask me, 'Can you put a final tone after  
3 your messages?' And they ask - and I ask them why  
4 they do that, and they say, 'Well, because people  
5 always stop and think - is, is the message going to  
6 change this time?' And if it does, then they have to  
7 learn to do something different. But if they get  
8 immune to a constantly repeated signal, they won't  
9 notice if there's a different message. And today's  
10 day and age, messages change because the emergency  
11 changes. Think of an MNS (phonetic) event that  
12 happens after a fire event. Suddenly, you're going to  
13 have a different message that tells people to defend  
14 in place, rather than evacuate. Well, if they've  
15 already tuned out the message, they don't know to do  
16 that.  
17 When I read the code here, 'It shall be  
18 repeated until the system is silenced or reset,' -  
19 that means I can't play that final event tone, and  
20 then possibly change it if events change.  
21 MALE SPEAKER: Um-hmm.  
22 MARK PAVIKA (phonetic): So I agree, we  
23 shouldn't shut off notification. But I like that idea  
24 about being able to have a tone at the end, maybe a  
25 temporal tone, to keep people going, and have them pay

Page 161

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

1 attention if the message changes. Thank you.  
2 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone  
3 Seven, please.  
4 MARTY HUIE: Marty Huie, Jacobs Engineering  
5 Group, representing myself. The presenter just --  
6 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Are you speaking --  
7 MARTY HUIE: -- made a --  
8 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: -- for or against the --  
9 MARTY HUIE: Speaking against. The presenter  
10 just presented an argument that made me want to come  
11 up and speak. And that is the number of high rises  
12 they may have in San Francisco. With the present  
13 language that's being proposed, high rises, single  
14 story buildings, hospitals can't shunt the alarm at  
15 all until the Fire Department comes and shunts the  
16 alarm.  
17 The language that is being recommended by the  
18 Committee, the high rise fire - and the Fire Marshal  
19 would come to an agreement with that, saying you can't  
20 shunt it until such time we arrive. It says at least  
21 three times. So he made the argument - at three  
22 times, or it could be seven times - earlier. And that  
23 is the argument I'm bringing to the table. If it's -  
24 the Fire Marshal can - you can have both pieces. The  
25 Fire Marshal on this high rise can say it can - it

Page 162

1 cannot shut down. But if we take the proposed  
2 language, a hospital cannot shut down their alarm  
3 until such time the Fire Marshal arrives. It just  
4 seems like they're asking two different sides of the  
5 same coin. And within a hospital facility, we have  
6 Alzheimer's patients; we have patients that are  
7 heavily estated (phonetic), and if so, they are maybe  
8 not being attended to; a nurse is not there by their  
9 side; they might be addressing other things. And they  
10 start climbing out of their bed, and they fall, and we  
11 have major other issues that we're dealing with.  
12 Thank you.  
13 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone Four,  
14 please.  
15 MALE SPEAKER: I move to Call the Question.  
16 (applause)  
17 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: There's a motion on the  
18 floor to Call the Question.  
19 MALE SPEAKER: Second.  
20 MALE SPEAKER: Second.  
21 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: I notice that there are a  
22 number of people remaining at the microphone, waiting  
23 to speak. But we'll proceed with the vote on Call the  
24 Question. Do we have a second?  
25 MALE SPEAKER: Second.

Page 163

1 MALE SPEAKER: Second.  
2 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: We do have a second. In  
3 order to vote on this motion, please scroll down to  
4 the bottom of the tablet to vote. If you wish to vote  
5 in support of the motion, touch Yes. If you wish to  
6 vote against the motion, touch No. Again, you're just  
7 voting on the Call the Question issue. Please record  
8 your vote. Voting will be closed in five seconds.  
9 Voting is closed. The results are 418 in favor of  
10 calling the question; 17 against. The motion to Call  
11 the Question has passed. Therefore, we will move  
12 directly to the vote on the motion.  
13 Before we vote, let me restate the motion. The  
14 motion on the floor is to Accept Public Comment Number  
15 458. To vote, touch the Vote button. If you wish to  
16 vote in support of the motion, and recommend the text  
17 on Screen One, touch Yes. If you wish to vote against  
18 the motion, and recommend the text on Screen Two,  
19 touch No. Please record your vote. The voting will  
20 be closed in five seconds. The voting is closed. The  
21 results are 287 votes in favor of the motion; 160  
22 against. The motion has passed.  
23 Now let's proceed with the discussion on **Certified**  
24 **Amending Motion 72-6**. Microphone One, please.  
25

Page 164

1 RICHARD SIMPSON: Richard Simpson, Vector  
2 Security. Move to Accept Public Comment Number Six.  
3 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. There's a motion  
4 on the floor to Accept Public Comment Number Six. Is  
5 there a second?  
6 FEMALE SPEAKER: Second.  
7 MALE SPEAKER: Second.  
8 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: We do have a second. Please  
9 proceed with the discussion on the motion.  
10 RICHARD SIMPSON: Richard Simpson, speaking on  
11 behalf of Vector Security, in support of the motion.  
12 The removal of the modifier, 'where permitted by the  
13 AHJ' addresses the current imbalance of facilities as  
14 defined in Section 26.5.3. Facility types should be  
15 considered equivalent to each other. This proposed  
16 change accomplishes this. A listed central station,  
17 or supervising station is required to meet the  
18 following standards: UL 827, and UL 1981. 827  
19 identifies the physical requirements of the facility,  
20 and 1981 identifies the hardware and software  
21 associated with fire alarm signals. Once an  
22 organization meets the listing requirements, a  
23 contractual relationship exists between a NRTL, and  
24 the listed supervising station, to build, maintain,  
25 and operate in compliance with UL 827, Central Station

Page 165

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

<p>1 Services, and UL 1981. Mandatory annual site visits 2 are designed to ensure facilities adhere to the 3 contractual requirements of the listing. The initial 4 requirements and the ongoing audits provide a level of 5 security that exceeds the minimum requirements in the 6 Facilities Section, located in 26.5.3. Listed central 7 supervising station meet the requirements of listed as 8 defined in Section 3.2.5 of the 2016 NFPA 72 edition. 9 Exceeding the minimum requirements of the 10 Facilities Section of 26.5.3, and also meeting the 11 listed definitions should provide to the AHJ the 12 necessary requirements for the monitoring of remote 13 supervising station service. All listed central 14 supervising stations meet the same UL 827 and 1981 15 requirements. There are over 400 listed supervising 16 stations operating in the United States today. 17 I'm a Committee member of SIGHAL (phonetic) for 18 the last 18 years. Household Fire Chapter SIGHAL 19 filed the facilities requirements in Section 26.5.3 of 20 NFPA 72, 2016. In 2019, SIGHAL Committee accepted 21 public input, thereby removing the clause where 22 permitted by the AHJ, and now allows listed central 23 supervising stations to monitor household fire alarm 24 systems. The new language reads as follows: 'Alarm 25 supervisory in trouble signals shall be permitted to</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 166</p>	<p>1 to the Committee of the whole, that we not accept, 2 i.e. resolve the, the issue. Mr. Simpson's proponent 3 was allowed to speak at that, and did talk to the 4 Committee members. We appreciated his input on it. 5 And after that, the Committee voted 19 to 1 in favor 6 of rejecting the proposal. And keep in mind, on the 7 Committee there are, there are people that are on the 8 Committee that also provide central station 9 monitoring. So the -- 10 MALE SPEAKER: (unintelligible). 11 WARREN OLSEN: -- in the Public Comments state 12 for the Second Draft meeting, this came back to our 13 attention; the Committee looked at it again, and again 14 felt that the rules regulating remote supervising 15 station alarm stations are - were initially intended 16 for municipal monitoring of alarm signals, but where - 17 as the handbook says - where the municipality is 18 unwilling or unable to, the municipality or the AHJ is 19 permitted to use a listed central station, or any 20 other service. I don't remember any time during the 21 Committee that we said anything bad about listed 22 central stations, because clearly they provide a great 23 service, and are accepted under central station 24 monitoring - but 18 to 1 in the second vote, and - so 25 in both cases, we proposed to reject the submittals.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 168</p>
<p>1 be received at a listed central supervising station.' 2 In closing, NFPA 72, 2019 allows listed central 3 supervising stations to monitor central station 4 service alarm systems, build, design, and monitor 5 proprietary supervising station alarm systems, 6 household fire alarm systems, but requires AHJ 7 permission to monitor remote supervising station alarm 8 systems. Support of CAM 6 will resolve this 9 confusion. Vote in favor of this motion. Thank you. 10 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Mr. Bunker, 11 would you like to offer the Committee's position? 12 MERTON BUNKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 13 Warren Olsen, the Chair of the Technical Committee on 14 Supervising Station Systems has a statement to make. 15 Thank you. 16 WARREN OLSEN: I am Warren Olsen. I'm Chair of 17 Chapter 26 Supervising Station Alarm Systems. The 18 Committee took this submittal very serious. We, we 19 went through - some of us went through it in the 2016 20 cycle. And so we knew this was probably going to come 21 back, so we had a - spent a lot of time making sure 22 that we did a good job with this submittal that came 23 in. 24 So during the First Draft cycle, we had a task 25 group look at the proposal, and made a recommendation</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 167</p>	<p>1 Thank you. 2 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. With that, we'll 3 open up the debate on the motion. Please provide your 4 name, affiliation, and whether you're speaking in 5 support, or against the motion. Microphone Three, 6 please. 7 IVAN SPECTOR: Thank you. Good afternoon. My 8 name is Ivan Spector. I'm the current President of 9 the Monitoring Association, and I'm speaking in 10 support of the motion. There are a few relevant 11 points that I'd like to make. It is important to note 12 that while a listed supervising station can act as a 13 remote station, a remote station cannot act as a 14 listing supervising station. Our NRTL certification 15 is not an easy process. It take much planning, 16 investment, and determination. These include, amongst 17 other things, a minimum of two operators on duty at 18 all times, and their task is dedicated to responding 19 to signals. Our listed supervising stations have 20 limited - limited entry, for security purposes. We 21 are required to have redundant, supervised 22 communication paths; backup generators; stringent 23 recordkeeping regarding system tests and signals 24 received; strict software and hardware testing; and 25 undergo an annual audit. These are rigorous</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 169</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

<p>1 requirements imposed upon NRTL listed supervising 2 stations. Our member companies and the security alarm 3 industry as a whole have been an important partner in 4 the business of life safety for many years. As 5 mentioned, we do not take this responsibility lightly. 6 To diminish this role in this important mandate 7 is doing a disservice to the many lives and property 8 we have saved in the past, and will hopefully continue 9 to do so in the future. 10 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. I am going to go 11 to Microphone Seven, please. Is -- 12 DAVE BARON: Hello. My name is Dave Baron, and 13 I am speaking against the motion. I'm here 14 personally, representing myself. And I, I don't 15 believe that limiting the AHJ's ability to have input 16 in anything involving a response by them to any 17 facility, regardless of what monitoring station is 18 receiving an alarm, or how the alarms are received, is 19 a good idea. 20 The, the - I, I'm not sure that I completely 21 and totally understand what the objection is to having 22 this - whether this, this central station is listed or 23 not, whether they're doing their jobs properly or not 24 - I, I don't think, well, that this is calling into 25 question the ability for a central station to properly</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 170</p>	<p>1 exceeds the requirements for a remote station. This 2 CAM corrects that. 3 The requirements to operate a NRTL listed 4 central supervising station are extremely stringent. 5 UL 827, and UL 1981 are standards that are very 6 prescriptive. As you consider what is said here today 7 in determining how to vote, please carefully take the 8 following comment into consideration. Recently added 9 Standards language that individually targets NRTL 10 listed central supervising stations, requiring them to 11 get special approval, even though they significantly 12 exceed the minimal standard, is something that needs 13 to be corrected. 14 I will say that I am on the Committee. It was 15 stated the vote was 18 to 1. I, I was the one vote. 16 I do believe there was really - there is only one 17 representative of a central station on that Committee, 18 and that's me. There are other people - are on that 19 Committee that represents - or central stations, but 20 they are directed votes, central station involved 21 Committee, and there's one vote - one, one central 22 station. That is, that is me. So I ask that you vote 23 in support of this CAM, and correcting 2019 edition of 24 the Code - what was a very controversial change in the 25 2016 edition. Thank you.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 172</p>
<p>1 provide services; but I do believe that limiting the 2 AHJ to have input into that decision is a bad idea. 3 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone 4 Eight, please. 5 JAY HAHN (phonetic): Thank you, Jim. Thank 6 you, James. I'm speaking in support of the CAM 7 motion. My name is Jay Hahn, and I am a member of the 8 Technical Committee responsible for the section of the 9 Code impacted by this CAM. I'm going to say that 10 you're going - you're going to hear that this is an 11 affront to the Fire Service. I really do not believe 12 that is accurate, and I'll, and I'll tell you why. 13 First, as the Standards experts in this room 14 know, NFPA 72 is a minimal Standard, defines the 15 minimum requirements that must be met. Exceeding the 16 minimum requirements throughout the Code is an 17 acceptable, normal practice. In fact, Chapter One of 18 NFPA 72, 1.5.3 clearly states, and I quote, 'The 19 systems, methods, devices, or appliances that are 20 found equivalent shall be approved,' unquote. I know 21 of nowhere else in the NFPA 72 Standard where 22 functionality that is not only equivalent, but exceeds 23 the minimum standard, is singled out for specific 24 approval. In this case, a NRTL listed supervising 25 station is not only an equivalent - it significantly</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 171</p>	<p>1 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. I'm going to go 2 to Microphone Two, please. 3 DAVE LOWREY: It's Dave Lowrey, City of Boulder 4 Fire-Rescue, also speaking on behalf of the Fire 5 Marshals Association of Colorado. I speak against 6 this motion here. 26.5 is for remote stations. It 7 seems like we're talking more about central stations, 8 and that everything should be going to central 9 stations. This is a remote station type requirement 10 that allows me, that if I want my remote station to be 11 a - to, to be a listed central supervising station, I 12 can do that. But if I don't, I can - I can still 13 allow a remote station, a true remote station, to 14 monitor my system. I, I, I can't understand where 15 the, the actual substantiation for this lies. We did 16 address this in Chicago three years ago, and, and I 17 don't know why we're still addressing this. Thank 18 you. 19 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Microphone One, please. 20 ROBERT BURKE: Yeah, my, my name is Robert 21 Burke, and I'm here on behalf of the Monitoring 22 Association and Wayne Alarm Systems of Lynn, 23 Massachusetts. My colleague with the Monitoring -- 24 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Yeah. 25 ROBERT BURKE: -- Association --</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 173</p>

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018



1 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Are you speaking for or  
2 against --  
3 ROBERT BURKE: I'm sorry --  
4 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: -- the motion?  
5 ROBERT BURKE: -- speaking for the amendment -  
6 for the motion. My colleague from the Monitoring  
7 Association did a great job. I'm not going to re-  
8 cover that area. I think why I've been asked here is  
9 because of my experience as an AHJ for 28 years. And  
10 I don't think anyone should consider this as an  
11 affront to AHJs. When I was an AHJ, I considered  
12 listed central stations as the gold standard, and I  
13 therefore can personally support this motion.  
14 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone Four,  
15 please.  
16 MIKE TYKA (phonetic): Thank you. My name is  
17 Mike Tyka. I'm representing the Illinois Fire  
18 Inspectors, and I'm opposing this motion. This motion  
19 does nothing but circumvent the - and limit the  
20 ability of the Building, Fire, or the elected  
21 officials in their community to provide decisions that  
22 they feel are in the best interests of their community  
23 to keep them safe. There is really no technical  
24 significance to this change, except for moving the  
25 language. The language 'of where required by the AHJ'

Page 174

1 is located throughout most of NFPA 72 documents, and  
2 NFPA 72 specific. Eliminating this ability is  
3 contrary to what the AHJ's mission, and public service  
4 and duty is. We're sworn to protect, and make those  
5 decisions on what we feel is best by our communities.  
6 The Technical Committee heard, reviewed, and voted on  
7 this proposed change during their development process,  
8 and overwhelmingly voted 19 to 1 against this.  
9 In closing, this motion changes the ability of  
10 the AHJs to protect and serve their communities. It  
11 provides no increased safety to our communities, and  
12 very well could negatively impact the safety of our  
13 communities of which we serve. Thank you.  
14 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone  
15 Three, please.  
16 MAX SCANDY (phonetic): Max Scandy,  
17 representing the Church of Jesus Christ Latter Day  
18 Saints. We kind of have a different --  
19 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Are you speaking for or  
20 against the motions?  
21 MAX SCANDY: Oh, I'm speaking for the motion -  
22 for the motion, for the motion. We kind of have a  
23 different perspective. We have our own central  
24 supervising station. And we may not have as many  
25 buildings as most people, but we have 7,000. So this

Page 175

1 gives us the ability to have a central location that  
2 can keep up with things, can tell us if we have an  
3 arson attempt at one or more buildings - how we can  
4 address that. We also have the opportunity to look  
5 into the fine details, so we can go to our building if  
6 we had a fire, and compare it to other buildings that  
7 are built the same way to see how we can improve that.  
8 We have a current initiative to put fire alarms in all  
9 of our buildings, even though the Code doesn't require  
10 it. We've been putting fire sprinklers in our  
11 buildings, all of our buildings, since the early  
12 2000s, even though the Code hasn't required it. So  
13 we've tried to be forthright in doing that, and  
14 providing additional protection. So please vote for  
15 the motion. Thank you.  
16 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone  
17 Seven, please.  
18 DAN FINNEGAN: Yes, hi. Good afternoon. I'm  
19 Dan Finnegan, with Siemens Building Technologies,  
20 former Fire Code official, and I do oppose this CAM,  
21 and I've asked for everyone to oppose this CAM. As I  
22 mentioned, Siemens is an owner operator of UL listed  
23 central station service operation, and we're also a  
24 member of the Monitoring Association. We're also one  
25 - and I specifically, as one - who have dedicated our

Page 176

1 lives to fire and life safety. And I ask you to  
2 oppose this, primarily because we need to support the  
3 Fire Service. Just looking at the language up there  
4 on the screen, when we delete the authority having  
5 jurisdiction, which in almost all cases is the Fire  
6 Service, is, is sad to see. Those are the gentlemen  
7 and ladies, that every time that alarm is dispatched,  
8 they're putting their lives on the line. They  
9 deserve, and they should, and they shall, have the  
10 right to be able to review and approve where the,  
11 the alarm signals are being monitored and dispatched from.  
12 Unfortunately, this CAM, as we know, has been  
13 around for a while, is being driven by greed, and not  
14 life safety. No one yet has brought a life safety  
15 issue forward to the point of discussion, which is the  
16 core competence of NFPA. There is no life safety  
17 issue here. The Code should remain as it is. I ask  
18 for you to oppose this, and to please support the Fire  
19 Service. Thank you.  
20 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. I'm going to go  
21 to Microphone One. I know you've been standing on Two  
22 for a while. Be patient with me, just for a second.  
23 Microphone One, please.  
24 PATRICK EGAN: Thank you. My name is Patrick -  
25 oh, boy, that echo is terrible. My name is Patrick

Page 177

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

1 Egan. I'm from Select Security, from Lancaster,  
2 Pennsylvania. I'm speaking in - for the motion. I'm  
3 a past member of the NFPA Committee that had handled  
4 this Section 72 for more than 20 years. I'm a retired  
5 Fire Chief from Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. I'm a  
6 51-year member, and current member of the Lancaster  
7 Township Volunteer Fire Department.  
8 You will hear that this is a subrogation of the  
9 authority having jurisdiction. As a retired Fire  
10 Chief, and an AHJ, I do not agree. I just listened to  
11 Mr. Finnegan's comments about how we need to support  
12 the Fire Service, and how this is not a life safety  
13 issue. I want to call into question that using a  
14 remote station does not require, or the Standard does  
15 not require any redundancy whatsoever. In many UL  
16 listed central stations, UL redundancy is required,  
17 and most central stations have redundant re - central  
18 stations. Thinking having a single fire alarm going  
19 to a remote station, a fire station, with the  
20 requirement of only one person on duty - I hope he's  
21 not taking a break, taking a nap, or in the toilet  
22 when that one fire alarm comes in at three o'clock in  
23 the morning.  
24 Remote station requirements are decades old.  
25 They have very, very minimal technical requirements.

Page 178

1 We heard today about redundancy in the, the battery  
2 cells, fuel cells. We talk about safety, having some  
3 standards in, in, in, in the air pack designs for  
4 SCBAs; redundancy for, for fire departments. There's  
5 very few fire departments that don't have at least two  
6 fire trucks. (laughter) The, the, the language in  
7 the Standard for some reason specifically requires  
8 special approval for a level of service that  
9 significantly - significantly exceeds the minimal  
10 standard, is frankly, irrational. I am voting in  
11 support of this CAM, and I ask that you all do the  
12 same. Thank you.  
13 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone Two,  
14 please.  
15 MICHAEL RONS: My name is Michael Rons. I'm  
16 the Fire Marshal at the Village of Schaumburg. I'm  
17 here to speak against the motion. After decades of  
18 having our fire alarms directly connected to our  
19 dispatch center, a little over 10 years ago, we  
20 allowed the community to, to revert to central  
21 stations. Earlier, we heard a member talk about the  
22 gold standard that the central stations offer. We've  
23 had a different experience, and we've had a number of  
24 issues over the last 10 years with these central  
25 station alarm monitoring companies.

Page 179

1 We started documenting this in 2014. Over a  
2 year and a half period, we had documented 30 issues  
3 related to out of service alarms, trouble alarms,  
4 supervisor alarms not being notified to the Fire  
5 Department. We've had issues with transmissions  
6 delays and errors. Our Village Board has an ordinance  
7 to go back to the way we were doing things before, and  
8 have a direct connection to our dispatch center.  
9 We've still been documenting those issues, and have  
10 had another 27 issues since that time. We've had  
11 multiple discussions with the central stations in our  
12 area, and they haven't been able to address those  
13 issues.  
14 With the language that's currently in the Code,  
15 that would be against the current motion, the Fire  
16 Department would have the ability to address those  
17 issues with those central stations. Not every  
18 department may need to go to a direct connect  
19 ordinance, such as we have, but they should be able to  
20 address the issue with central stations that are  
21 underperforming. So I encourage everyone here today  
22 to vote against this motion. Thank you.  
23 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone One,  
24 please.  
25 ROBERT SHORE: My name is Robert Shore. I'm

Page 180

1 from Systems Design Group in Flemington, New Jersey.  
2 And I just want to --  
3 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Are you speaking in favor or  
4 against the motion?  
5 ROBERT SHORE: I am speaking in favor of this  
6 motion. And I want to address the comment by my  
7 colleague, Dan Finnegan, where this is motivated by  
8 greed - for greed. For 35 years, since 1984, central  
9 stations have been providing this service, and have  
10 doing - have done a very, very good job. I believe  
11 that giving the option of using a central station to  
12 the AHJ is a huge mistake, being that they could  
13 essentially put a lot of alarm businesses out of  
14 business - companies that have been around for many  
15 years, building a recurring revenue base in  
16 monitoring, by subbing it out to a central station,  
17 could be adversely affected. I don't think that's a  
18 good move. We've been building our businesses for -  
19 for decades, and building our retirements, which could  
20 be wiped away out of our community easily by an AHJ.  
21 Now, I believe if there's any greed motivating  
22 this, it is coming from the Fire Service more than it  
23 is coming from the central station businesses; and  
24 that maybe the greed is what's motivating them,  
25 because of the revenue. Thank you.

Page 181

Audio Transcription of Technical Committee Session - Part 2  
June 14, 2018

1 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone  
2 Eight, please.  
3 BILL FISKE: Thank you, Chairman. My name is  
4 Bill Fiske, and I am speaking for myself, in support  
5 of this motion. Now, I recognize that every NFPA Code  
6 and Standards Committee can decide for itself. But I  
7 have been a member of the National Electrical Code  
8 Committee since 1985, on three different Code Panels,  
9 and the Correlating Committee at one time or another.  
10 And in the NEC, as most of you know, if equipment is  
11 listed that has to be (unintelligible) - that it is  
12 approved, the AHJ has very little to say about that.  
13 And in those 33 years that I've been on the NEC  
14 Committee, I don't recall an I - an AHJ representative  
15 ever complaining about that. So as far as AHJ  
16 prerogatives, I'm not quite convinced.  
17 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. I'm going to  
18 move to Microphone Seven, then I'll come to Three.  
19 DAVE BARON: My name is Dave Baron, and I am  
20 speaking against the motion. I, I was for a short  
21 time on Fire Department, and I've listened to a lot of  
22 the, the proponents for this motion. I'm a simple  
23 sprinkler guy now. I can't believe that there are any  
24 even suggestions that an AHJ would take advantage of a  
25 position in, in any way, shape, or form, adversely to

Page 182

1 reject the ability of a remote or central station  
2 monitoring service, to be able to perform their duties  
3 properly, for any reason; and especially for personal  
4 gain, or greed, or anything remotely close to that. I  
5 believe that this is a solution to a problem that  
6 doesn't exist - whether it's new, or if it's been in  
7 Standard since the inception of 72, I - being a simple  
8 sprinkler guy, I really can't understand where the  
9 problem is, by simply allowing an AHJ the option to  
10 hold somebody's feet to the fire if they're not doing  
11 their jobs properly. And if that's wrong, coming from  
12 a simple sprinkler guy that doesn't know a lot about  
13 alarms, alarm monitoring, central station, remote  
14 station, signaling devices and how they're received,  
15 whether they're reported to a fire department or not -  
16 it seems to be somewhat ridiculous to not want to  
17 allow an AHJ who's going to send people into a  
18 building that may have the, the potential for the loss  
19 of life. None of these guys sitting in a central  
20 station, or alarm people are going into these  
21 buildings. I think taking that ability away from the  
22 AHJ is wrong. Thank you.  
23 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone  
24 Three.  
25 TED LEVENTHAL: Thank you. I am for the

Page 183

1 motion. My name is Ted Leventhal; 41 years in the  
2 industry. I actually don't have a dog in this race,  
3 shall we say. I don't run a central station; I don't  
4 run an alarm company any more. It's a question of  
5 accountability. In the fire alarm industry, we have  
6 always made sure there is an accountability, and  
7 central stations are forced to have accountability.  
8 If they are UL listed, FM listed, whatever it is, they  
9 have to account to a standard of operation. And  
10 that's the real question - accountability. Thank you.  
11 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. I'm going to go  
12 to Microphone Eight.  
13 KEVIN LEHAND (phonetic): I'm for this motion.  
14 My name is Kevin Lehand. I'm from Emergency 24. I  
15 want to address specifically Mr. Rons from Schaumburg.  
16 I was in those meetings with you. We offered you  
17 solutions. I've also reviewed the Freedom of  
18 Information documents that we received back and the,  
19 the statements that you made about the issues with  
20 central stations - I, I don't believe are accurate. I  
21 also didn't hear you say anything about the systems  
22 that were not monitored - system owned - or systems  
23 owned by the City of Schaumburg. So I would just like  
24 that there would be full transparency here. Thank  
25 you.

Page 184

1 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Thank you. Microphone Two.  
2 CHAD JONES: Chad Jones, Cisco Systems. I Call  
3 the Question.  
4 MALE SPEAKER: Second.  
5 MALE SPEAKER: Thank you.  
6 (applause)  
7 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: There's a motion from the  
8 floor to Call the Question. I notice that there are a  
9 number of people remaining at the microphones, waiting  
10 to speak. But we will proceed with the vote on the  
11 call of the question. Do we have a second?  
12 MALE SPEAKER: Second.  
13 MALE SPEAKER: Second.  
14 MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.  
15 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: We do have a second. In  
16 order to vote on this motion, please scroll down to  
17 the bottom of the tablet to vote. If you wish to vote  
18 in support of the motion to Call the Question, touch  
19 Yes. If you wish to vote against the motion to Call  
20 the Question, touch No. Please record your vote. The  
21 voting will be closed in five seconds. Voting is  
22 closed. The vote is 389 in favor of calling the  
23 question; 33 against. The motion to Call the Question  
24 has passed. Therefore, we will move directly to  
25 voting on the motion.

Page 185

1 Before we vote, let me restate the motion. The  
2 motion on the floor is to Accept Public Comment Number  
3 Six.  
4 And before we vote here, I just want to -  
5 there's a couple of housekeeping items that I'm going  
6 to need to announce, because I know once this final  
7 vote is done, some of you are going to be bolting from  
8 the door. (laughter) So before you jump, listen to  
9 what I have to say, because it's very important about  
10 your voting tablet, the way you log out, and the way  
11 you need to return it. So we will go through this,  
12 but just be patient with me.  
13 So we - before we vote on the motion, let me  
14 restate the motion. The motion on the floor is to  
15 Accept Public Comment Number Six. To vote, touch the  
16 Vote button. If you wish to vote in support of the  
17 motion, and recommend the text on Screen One, touch  
18 Yes. If you wish to vote against the motion, and  
19 recommend the text on Screen Two, touch No. Please  
20 record your vote.  
21 MALE SPEAKER: Hmm?  
22 MALE SPEAKER: Not with (unintelligible).  
23 MALE SPEAKER: You don't even get a chance to  
24 (unintelligible).  
25 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: The voting will be closed in

Page 186

1 five seconds, or the time it takes me to get a  
2 margarita. (laughter) The voting is closed.  
3 (applause) The results are 304 in favor of the  
4 motion; 128 against the motion. The motion has  
5 passed.  
6 Is there any further discussion on NFPA 72?  
7 Thank you, Mr. Bunker.  
8 MERTON BUNKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
9 JAMES GOLINVEAUX: Could you - could everyone  
10 please look at their device; click on the button next  
11 to your name, and type the following log, log-out  
12 code: 1218. So there's a button next to your name;  
13 and type log-out code 1218. You can then drop your  
14 devices off at the back of the hall.  
15 This officially concludes the 2018 NFPA  
16 Technical Meeting. I want to thank you for your  
17 participation, interest, and support. I now declare  
18 the 2018 NFPA Technical Meeting officially adjourned.  
19 (applause)  
20  
21 (END OF MEETING)  
22  
23  
24  
25

Page 187

1 TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE  
2  
3  
4  
5 I, MARY HARLOW, attest that the foregoing proceedings  
6 provided to me via audio were transcribed by me to the  
7 best of my ability.  
8 I further attest that I am not a relative or employee  
9 to any attorney or party nor financially interested in  
10 this action.  
11 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of  
12 the state of Massachusetts that the foregoing is true  
13 and correct.  
14 Dated this 1st day of July, 2018.  
15  
16  
17 -----  
18 MARY HARLOW  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Page 188

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25