

Created: 2020-06-19 20:23 (UTC)

Full Name: Roland Kraiss

Company: UW Health

Affiliation: Health Care

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: It doesn't require fire retardent is used, but if fire retardent is used this will ensure that the tree is more flammable.

Created: 2020-06-19 17:45 (UTC)

Full Name: Kent Maune

Company: Ruskin Manufacturing

Affiliation: AMCA

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: Smoke and combination fire smoke dampers are a vital part of a building's fire and smoke resistance. Smoke and combination fire smoke dampers are considered as passive protection but are quite often connected to the fire alarm panel and/or the BMS. During a fire event these dampers are designed to close to prevent the spread of a fire or smoke and/or open to Evac the smoke from the facility. These dampers need to be tested with all the other systems being tested to verify that everything works together. If the section calls out only "active" integrated fire protection and does not include the "passive" protection, then not including the smoke and combination fire smoke dampers will leave a vulnerability in the fire and smoke protection in the building.

Created: 2020-06-19 17:07 (UTC)

Full Name: Palmer Hickman

Company: Electrical Training Alliance

Affiliation: IBEW

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: Just cause.

Created: 2020-06-19 02:19 (UTC)

Full Name: James Priest

Company: Fermi National Accelerator Lab

Affiliation: Government

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: I agree why would otherwise who knows what the treatment means.

Created: 2020-06-18 22:44 (UTC)

Full Name: Oscar Torres

Company: Cohisa

Affiliation: 3431347

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: Establishes requirements clearly and effectively

Created: 2020-06-18 18:56 (UTC)

Full Name: Raymond Grill

Company: Arup

Affiliation: Self

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: Fire retardant treatments need to be effective if applied.

Created: 2020-06-18 05:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Russel Faleiro

Company: Gosafe Fire Security Safety

Affiliation: FIRE SYSTEM

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: AGREED

Created: 2020-06-18 01:12 (UTC)

Full Name: John Campbell

Company: Global Fire Protection Group,

Affiliation: Member

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: agree with the motion

Created: 2020-06-17 20:21 (UTC)

Full Name: Todd Kidd

Company: Liberty Mutual Insurance Compa

Affiliation: Insurance

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: Good text addition

Created: 2020-06-17 19:38 (UTC)

Full Name: Danny Underwood

Company: Tanner Medical Ctr

Affiliation: Tanner Medical Center, Inc.

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: for this motion, I am

Created: 2020-06-17 18:54 (UTC)

Full Name: John Goodsell

Company: Goodsell Consulting

Affiliation: Goodsell Consulting

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: Agree with motion

Created: 2020-06-17 18:48 (UTC)

Full Name: Bret Martin

Company: CNA Insurance

Affiliation: Self

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: Agree with the principle.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:10 (UTC)
Full Name: Jonathan Griffin
Company: Cosco Fire Protection Inc.
Affiliation: NICET

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: Agree with Committee

Created: 2020-06-17 17:01 (UTC)
Full Name: Daniel Welkley
Company: Ameren Corp
Affiliation: NFPA Member

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: Agree with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-17 16:52 (UTC)
Full Name: Steve Tafoya
Company:
Affiliation: Fayette County BOC

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: no comment

Created: 2020-06-17 16:49 (UTC)
Full Name: Curtis Jackson
Company: United Enertech
Affiliation: Engineering Manager

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: In the interest of safety, this makes sense.

Created: 2020-06-17 16:29 (UTC)
Full Name: Brenda McNorton

Company: Kansas State Fire Marshal
Affiliation: Kansas State Fire Marshal

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: Familiar testing procedure

Created: 2020-06-16 21:25 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Baroncini
Company: Siemens, Inc.
Affiliation: Siemens, Inc.

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: Defines requirements

Created: 2020-06-16 17:52 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Quintero
Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marshal

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: Update necessary

Created: 2020-06-15 16:55 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Quintero
Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-15 13:54 (UTC)
Full Name: William Fitch
Company: Phyrefish.com
Affiliation: Phyrefish.com

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: The provision does not require that a treatment be applied to natural cut trees but if such treatment is used then this provision ensures that the treatment does not make the tree more flammable.

Created: 2020-06-15 13:46 (UTC)

Full Name: Bridget Mourao

Company: Emory University

Affiliation: NFPA Technical Member

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: Test method labeling is important in understanding the level of fire retardant.

Created: 2020-06-12 15:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Jonathan Tarvin

Company: Alabama Power

Affiliation: nicet

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: ok

Created: 2020-06-11 17:18 (UTC)

Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler

Company: GBH International

Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: This is consistent with NFPA 101 and will not require FR treatments.

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Scott Newman

Company: Walgreens

Affiliation: None

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: In alignment with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)

Full Name: Kenneth Tyree

Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh

Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)

Full Name: Christopher Kachura

Company: Southeast Fire Protection

Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: A

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Jameson Wendell

Company: Merck Co

Affiliation: User

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: I agree.

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Shay Rankhorn

Company: Ballad Health

Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: Against

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)
Full Name: Douglas Miller
Company: Local 190
Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: I think there should be a fire retardant requirement.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)
Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas
Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue
Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)
Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed
Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp
Affiliation: member

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)
Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos
Company: City Of Tamarac
Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: I agree that there is needed language indicating the ASTM information and approved test methods.

Created: 2020-06-08 17:27 (UTC)
Full Name: Julian Burns

Company: Quality Power Solutions, Inc.
Affiliation: IEC

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: Only makes clearer

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)
Full Name: Matthew Mertens
Company: North Shore Fire Department
Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: It appears without this statement there will be no direction as to the product used.

Created: 2020-06-17 20:56 (UTC)
Full Name: Andrew Fosina
Company: Htfd No1
Affiliation: Government - Fire Service

CAM 1-3

AGAINST

Reason: Not practical. Too many variables with trees in size and moisture content.

Created: 2020-06-17 19:58 (UTC)
Full Name: Jason Ellis
Company: University Of Kentucky
Affiliation: AHJ

CAM 1-3

AGAINST

Reason: I disagree with changing the location.

Created: 2020-06-17 19:48 (UTC)
Full Name: John Taylor
Company: HCT, LLC
Affiliation: Healthcare Consulting

CAM 1-3

AGAINST

Reason: Support committee.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:32 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Pitschneider

Company: Shakopee City Of

Affiliation: Shakopee Fire

CAM 1-3

AGAINST

Reason: Although I like the provision I would prefer to see this option only allowed per Table 10.13.1.1. I would also prefer to see a limit on the number of trees per building.

Created: 2020-06-17 16:51 (UTC)

Full Name: Archie McCartney

Company: Vcu Community Memorial Hospt

Affiliation: Member

CAM 1-3

AGAINST

Reason: Don't under stand the reason for this

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Parrish

Company: Telgian Corporation

Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 1-3

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision

Created: 2020-06-19 20:23 (UTC)

Full Name: Roland Kraiss

Company: UW Health

Affiliation: Health Care

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-19 20:19 (UTC)

Full Name: Ronald Smidt

Company: Atrium Health

Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: Correlates to FGI

Created: 2020-06-19 18:26 (UTC)

Full Name: Gregory Ohnemus

Company: Anvil International

Affiliation: Anvil International & NFSA E&S

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: The NFPA 1 technical committee reduced the fire apparatus access distance from 450 feet to 300 feet for NFPA 13R systems.

Created: 2020-06-19 15:34 (UTC)

Full Name: Terry Victor

Company: Johnson Controls

Affiliation: Johnson Controls

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: This allowance should apply to buildings protected with NFPA 13R systems as well. For it to apply to a building protected with a 13D system and not a 13R system doesn't make sense.

Created: 2020-06-19 12:09 (UTC)

Full Name: Martin Anderson

Company: Siemens Building Technologies,

Affiliation: AFAA

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: For

Created: 2020-06-18 22:44 (UTC)

Full Name: Oscar Torres

Company: Cohisa

Affiliation: 3431347

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: 450 ft is an appropriate limit, and the structure is more concise and precise

Created: 2020-06-18 20:02 (UTC)

Full Name: Terin Hopkins

Company: National Fire Sprinkler Associ

Affiliation: NFSA

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: While we have seen multiple catastrophic 13R fires in buildings under construction triggering this proposed change, those fires do not correlate with higher loss of life. In fact, NFPA's "US Experience with Sprinklers" published in 2017, reported that activated sprinklers system in residential occupancies are 97% effective in controlling fires. The distance reduction of 150' is simply based in conjecture and without any technical merit or supporting data. These systems are not simply life safety systems but also provide a similar degree of property protection in "occupied spaces" provided by NFPA 13 systems. Buildings equipped with NFPA 13R systems are by standard considered to be "fully sprinklered throughout" by definition and as such are entitled to the distance incentives that have been in the code since the 2003 edition of NFPA 1. Moving forward, we must continue to balance incentives; they are a package deal and without proper justification they should not be randomly altered without clear data showing cause. Please Support and vote FOR CAM: 1-6

Created: 2020-06-18 18:56 (UTC)

Full Name: Raymond Grill

Company: Arup

Affiliation: Self

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: 13R systems should be recognized. Par. 18.2.3.2.2 becomes redundant.

Created: 2020-06-18 05:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Russel Faleiro
Company: Gosafe Fire Security Safety
Affiliation: FIRE SYSTEM

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: AGREED

Created: 2020-06-18 01:12 (UTC)
Full Name: John Campbell
Company: Global Fire Protection Group,
Affiliation: Member

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: agree with the motion

Created: 2020-06-17 20:21 (UTC)
Full Name: Todd Kidd
Company: Liberty Mutual Insurance Compa
Affiliation: Insurance

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: Good additional text

Created: 2020-06-17 19:58 (UTC)
Full Name: Jason Ellis
Company: University Of Kentucky
Affiliation: AHJ

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-17 19:48 (UTC)
Full Name: John Taylor
Company: HCT, LLC
Affiliation: Healthcare Consulting

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: Permits 13R systems where applicable.

Created: 2020-06-17 19:38 (UTC)

Full Name: Danny Underwood

Company: Tanner Medical Ctr

Affiliation: Tanner Medical Center, Inc.

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: for

Created: 2020-06-17 18:32 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Pitschneider

Company: Shakopee City Of

Affiliation: Shakopee Fire

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: The only change from the 2018 code is When to Where and the listing order of the NFPA standards.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:31 (UTC)

Full Name: Ron Ritchey

Company: NFSA

Affiliation: NFSA

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: The NFPA 1 technical committee reduced the fire apparatus access distance from 450 feet to 300 feet for NFPA 13R systems.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:10 (UTC)

Full Name: Jonathan Griffin

Company: Cosco Fire Protection Inc.

Affiliation: NICET

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: Agree with Committee

Created: 2020-06-17 17:01 (UTC)

Full Name: Daniel Welkley

Company: Ameren Corp

Affiliation: NFPA Member

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: Agree with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-17 16:51 (UTC)

Full Name: Archie McCartney

Company: Vcu Community Memorial Hospt

Affiliation: Member

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: I think it makes sense

Created: 2020-06-17 16:29 (UTC)

Full Name: Brenda McNorton

Company: Kansas State Fire Marshal

Affiliation: Kansas State Fire Marshal

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: To allow additional benefit of a 13R system

Created: 2020-06-16 21:25 (UTC)

Full Name: Vincent Baroncini

Company: Siemens, Inc.

Affiliation: Siemens, Inc.

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: Eliminates confusion.

Created: 2020-06-16 19:26 (UTC)
Full Name: Chase Browning
Company: Medford Fire Rescue
Affiliation: Medford Fire Department

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: As an AHJ, it is important to rely on clear technical substantiation when codes change. This change seems arbitrary and the technical committee statements indicate that they may not have been aware of the adjustments made in recent code cycles of 5000 and the IBC to address concerns regarding unprotected attics in some taller 13R applications. I encourage the membership to support this motion to return to the previous text that has served the code well for many years.

Created: 2020-06-16 17:52 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Quintero
Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marshal

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: Update necessary

Created: 2020-06-15 13:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Bridget Mourao
Company: Emory University
Affiliation: NFPA Technical Member

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: Sprinkler systems should allow increase in distancing.

Created: 2020-06-12 15:15 (UTC)
Full Name: Jonathan Tarvin
Company: Alabama Power
Affiliation: nicet

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: ok

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Scott Newman

Company: Walgreens

Affiliation: None

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: In alignment with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)

Full Name: Kenneth Tyree

Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh

Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)

Full Name: Christopher Kachura

Company: Southeast Fire Protection

Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: A

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Jameson Wendell

Company: Merck Co

Affiliation: User

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)
Full Name: Shay Rankhorn
Company: Ballad Health
Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: For

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)
Full Name: Douglas Miller
Company: Local 190
Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: There is redundancy between the first and second code. Therefore eliminating the second one seems to be best to eliminate confusion.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)
Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas
Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue
Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)
Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed
Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp
Affiliation: member

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-08 18:15 (UTC)
Full Name: Jeffrey Hugo

Company: NFSA
Affiliation: NFSA

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: Motion to Accept Public Comment No. 34 Public Comment No. 34 (PC-34) eliminates the changes of First Revision No. 78 (FR-78) and reverts the section back to the same text as written and (nearly) unchanged since the 2003 edition of NFPA 1 Fire Code. The 2021 revision of concern to NFPA 1, Section 18.2.3.2.2.1 started with Public Input No. 84 (PI-84) and continued with FR-78 that singles out buildings protected by NFPA 13R systems and reduces the fire apparatus access distance from 450 ft to 300 ft. The original PI-84 sought to reduce the apparatus to and around the buildings protected by all types of sprinkler systems (NFPA 13, NFPA 13R and NFPA 13D) to 300 ft, but the committee arbitrarily selected only buildings protected by NFPA 13R to be reduced, leaving NFPA 13 and NFPA 13D at 450 ft. The ballot for FR-78 produced two negative comments: one from Terin Hopkins asking if there was data to justify the distance reduction of 150 ft and another from Kelly Nicolello who cited the lack of technical substantiation to justify the change. PC-34 was drafted and submitted by the National Fire Sprinkler Association (NFSA) to the committee to address the two negative comments. At the second draft meeting, the committee rejected PC-34 without addressing the two negative comments or providing any technical substantiation for reducing the distance for fire apparatus access by 150 ft—singling out buildings protected by NFPA 13R systems. The committee statement for rejecting this public comment simply stated that NFPA 13R is a life safety system and not a property protection system. This is not a technical substantiation but is simply a statement. As mentioned, the 450 ft increase has been in the NFPA 1 Fire Code since the 2003 edition. The heights and areas for residential buildings protected by NFPA 13R have not changed. The latest codes modified the use of NFPA 13R upon pedestal and podium buildings based upon concerns expressed at the 2015 NFPA summit titled, Workshop on Life Safety Sprinkler System Challenge. The 2018 edition of NFPA 5000 and the International Building Code (IBC) addressed attics over 55 ft in pedestal and podium buildings and the 2021 IBC reduced all residential buildings protected by NFPA 13R to a maximum of three stories. The NFPA 1 technical committee left buildings protected by NFPA 13D and NFPA 13 at the existing distance of 450 ft. If NFPA 13R was reduced to 300 feet because it is only a life safety system, why was NFPA 13D not adjusted to the same distance? There are more residential buildings permitted today in the IBC and NFPA 5000 protected by NFPA 13D than when NFPA 1 first allowed the apparatus distance to be increased to 450 ft. in 2003. NFPA 13R is a life safety system, but it has an increased system demand and duration, plus a fire department connection and often a standpipe system whereas NFPA 13D does not. The NFSA is asking the NFPA membership to return the code language back to where it has been for the last six edition

Created: 2020-06-19 16:27 (UTC)

Full Name: William Koffel

Company: Koffel Associates, Inc.

Affiliation: Self

CAM 1-6

AGAINST

Reason: Whereas NFPA 13R allows the omission of sprinklers from areas that would be required to be protected with sprinklers if the system were an NFPA 13 system, there is justification to distinguish between NFPA 13 and NFPA 13R systems. Of primary concern should be the ability to omit sprinklers from combustible attic spaces. While one could argue that the same could be said for NFPA 13D systems, the general assumption is that buildings protected by NFPA 13D systems are generally smaller in area, and in many instances height, than a building that could be protected by an NFPA 13R system.

Created: 2020-06-19 02:19 (UTC)

Full Name: James Priest

Company: Fermi National Accelerator Lab

Affiliation: Government

CAM 1-6

AGAINST

Reason: 1-6 -Disagree to ...2.1 – Travel distance for buildings with elderly, special needs should be taken into consideration and 450 ft seems a big increase.

Created: 2020-06-17 20:56 (UTC)

Full Name: Andrew Fosina

Company: Htfd No1

Affiliation: Government - Fire Service

CAM 1-6

AGAINST

Reason: Extending the travel distance should not be increased, there are still times when sprinkler systems are off line for maintenance.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:48 (UTC)

Full Name: Bret Martin

Company: CNA Insurance

Affiliation: Self

CAM 1-6

AGAINST

Reason: NFPA 13R is centric on Life Safety provisions, rather than property protection. As such, I would not give as much credit as for a fully sprinklered building to NFPA 13.

Created: 2020-06-17 16:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Steve Tafoya

Company:

Affiliation: Fayette County BOC

CAM 1-6

AGAINST

Reason: no comment

Created: 2020-06-17 16:49 (UTC)

Full Name: Curtis Jackson

Company: United Enertech

Affiliation: Engineering Manager

CAM 1-6

AGAINST

Reason: I see no added value to this change/addition.

Created: 2020-06-16 16:19 (UTC)

Full Name: Norbert Makowka

Company: National Association Of Fire E

Affiliation: NAFED

CAM 1-6

AGAINST

Reason: This proposed revision would decrease the level of safety.

Created: 2020-06-15 23:32 (UTC)

Full Name: Shamim Rashidsumar

Company: Natl Ready Mixed Concrete Assn

Affiliation: Build with Strength Coalition

CAM 1-6

AGAINST

Reason: This motion extends the trade-off for distance to fire department access roads in buildings equipped with 13R automatic sprinkler systems from 300 ft to 450 ft. Distance from fire department access roads impacts the fire service's ability to access buildings in an emergency, affecting search and rescue operations and fire fighting efforts. NFPA 13R systems often serve multifamily housing with substantially higher occupant loads than 13D systems, which apply to one- and two-family dwellings. While automatic sprinkler systems are a cornerstone to the fire and life safety strategy of a building, it is important to maintain a balanced approach with multiple layers of safety afforded to building residents and communities.

Created: 2020-06-15 16:55 (UTC)

Full Name: Vincent Quintero
Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha

CAM 1-6

AGAINST

Reason: If changed, how does this effect the open interior construction of a new dwelling?

Created: 2020-06-15 13:54 (UTC)

Full Name: William Fitch
Company: Phyrefish.com
Affiliation: Phyrefish.com

CAM 1-6

AGAINST

Reason: Do not believe this increase is justified

Created: 2020-06-11 13:58 (UTC)

Full Name: James Narva
Company: NASFM
Affiliation: National Association of State Fire Marshals

CAM 1-6

AGAINST

Reason: It is felt such a proposal would actually decrease the overall level of safety of occupants, and communities

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Parrish
Company: Telgian Corporation
Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 1-6

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)

Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos
Company: City Of Tamarac

Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 1-6

AGAINST

Reason: 13R system does not provide full/throughout protection and should be closer to an emergency access road than others. This current language you will receive an incentive but the building is closer to an access road.

Created: 2020-06-08 14:23 (UTC)

Full Name: Warren Olsen

Company: Fire Safety Consultants, Inc.

Affiliation: Illinois Fire Inspectors Association

CAM 1-6

AGAINST

Reason: I am not convinced that either of the increases (150 to 450-feet and 150 to 300-feet) based on the use of a 13, 13R, or 13D has been justified. Therefore, the increase allowed with 13R systems to 300-feet is more acceptable than increasing it to 450-feet.

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)

Full Name: Matthew Mertens

Company: North Shore Fire Department

Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 1-6

AGAINST

Reason: the travel distance for 13R at 450' is too long where concealed spaces are not addressed.

Created: 2020-06-19 20:43 (UTC)

Full Name: Patrick Franks

Company: Go Doorstep, LLC

Affiliation: Go Doorstep, LLC

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: Banning valet trash would require me to find a new way to feed my family, would require me to terminate over 100 employees, and would cost our customers millions of dollars because they would lose an income stream. Many apartment communities are owned by pension funds and in 401(k)s via REITs. Believe it or not, the average American owns a tiny slice of apartment communities in their retirement funds! The average American counts on the the income we create for property owners. This service is wanted by apartment residents and their owners. It's been around since 1995 with zero or few reported incidents. Banning it outright seems extreme when the industry is willing to work to find ways to make our service even safer.

Created: 2020-06-19 19:50 (UTC)

Full Name: Russ Webb

Company:

Affiliation: BAAA

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: With more than 3 billion collections and zero incidences, it is hard to see how valet trash is a threat to anyone. Providing more than 10,000 jobs in a time when our economy needs them, there are zero reasons to ban this important service to multifamily communities.

Created: 2020-06-19 18:26 (UTC)

Full Name: Gregory Ohnemus

Company: Anvil International

Affiliation: Anvil International & NFSA E&S

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: NFPA 1 should not void provisions under the scope of another NFPA document.

Created: 2020-06-19 17:41 (UTC)

Full Name: Robert Watson

Company: WSI of Utah, LLC

Affiliation: NTRVA

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: I would like the records to show that my original comment submitted for CAM 1-8 in error identifies this as CAM 101-8. I apologize as this was in error and indeed addresses CAM 1-8. Thank you.

Created: 2020-06-19 17:35 (UTC)

Full Name: Justin Watson

Company: WSI of Utah, LLC
Affiliation: WSI of Utah, LLC

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: If CAM 1-8 fails, it refutes the due diligence and good faith trash and recycling valet companies have put into working with the ICC and NFPA as we originally committed when many of the small businesses were made aware of these code adoption processes at the International Code Council Conference in October of 2019. Also, retaining this language is in opposition to language generated from NFPA 101 and is disorienting for both administrators enforcing these codes and for industry partners following compliance. The trash and recycling valet services have promulgated within the multifamily industry for over 25 years and this is an opportunity to establish regulation as agreed upon by both industry and code creators.

Created: 2020-06-19 16:57 (UTC)
Full Name: Sueze Watson
Company: WSI of New Mexico LLC
Affiliation: WSI of New Mexico, LLC

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: If this motion fails, it completely destroys all the work we have done with this committee. The whole trash valet industry will be impacted.

Created: 2020-06-19 16:56 (UTC)
Full Name: John Watson
Company: WSI of Texas
Affiliation: WSI of Texas

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: If this motion fails then it will be in conflict with the NFPA 101 codes that have been previously established.

Created: 2020-06-19 12:52 (UTC)
Full Name: Austin Butchart
Company: Spartan Trash Valet
Affiliation: Owner

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: We as a company put a huge importance on the safety of the residents, property as a whole, and our employees when they are onsite. However, what is being proposed here is completely overkill and will ultimately be the end of the Valet Trash industry and ruin the livelihood of the employees and owners of these company's. We have done extensive research on finding trash cans that meet these proposed requirements and we have come to two conclusions. Number one being that every supplier that we have spoken to, does not currently make trash cans that meet these requirements. Number two being that when they do get around to creating trash cans that meet these standards, they will be so expensive that it will put 99% of Valet Trash companies out of business. There is only one company in this industry that can afford to do this, Valet Living, and this will ultimately create a monopoly, which is illegal. There has been over 3 billion doors serviced over the last 25 years and there has never been a fire incident related to Valet Trash. If anything, we help mitigate the risk of fire hazards by removing trash and debris that residents leave out on a daily basis. Residents put out trash on their porch regardless if they have a Valet Trash service or not because they do not want it in their unit. That is where come in on a nightly basis and remove that fire hazard. From personally servicing multiple apartment units, you should really be focused on residents that leave out couches, packages, bikes, etc that cause more of a fire hazard than our service. Our service helps people from hoarding trash in their unit because they are far away from the compactor or dumpster. There is zero logic behind trying to implement this legislation. People smoke, cook, light candles on a daily basis which are some of the greatest fire hazards apartment communities face. Completely crushing an industry will not solve anything, people will still leave trash out which will create a bigger fire hazard than you currently think there is. Thank you.

Created: 2020-06-19 05:25 (UTC)

Full Name: Robert Watson

Company: WSI of Utah

Affiliation: NTRVA

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: Before the vote is taken on this CAM 101-8 and other related CAMs, there is foundation for this Cam and CAM 101-10 that needs to be reviewed for better understanding and information purposes. I apologize in advance for the length of this response. There are many within the NFPA who do not readily understand the Multifamily Trash and Recycling Valet Industry, the value it brings to millions of households and the safety that is an integral part of the industry. During the July 8th 2019, Technical Committee Meeting of the NFPA 101 Life Safety Code Committee, held in Saint Louis, Missouri, attendance was granted to representatives of the National Trash & Recycling Valet Association NTRVA, (that provides a voice for the over 200 American independent Trash and Recycling Valet Companies), Valet Living, a large national Trash Valet Company, and others. During this meeting, all parties came together to better understand the Trash & Recycling Valet Industry and ultimately to negotiate in good faith to address concerns and ideas with the intent to provide a platform to provide regulation for this 25 year old industry that provides an amenity to the Multifamily Housing Industry that has been ranked a #1 Amenity on several occasions by the National Apartment Association. The discourse of communication at this event was lively and in depth. After lengthy discussion and questions, a subcommittee representing all parties was convened to further provide information for potential codification. After hours of deliberation and through discussion the Technical Committee of the NFPA 101 came to a consensus of recommended codification of regulation to address the Fire Life Safety issues of the Multifamily Residential Trash & Recycling Valet Industry that though not totally acceptable to the Industry Representatives, was considered to be a responsible, reasonable and enforceable solution to regulation of this industry as it relates to Fire and Life Safety Concerns. This Committee needs to be commended for their dedicated efforts and open-minded solution approach in arriving at the language presented in CAM 101-10. As a spokesperson for this Industry, I encourage all to vote for the passage of the Certified Amending Motion CAM 1-8. To do otherwise will have far reaching consequences, both intended and unintended that will needlessly cause chaos within a proven safe industry, harm millions of American families, and cause the loss of tens of thousands of jobs at both the service level and involved related industries. Multifamily Residential Trash & Recycling Valet: Door-side Trash and Recycling Valet Services for Multifamily Residential Communities has been in existence for over 25 years and proudly maintains a safety track record that would be the envy of any industry. During the recent outbreak of Covid19 This service was deemed nationally to be an essential provider business because of the additional level of safety it presents for Multifamily Resid

Created: 2020-06-19 03:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Gary Frost
Company: Affinity Waste Solutions
Affiliation: Multi-Family Industry

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: As a Retired Chief Master Sergeant of the United States Air-Force for 30+ years I can declare that this is some of the most ridiculous language that I have ever seen. You have an industry with a large footprint that has been around for a quarter of a century trying to offer solutions to the T1 committee about safer regulations and the T1 committee shuts the door on them trying to leave over 10,000 people without a job. The T1 committee made this decision without gathering industry data or getting educated on truly how safe the service is and what it has to offer to senior citizens and veterans like myself. Its absurd to think that NFPA membes would possibly vote for valet trash to be illegal with out doing their market research on the industry. Are you fully educated to make a decision to cause 200 companies to go under that supports over 10,000 jobs including fire fighters, veterans, and other hard working Americans trying to make ends meat. Why wasn't a task force created like the leadership did at the T101 committee to discuss a reasonable solution? Is there really a fire safety issue? If so, then why is this just now being discussed after 25 years of the industry servicing in 50 states? This is obviously a conflict when you have two Technical committees believing in the total opposite of each other. Regulation does need to be established to help create a level safe playing field throughout the country for the industry to follow. The NFPA and the ICC asked the valet trash industry to come to the table to help develop safe regulation. Prohibiting valet trash will not fix the problem, it will only make it worse. Its like having malignant cancer, you cant just cut it out hoping to fix the problem. You have to have a treatment and a plan of action in place. Same as valet trash. Help be the Solution!! DATA FACT- Were you aware that a 11 gallon interior valet trash can only has trash in it for about 4-5 hours a day and that there is still a minimum of a 4-5ft walk space in the corridor?

Created: 2020-06-19 03:27 (UTC)

Full Name: Darren Ott

Company: Houston Fire

Affiliation: local 341

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: As a Houston Firefighter and a Valet Trash Company owner, I believe that NFPA 1 needs to be thrown out since NFPA 101 already has a task force with language existence for safety. NFPA 1's stance on Valet Trash would cause thousands of people to lose their job. This would have a negative impact on the economy.

Created: 2020-06-19 02:19 (UTC)

Full Name: James Priest

Company: Fermi National Accelerator Lab

Affiliation: Government

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: Having been involved with several fires caused by trash and recyle containers I think recommended changes are good

Created: 2020-06-19 01:31 (UTC)

Full Name: Russell Skinner
Company: Skinner Waste Solutions
Affiliation: Florida Apartment Association

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: Our company employees

Created: 2020-06-18 22:44 (UTC)
Full Name: Oscar Torres
Company: Cohisa
Affiliation: 3431347

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: NFPA 101 establishes the requirements clearly and precisely

Created: 2020-06-18 22:15 (UTC)
Full Name: Omar Soliman
Company:
Affiliation: TB

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: This is a much needed amenity this increases recycling and resident safety. There are no hazards and the service allows for a nighttime employee to keep the community clean and safe. Not 1 case of any fire caused or obstructed because of this service

Created: 2020-06-18 21:39 (UTC)
Full Name: Martin Anderson
Company: Siemens Building Technologies,
Affiliation: AFAA

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: I believe NFPA 101 covers this properly

Created: 2020-06-18 19:35 (UTC)
Full Name:

Company:
Affiliation: National Apartment Association

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: Valet trash services have been in existence since 1995. There have been over 3 billion collections with zero reported incidents.

Created: 2020-06-18 19:20 (UTC)
Full Name: Amanda Gill
Company: Florida Apartment Association
Affiliation: Florida Apartment Association

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: The Florida Apartment Association (FAA), which represents more than 750,000 apartment homes across the state, is writing to express support for NFPA 1-8. Valet trash services are a valuable amenity offered by apartment communities and FAA supports the ability for these services to be allowable under the code in the future. Typically, an apartment community is serviced by a valet trash provider multiple times a week. During service times, a resident's personal trash is placed outside of the apartment for a short period of time before it is collected by the valet trash provider and disposed of in the apartment community's compactor. In addition to providing trash disposal services, many valet waste providers collect residents' recyclable materials, thereby increasing the industry's overall recycling efforts and allowing apartment communities to comply with local government recycling mandates. Valet trash services provide an array of benefits for apartment operators as well as residents. On the operations side, valet trash services make an apartment community a more attractive option for prospective renters and reduce spills in hallways, which in turn reduces costs and prevents messes that may lead to sanitary concerns or a slip and fall incident. Valet waste services also provide important benefits for residents, especially those who have limited mobility or would otherwise find it difficult to dispose of their trash.

Created: 2020-06-18 18:56 (UTC)
Full Name: Raymond Grill
Company: Arup
Affiliation: Self

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: having a conflict between 1010 and 1 is inappropriate.

Created: 2020-06-18 18:44 (UTC)
Full Name: Mike Dean

Company: A1 Valet Trash, LLC
Affiliation: Atlanta Apartment Association

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: Valet Trash has been around for 25 + years. It has been deemed an essential service and employs over 10,000 hard working Americans. The industry also serves over 2 million residents. Since then there has been ~3 billion pick-ups with ZERO incidents. This is a non-issue. I have sourced bin options that would meet the specifications, and findings confirm they reach a threshold that becomes unsustainable. This regulation is not feasible, and will drive my company and 10,000 other people out of work. It's a kitchen size trash can with household waste. It's on par with the risk we run from UBER Eats, Amazon and Dry Cleaning deliveries sitting on the doorstep. There is absolutely zero problem here. I'm on board for common sense regulation, but there is zero evidence or reason to ban the service or make it so costly the industry implodes.

Created: 2020-06-18 17:53 (UTC)
Full Name: Patrick Kelley
Company: Pro Valet Trash
Affiliation: Apartment Association

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: Please be realistic about what an actual valet trash and recycling collection program consists of and its actual relevance to any fire safety or life threatening hazards that may arise out of it. Base it off real world application of how such a program works and any supporting data of instances where this specifically has caused any concerns.

Created: 2020-06-18 05:52 (UTC)
Full Name: Russel Faleiro
Company: Gosafe Fire Security Safety
Affiliation: FIRE SYSTEM

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: AGREED

Created: 2020-06-18 05:19 (UTC)
Full Name: Justin Frost
Company: Affinity Waste Solutions
Affiliation: National Trash and Recycling Valet Association

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: As the President of the National Trash and Recycling Valet Association please review my comments listed below as I attended both NFPA1 and NFPA101 technical meetings in Boston and in St Louis. NFPA-1 and NFPA 101 are contradicting each other and have the complete opposite opinion of the other. Valet trash is a billion dollar industry that has been around for 25 years and is an essential business that provides over 10,000 jobs servicing over 2 million residents a safe way to dispose of their trash. This service helps military veterans, senior citizens, single moms, college kids, and all residents by picking up their trash in a leak proof container and taking it to the onsite dumpster which can be up to 1/2 a mile away from the residents unit or in the darkest area of the property creating a safety concern. The committee had several opportunities to work with the Valet Trash Association representing over 200 companies in 50 states and refused to help create a safe regulation. Instead of working with an industry that has been around for 25 years, they wanted to get rid of it. The committee believed that this is a safety issue. In 25 years over 3 billion doors have been serviced and there have never been a recorded fire issue related to "Valet Trash Services' ". There are many firefighters that work for or own valet trash companies that do not agree with the Association of fire fighters for trying to prohibit valet trash services. There are several Chief fire fighters throughout the entire country that believes that Apartments that have valet trash brings a safer environment to the community. Please see the facts listed below : *200 Family Owned Small businesses will go under *Over 10,000 people will lose their job* Amazon Packages that sit outside an apartment unit all day cause a bigger fire safety issue *This will affect every Apartment Community sale value by \$250,000 that has Valet Trash *Valet employees have saved residents lives by being on property 5 nights a week *Trash is only set outside their door for a maximum of 5 hours *Trash is placed inside a 13 gallon trash can with a lid and must be brought back inside after service *Valet trash prevents leakages in hallways preventing residents from slip and falls *Valet Trash has been voted in the past as the #1 Apartment amenity *Valet Trash helps prevent the spread of COVID 19 so 300 residents and their families a day don't touch the same compactor door potentially causing a entire community outbreak

Created: 2020-06-18 01:12 (UTC)

Full Name: John Campbell

Company: Global Fire Protection Group,

Affiliation: Member

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: agree with the motion

Created: 2020-06-17 19:48 (UTC)

Full Name: John Taylor

Company: HCT, LLC

Affiliation: Healthcare Consulting

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: Overly burdensome.

Created: 2020-06-17 19:38 (UTC)

Full Name: Danny Underwood

Company: Tanner Medical Ctr

Affiliation: Tanner Medical Center, Inc.

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: for

Created: 2020-06-17 18:31 (UTC)

Full Name: Ron Ritchey

Company: NFSA

Affiliation: NFSA

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: NFPA 1 should not void provisions under the scope of another NFPA document.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:10 (UTC)

Full Name: Jonathan Griffin

Company: Cosco Fire Protection Inc.

Affiliation: NICET

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: Agree with Committee

Created: 2020-06-17 17:01 (UTC)

Full Name: Daniel Welkley

Company: Ameren Corp

Affiliation: NFPA Member

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: Agree with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-17 16:49 (UTC)
Full Name: Curtis Jackson
Company: United Eneritech
Affiliation: Engineering Manager

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: In the interest of safety, this makes sense

Created: 2020-06-16 23:50 (UTC)
Full Name: Jon Boyd
Company: Tide Valet Waste LLC
Affiliation: President

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: Good morning Industry Leaders, How did we get here? Last Thursday I jumped on a call with 15 participants lead by Robby Dawson of the NFPA and the President of the National Valet Trash and Recycling association. I was informed that my entire business and it's 150 employees, across 9 states, that rely on this opportunity to provide for their families could possibly go from an essential employee to unemployed and would be considered an illegal operation by this Friday. My world was turned upside down in the pouring rain that afternoon. I felt like I let my teammates down and created a schism within the NFPA community. I never grew up thinking I wanted to get into the trash business, because who does? But in 2013 I started a door to door valet trash company out of adversity called Tide Valet. I spilled trash in a brand new car going to the compactor at my apartment community and never looked back. All I want to do is take out your trash, safely. Currently, we service 25,000 homes a night and we are just a small fish in a big pond. Since our inception we have had 0 recordables with the thousands of people we have employed and serviced over the last 7 years. My 3rd in command of the company is a volunteer fire fighter in Long Island and some of my best employees are fire fighters. A firefighter on the call owns a valet trash company and operates out of Houston. This news came as a surprise to all of us let alone the dozens and dozens of valet trash companies that have no clue what is being proposed here. We (Tide Valet Waste, LLC) agree, some stationary bins are too large and we have lost business because we put safety first here. Our valet trash bin is about 3 pounds and holds a 13 gallon tall trash bag. It's placement hours are from 6-8pm, we start service at 8pm from 11pm and the bins are inside back inside the residence by 9am the next morning. In my experience, our presence has helped the community at large be a safer one. We want our discussions to be based around facts and trendlines to be drivers for change; I am not sure terms like "fuel package" and "allowing anything in the hallways is a hazard" are valet trash specific as some of this proposed language lines out. You all have my company's full corporation to find a better solution to allow us to keep working safely as our industry has for over 25 years. Safety is at the forefront of our focus daily and the data shows it. You all are my brothers and sisters and we are after the same goal. I will open my operations processes and technology that unequivocally shows how serious we are about safety and the safety of all. I am available 24/7 to help assist with internal concerns and review best practices. Faithfully, Jon David Boyd | President of Tide Valet Waste LLC | JBoyd@tidevalet.com | 843.990.8373

Created: 2020-06-16 21:25 (UTC)

Full Name: Vincent Baroncini

Company: Siemens, Inc.

Affiliation: Siemens, Inc.

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: Will be addressed in NFPA 101

Created: 2020-06-16 17:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Vincent Quintero

Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marshal

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: Update necessary

Created: 2020-06-16 17:45 (UTC)
Full Name: Doug Borkowski
Company: Tide Valet
Affiliation: Valet Trash Vendor

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: We welcome implementing agreed upon safety standards but not removal of the industry as a whole. In the history of the service and how ubiquitous it is, it is clear the service can be performed safely and provides benefits to all parties. Valet trash and recycling services have been around for decades. The removal of the service will affect millions of residents from receiving a convenient amenity, cost thousands of jobs on both the vendor side & the property management side, and impact tax revenues for states/counties. In terms of egress - the cans/trash do not block any exits and can be easily moved as they are < 3lb cans. In terms of "storage" of combustible materials - this is short term placement with a limited time window. By this logic, nothing should be allowed in front of any apartment unit - doormats, packages/mail, decorations, plants, etc. as literally anything "could" be a hazard if you imagine it to be.

Created: 2020-06-15 13:54 (UTC)
Full Name: William Fitch
Company: Phyrefish.com
Affiliation: Phyrefish.com

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: Agree with submitter that this issue should be resolved in NFPA 101 and not have conflicts between two NFPA standards

Created: 2020-06-15 13:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Bridget Mourao
Company: Emory University
Affiliation: NFPA Technical Member

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: In dealing with Trash and Recycling Collection Services, this proposal is welcomed.

Created: 2020-06-12 17:41 (UTC)

Full Name: Kevin Schwartz

Company:

Affiliation: Valet Living, LLC

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: The service, known generically as door-step trash collection, is 25 years old and is occurring in all 50 states in more than 10 percent of all apartment homes (appx 2.1 million units served) without rules specifically governing its operation. For those who want it specifically regulated, the 101 language that is the subject of CAMs 101-10/11 (and could be locked out of NFPA 1 if this CAM fails) is a reasonable starting place as it was the first language negotiated with the two opposing industry factions and requires fire-safety containers to be used where none are required now in any NFPA state. Even if you oppose this industry, the introduction of fire-safety containers to the system will objectively, inarguably make apartment residents, guests and staffs safer.

Created: 2020-06-11 17:18 (UTC)

Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler

Company: GBH International

Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: Valet trash collection exists now and needs to be regulated. Simply eliminating regulation will not make the activity go away.

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Scott Newman

Company: Walgreens

Affiliation: None

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: In alignment with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Jameson Wendell

Company: Merck Co
Affiliation: User

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)
Full Name: Shay Rankhorn
Company: Ballad Health
Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: For

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)
Full Name: Douglas Miller
Company: Local 190
Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: Needs to be addressed but maybe not in 101 if NFPA 1 will be covering it.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)
Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas
Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue
Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)
Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed
Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp
Affiliation: member

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-08 22:51 (UTC)

Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler

Company: GBH International

Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: In the absence of regulation the type of valet trash collection service will not go away but simply remain unregulated and will be unsafe. This type of service has been going on for a long time and should be regulated for safety. The opposite action in 101-10 and 101-11 should be opposed.

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)

Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos

Company: City Of Tamarac

Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: I agree that if language was removed from section 30.7.5, this reference would direct code officials to a non-existent section.

Created: 2020-06-19 20:48 (UTC)

Full Name: Catherine Stashak

Company: Office Of The Illinois State F

Affiliation: Employee

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: I oppose this recommended change to NFPA 1. Valet trash may have been around for a long time but its presence has been in violation of fire codes and life safety codes. The model codes used in the U.S. including the I-Codes and NFPA 1 and NFPA 101 have prohibited corridors to be used for storage of hazardous items or to have items placed in corridors that represent a hazardous, flammable, or combustibile situation for decades. Valet trash represents unknown hazards to building occupants because there is no control over what is placed in those bags. There could be items that would contribute to a growing fire or present a hazardous challenge to first responders. Additionally, valet trash presents obstructions to the means of egress which has also been prohibited in the model codes (including the I-Codes and NFPA codes) for decades and decades. These codes have never permitted the addition of more hazardous items within a means of egress or permitted travel through an area that presents a higher hazard. This also resents a challenge to first responders setting up operations. Valet trash may have been around for many years, but again, it has been an illegal and unsafe operation in accordance with the bulk of the codes adopted by jurisdictions throughout the U.S. This language should be kept out of both NFPA 1 and NFPA 101.

Created: 2020-06-17 20:21 (UTC)

Full Name: Todd Kidd

Company: Liberty Mutual Insurance Compa

Affiliation: Insurance

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: Would reduce the restrictions

Created: 2020-06-17 19:58 (UTC)

Full Name: Jason Ellis

Company: University Of Kentucky

Affiliation: AHJ

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: I disagree

Created: 2020-06-17 18:48 (UTC)

Full Name: Bret Martin

Company: CNA Insurance

Affiliation: Self

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: Agree in principle with committee.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:32 (UTC)
Full Name: Thomas Pitschneider
Company: Shakopee City Of
Affiliation: Shakopee Fire

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: I don't believe in adding combustible load to a rated exit corridor.

Created: 2020-06-17 16:52 (UTC)
Full Name: Steve Tafoya
Company:
Affiliation: Fayette County BOC

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: no comment

Created: 2020-06-17 16:51 (UTC)
Full Name: Archie McCartney
Company: Vcu Community Memorial Hospt
Affiliation: Member

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: It doesn't make sense

Created: 2020-06-17 16:29 (UTC)
Full Name: Brenda McNorton
Company: Kansas State Fire Marshal
Affiliation: Kansas State Fire Marshal

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: Because many LJDs don't use or reference NFPA 1

Created: 2020-06-16 16:19 (UTC)
Full Name: Norbert Makowka
Company: National Association Of Fire E

Affiliation: NAFED

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: Valet trash services should not be allowed by the Code

Created: 2020-06-15 16:55 (UTC)

Full Name: Vincent Quintero

Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha

Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: Redundant citing are necessary just in case one the NFPA citing aren't adopted

Created: 2020-06-13 23:13 (UTC)

Full Name: Catherine Stashak

Company: Illinois State Fire Marshal

Affiliation: Employee

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: The Technical Correlating Committee for NFPA 101 voted and successfully passed ballot to consider deleting valet trash provisions submitted under FR-6741 and FR-6898 on December 11, 2018 indicated valet trash falls within the scope of NFPA 1. Valet trash violates all the tenets and goals of the Life Safety package of an Apartment Building that have been in place for decades: one of those being protecting the means of egress so occupants can evacuate. Protecting the means of egress from obstructions and hazards is a sacred, tried, and true fire safety principle. NFPA 1 specifically prohibits the introduction of high hazards into, or travel through an area with high hazards. I have heard supporters indicate that valet trash will prevent hoarding and that this concept permits the relocation of hazards from the area where occupants reside to the outside of their dwelling unit (in an apartment building). These discussions represent the exact opposite of what a life safety package's goal is all about. The Fire Code and AHJs have no control over what occupants of Apartment Buildings will be doing inside their apartments. Someone could be smoker with a bad habit of falling a sleep while smoking, or someone with risky cooking habits (whether food or maybe meth), we really have no control over what happens within the dwelling units of an Apartment Building. That is why we separate the corridors and the means of egress from those unknowns with fire-rated walls and doors and language that prevents the placement of hazardous materials within the corridors. Remember we also have no control over what will be in those garbage bags sitting out in those exit access corridors. Firefighter safety, one of the goals of the Fire Code, is also affected by this language. All these extra combustibles represent extra challenges, obstructions, and hazards to first responders...again we don't know what will be placed in these garbage bags or garbage cans.

Created: 2020-06-12 15:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Jonathan Tarvin

Company: Alabama Power

Affiliation: nicet

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: ok

Created: 2020-06-11 17:25 (UTC)

Full Name: Rick Swan

Company: IAFF Local 2881/CAL FIRE Fight

Affiliation: International Association of Fire Fighters

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: Supporters of this CAM will tell you that this is for the elderly, the very folks that will need support from incoming fire fighters to evacuate during emergencies. Allowing trash cans into the exit path will only cause more hazards to the very folk's supporters say why a trash valet is needed. Convenience should never be placed over safety. Allowing anything in the hallways is a hazard and should not be allowed. It has been stated that without this CAM that trash valet will be unregulated. The current language already says trash valet shall not be permitted. By opposing this CAM and supporting NFPA 101, CAM 101-10/101-20 and 101-11/101-21 will correlate the two documents, again, not allowing trash valet.

Created: 2020-06-11 13:58 (UTC)

Full Name: James Narva

Company: NASFM

Affiliation: National Association of State Fire Marshals

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: The National Association of State Fire Marshal (NASFM) is opposed to CAM 1-8 20.9.2.2 Trash and Recycling Collection Services. The introduction of trash in corridors of any occupancy goes against the basic principles of egress for occupant and creates a fire and life safety, property protection and fire fighter safety hazard, and is in direct violation of NFPA 1. Specifically chapter 19 which prohibits “waste materials from accumulating in an area that can create a fire hazard or hazard to life or property (19.1.2), and chapter 14 which requires the means of egress to “be continuously maintained free of all obstructions or impediments to full and instant use in the case of fire or other emergency” 14.4.1). The placement of trash in the exit corridor adds an unwanted fuel package to the fire load which creates an added fire hazard and creates obstructions in the means of egress. The NFPA 1 Technical Committee (TC) removed the provisions of valet trash and added new requirements prohibiting its use. The NFPA 101 Residential TC in their acceptance SR 6587 and 6588 failed to address the Correlating Committee note “Consider deleting the proposed valet trash pick-up requirements and either reference or extract criteria from NFPA 1. Valet trash requirements appear to be within the scope of NFPA 1 rather than NFPA 101.” We agree with the Correlating Committee and believe it is as it’s more than a life safety issue, which is supported by the scope of NFPA 1, specifically: •III1.1.1(1) the storage of additional fuel packages in the means of egress is a fire related life safety situation. •III1.1.1(8) the addition of trash storage in hallways will impede fire department operations. •III1.1.1(11) the additional combustible materials associated with storage of trash will contribute to fire spread and smoke production. •III1.1.1(15) the added fuel will create added hazards to firefighter safety due to fire, smoke, and heat production. •III1.1.1(16) trash in the hallway will affect the means of egress. The proposed text is in conflict with proven fire safety principles used for many years which prohibit combustible materials in egress corridors and is clear conflict with those chapter 14 and 19 provisions noted above. NASFM recent research has proven that while buildings as a whole may be safer, occupant evacuation times has decreased. Allowing trash into egress corridors would simply compound this issue. Adding this language will create confusion and conflict within the code. Past fire history has shown how combustibles in the means of egress contributes to fire spread, hampers firefighting efforts, and limits the occupant’s ability to egress. Materials, especially combustible materials, are fire fighter safety issues as it creates a new fire load when stored in the means of egress and may inhibit quick and effective firefighting operations. In closing the National Association of State Fire Marshal (NASFM) is opposed to CAM 1-8 on section 20.9.2.2 Tras

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)
Full Name: Kenneth Tyree
Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh
Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: IFMA is opposed to requirements on valet trash. The introduction of trash in corridors of any occupancy goes against the basic principles of egress for occupant and creates a fire and life safety, property protection and fire fighter safety hazard, and is in direct violation of NFPA 1. Specifically chapter 19 which prohibits “waste materials from accumulating in an area that can create a fire hazard or hazard to life or property (19.1.2), and chapter 14 which requires the means of egress to “be continuously maintained free of all obstructions or impediments to full and instant use in the case of fire or other emergency” 14.4.1). The placement of trash in the exit corridor adds an unwanted fuel package to the fire load which creates an added fire hazard, and creates obstructions in the means of egress. The NFPA 1 TC removed the provisions of valet trash and added new requirements prohibiting its use. The NFPA 101 Residential TC in their acceptance SR 6587 and 6588 failed to address the Correlating Committee note “Consider deleting the proposed valet trash pick-up requirements and either reference or extract criteria from NFPA 1. Valet trash requirements appear to be within the scope of NFPA 1 rather than NFPA 101.” We agree with the Correlating Committee and believe it is as it’s more than a life safety issue, which is supported by the scope of NFPA 1, specifically: •III1.1.1(1) the storage of additional fuel packages in the means of egress is a fire related life safety situation. •III1.1.1(8) the addition of trash storage in hallways will impede fire department operations. •III1.1.1(11) the additional combustible materials associated with storage of trash will contribute to fire spread and smoke production. •III1.1.1(15) the added fuel will create added hazards to firefighter safety due to fire, smoke, and heat production. •III1.1.1(16) trash in the hallway will affect the means of egress.. The proposed text is in conflict with proven fire safety principles used for many years which prohibit combustible materials in egress corridors, and is clear conflict with those chapter 14 and 19 provisions noted above. Adding this language will create confusion and conflict within the code. Past fire history has shown how combustibles in the means of egress contributes to fire spread, hampers firefighting efforts, and limits the occupant’s ability to egress. Materials, especially combustible materials, are fire fighter safety issues as it creates a new fire load when stored in the means of egress and may inhibit quick and effective firefighting operations.

Created: 2020-06-10 22:57 (UTC)
Full Name: Bruce Kral
Company: West Metro Fire Prot Dist
Affiliation: West Metro Fire

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: NFPA's fire code is the proper place to identify allowable conditions for fire code required exit pathways and their reliability. The Life Safety Code should concur with the requirements of the fire code.

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)
Full Name: Christopher Kachura
Company: Southeast Fire Protection
Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: Text should remain for reference.

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Parrish

Company: Telgian Corporation

Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)

Full Name: Matthew Mertens

Company: North Shore Fire Department

Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: This is a very broad stroke to allow trash collection services in all building and need further vetting prior to allowance.

Created: 2020-06-19 18:26 (UTC)

Full Name: Gregory Ohnemus

Company: Anvil International

Affiliation: Anvil International & NFSA E&S

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: This requires a jurisdiction to retain electronic inspection records when deficiencies are enforced.

Created: 2020-06-19 15:34 (UTC)

Full Name: Terry Victor

Company: Johnson Controls

Affiliation: Johnson Controls

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: Agree with submitter's statement.

Created: 2020-06-19 12:09 (UTC)

Full Name: Martin Anderson
Company: Siemens Building Technologies,
Affiliation: AFAA

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: For

Created: 2020-06-19 02:19 (UTC)
Full Name: James Priest
Company: Fermi National Accelerator Lab
Affiliation: Government

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: Yes, they need to be maintained if for no other reason future litigation if an accident occurred or at least a reasonable time frame with the statute of limitations. This seems more of question for the attorneys.

Created: 2020-06-18 22:44 (UTC)
Full Name: Oscar Torres
Company: Cohisa
Affiliation: 3431347

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: improves control

Created: 2020-06-18 20:02 (UTC)
Full Name: Terin Hopkins
Company: National Fire Sprinkler Associ
Affiliation: NFSA

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: This language simply looks to clarify that when a “notice of violation” is written by the AHJ, supporting documents showing the violation should become part of the AHJ’s report, which is already required by the code to be maintained. Currently the AHJ could cite a violation and any supporting document used in that citation would not be required to be maintained, leaving the AHJ without documented cause for the enforcement. This section does not require the AHJ to maintain building owner’s maintenance records but simple the ones cited in enforcement. Please support and vote FOR: CAM 1-9

Created: 2020-06-18 05:52 (UTC)
Full Name: Russel Faleiro
Company: Gosafe Fire Security Safety
Affiliation: FIRE SYSTEM

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: AGREED

Created: 2020-06-17 20:21 (UTC)
Full Name: Todd Kidd
Company: Liberty Mutual Insurance Compa
Affiliation: Insurance

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: Good text addition

Created: 2020-06-17 19:38 (UTC)
Full Name: Danny Underwood
Company: Tanner Medical Ctr
Affiliation: Tanner Medical Center, Inc.

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: for

Created: 2020-06-17 18:31 (UTC)
Full Name: Ron Ritchey
Company: NFSA
Affiliation: NFSA

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: This requires a jurisdiction to retain electronic inspection records when deficiencies are enforced.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:10 (UTC)
Full Name: Jonathan Griffin
Company: Cosco Fire Protection Inc.
Affiliation: NICET

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: Agree with Committee

Created: 2020-06-17 17:01 (UTC)
Full Name: Daniel Welkley
Company: Ameren Corp
Affiliation: NFPA Member

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: Agree with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-17 16:49 (UTC)
Full Name: Curtis Jackson
Company: United Enertech
Affiliation: Engineering Manager

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: In the interest of safety, this makes sense

Created: 2020-06-16 21:25 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Baroncini
Company: Siemens, Inc.
Affiliation: Siemens, Inc.

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: Makes the documents available.

Created: 2020-06-16 19:26 (UTC)
Full Name: Chase Browning
Company: Medford Fire Rescue
Affiliation: Medford Fire Department

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: As an AHJ, I think it is important to include this requirement.

Created: 2020-06-16 17:52 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Quintero
Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marshal

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: Update necessary

Created: 2020-06-15 16:55 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Quintero
Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: Redundancy is necessary

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Scott Newman
Company: Walgreens
Affiliation: None

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: In alignment with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)
Full Name: Kenneth Tyree

Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh
Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Jameson Wendell
Company: Merck Co
Affiliation: User

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)
Full Name: Shay Rankhorn
Company: Ballad Health
Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: For

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)
Full Name: Douglas Miller
Company: Local 190
Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: These documents should be readily available if there are deficiencies in the system.

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)
Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed
Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp
Affiliation: member

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-08 18:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Jeffrey Hugo

Company: NFSA

Affiliation: NFSA

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: Motion to Accept Public Comment No. 33 Currently NFPA 1 requires records of examinations, approvals, equivalencies, alternates to be kept and maintained by the AHJ. Public comment No. 33 (PC-33) fills a gap in the records and reports section (Section 1.11) of NFPA 1 and complements the changes made by First Revision No. 10 (FR-10). PC-33 closes a loophole that electronic inspection reporting and services are providing to AHJs. When an AHJ uses a third-party service to deliver inspection, testing, and maintenance (ITM) reports, they are done so electronically. The inspection records submitted by the inspection contractor are usually kept in the cloud on a server. The electronic ITM enforcement process is typically viewed through a user dashboard by the AHJ to monitor and enforce fire protection ITM reports per the frequencies prescribed by fire protection ITM standards, such as NFPA 12, NFPA 25, NFPA 72, NFPA 96, NFPA 101, NFPA 2001, etc. The AHJ can view inspection records without downloading them on the AHJ's computer and the document ownership typically remains back to the building owner, but some third-party contracts on document ownership in the cloud are unclear. Section 1.11 addresses many AHJ maintained documents and paper trails for enforcement, but as an electronic document, viewable on a dashboard, it is not usually in the AHJ's possession to enforce. The committee rejected PC-33 because NFPA 1 requires the building owner maintain ITM documentation. This is a true statement, but how does the AHJ enforce a deficiency on a document it does not retain? If other documents that the AHJ processes, reviews, issues and enforces are required to be maintained, then ITM records should be treated the same. PC-33 would not require the AHJ to retain all ITM documentation. PC-33 addresses when the AHJ enforces ITM, such as through a notice of violation or penalty it retains the ITM inspection record as the reason for the enforcement. If an ITM system has deficiencies, the AHJ writes the notice of violation letter with a copy or documentation of the deficiency. The 2021 NFPA 1, through FR-10, will require the AHJ to retain all plan reviews, permits, and all associated notes in Section 1.11. PC-33 does not require all the electronic ITM records are maintained by the AHJ, only those ITM records that are used for enforcement. PC-33 allows the building owners to retain ownership of their documents when the fire protection systems are maintained according to the ITM standards. Respectfully submitted, Jeffrey M. Hugo – National Fire Sprinkler Association

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)

Full Name: Matthew Mertens

Company: North Shore Fire Department

Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: deficiencies and corrective orders are already a part of normal practice.

Created: 2020-06-18 18:56 (UTC)

Full Name: Raymond Grill

Company: Arup

Affiliation: Self

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: The requirement is not clear. How long does the AHJ have to maintain the documents?

Created: 2020-06-18 01:12 (UTC)

Full Name: John Campbell

Company: Global Fire Protection Group,

Affiliation: Member

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: Should not put the requirement for document retention on the AHJ

Created: 2020-06-17 20:56 (UTC)

Full Name: Andrew Fosina

Company: Htfd No1

Affiliation: Government - Fire Service

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: For what period of time? Too open ended.

Created: 2020-06-17 19:58 (UTC)

Full Name: Jason Ellis

Company: University Of Kentucky

Affiliation: AHJ

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: It should remain the responsibility of the property owner to maintain records and provide proof of corrections to AHJ.

Created: 2020-06-17 19:48 (UTC)

Full Name: John Taylor

Company: HCT, LLC

Affiliation: Healthcare Consulting

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: Overly burdeonsome on the AHJ. Recommended practice.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:48 (UTC)

Full Name: Bret Martin

Company: CNA Insurance

Affiliation: Self

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: AHJ's should not be responsible for maintained by an AHJ.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:32 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Pitschneider

Company: Shakopee City Of

Affiliation: Shakopee Fire

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: The property owner by code owns the systems and should be required to maintain all the records.

Created: 2020-06-17 16:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Steve Tafoya

Company:

Affiliation: Fayette County BOC

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: no comment

Created: 2020-06-17 16:51 (UTC)
Full Name: Archie McCartney
Company: Vcu Community Memorial Hospt
Affiliation: Member

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: There is no reason for this

Created: 2020-06-17 16:29 (UTC)
Full Name: Brenda McNorton
Company: Kansas State Fire Marshal
Affiliation: Kansas State Fire Marshal

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: Because the owner/manager should be responsible

Created: 2020-06-16 16:19 (UTC)
Full Name: Norbert Makowka
Company: National Association Of Fire E
Affiliation: NAFED

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: Undue burden for AHJ

Created: 2020-06-15 13:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Bridget Mourao
Company: Emory University
Affiliation: NFPA Technical Member

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: AHJ competencies in fire protection vary and this delegation of authority could cause bureaucratic issues in maintaining fire protection systems.

Created: 2020-06-12 15:15 (UTC)
Full Name: Jonathan Tarvin

Company: Alabama Power
Affiliation: nicet

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: ok

Created: 2020-06-11 13:58 (UTC)
Full Name: James Narva
Company: NASFM
Affiliation: National Association of State Fire Marshals

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: Places an undue and excessive burden on AHJs

Created: 2020-06-10 22:57 (UTC)
Full Name: Bruce Kral
Company: West Metro Fire Prot Dist
Affiliation: West Metro Fire

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: Requested by who? For how long?

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)
Full Name: Christopher Kachura
Company: Southeast Fire Protection
Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: AHJ is not responsible for maintain owner records.

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Thomas Parrish
Company: Telgian Corporation
Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision the code already requires the system owner to retain all records.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)

Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas

Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: The language is unclear if it allows for a third party reporting service to store the documents and places an unfunded liability on the AHJ for software and storage needs for public records requirements.

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)

Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos

Company: City Of Tamarac

Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: If the property owner is requesting documents, how/why is the AHJ having to maintain these? How will the AHJ be notified that these documents are being requested? This deficiency report should be kept by the servicing company and by the property owner.

Created: 2020-06-08 14:23 (UTC)

Full Name: Warren Olsen

Company: Fire Safety Consultants, Inc.

Affiliation: Illinois Fire Inspectors Association

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: CAM 1-9 does not include language indicating how long the documents must be maintained for.

Created: 2020-06-19 20:23 (UTC)

Full Name: Roland Kraiss

Company: UW Health

Affiliation: Health Care

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: The need to document that the active fire protection devices coordinate with the passive fire protection elements needs to be coordinated within the integrated fire alarm testing.

Created: 2020-06-19 20:19 (UTC)

Full Name: Ronald Smidt

Company: Atrium Health

Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Good verbiage

Created: 2020-06-19 16:27 (UTC)

Full Name: William Koffel

Company: Koffel Associates, Inc.

Affiliation: Self

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: I have reviewed the responses that are against CAM 4-1 and would like to respond to some of those comments. I encourage the membership to continue to support CAM 4-1. For the record, while some of our clients have submitted comments in support of CAM 4-1, the NITMAM and these comments were not submitted on behalf of any client. The NITMAM was submitted as a personal view as to what is correct for proper fire protection. One opposing argument is that fire resistance rated walls do not require any additional testing. In general I agree and such a feature is not "integrated" with other fire protection systems. However, there are passive features that must perform some change in state as part of an integrated fire protection system. If not, why does the document continue to refer to passive systems in other sections? For example, there are some door assemblies that have a fire resistance rating and as such, by many codes are actually considered fire resistance rated walls. These "movable" walls may define the barrier of a smoke zone. They are integrated with other fire protection systems. If the movable wall fails to operate properly, the smoke control system is also likely to fail to function properly. As such, they should be included in the test of an integrated fire protection or life safety system. I do not see how this change really impacts staffing or fire drills. However, one of the submitters who voted "against" actually seems to support CAM 4-1. While passive system testing is addressed by acceptance criteria in individual standards (such as NFPA 80) and may be included in the commissioning document (such as NFPA 3), the methods by which such features are to be tested as an integrated system are covered by NFPA 4. If the argument that integrated testing is covered by installation standards and NFPA 3 for passive systems is valid, the same could be true for active systems and there would be no need for NFPA 4. It is essential that both passive and active systems that are part of an integrated system be properly tested as required by NFPA 4. I agree that integrated systems can vary significantly. A properly prepared test plan will address the unique aspects for each integrated system. Again, this condition applies to both active and passive systems and provides no basis for the scope to delete passive systems. In summary, there appears to be strong support for CAM 4-1 and the Technical Committee ballot for the Second Revision passed by one vote. While "passive" was deleted from the Scope by SR#4, multiple other references to passive systems were retained. If NFPA 4 should not address passive systems, why does the document continue to address the need to test passive systems in other sections? Support CAM 4-1.

Created: 2020-06-19 02:19 (UTC)

Full Name: James Priest

Company: Fermi National Accelerator Lab

Affiliation: Government

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: This makes sense and Fermilab Fire Dept and Emergency Management and occupants has used this opportunity for practice

Created: 2020-06-18 21:39 (UTC)

Full Name: Martin Anderson

Company: Siemens Building Technologies,

Affiliation: AFAA

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: I agree passive systems must be included in the testing

Created: 2020-06-18 18:59 (UTC)

Full Name: Michael Mattson

Company: Substation Standards

Affiliation: Salt River Project

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: The integrated nature of active and passive fire protection is represented in the revised wording. The revised wording ensures the passive fire protection is considered when considering operational readiness.

Created: 2020-06-18 18:09 (UTC)

Full Name: Peter Carbone

Company: Proton Intl Hti Cancer Ctr

Affiliation: Proton International

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: ASHE recommends

Created: 2020-06-18 16:41 (UTC)

Full Name: Edward Goldhammer

Company: Hilti

Affiliation: Hilti

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Agree with the substantiation, this document covers both active and passive fire protection and is not limited to active only. The revised language creates confusion on the overall intent of the document.

Created: 2020-06-18 12:12 (UTC)

Full Name: James Green

Company: Nailor Industries

Affiliation: Producer

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Smoke and Combination Fire and Smoke dampers are an integral part of the life safety systems and compliment the active fire protection components. By removing passive fire protection the integrated testing will not encompass the overall fire protection of the system. In order to remove any vulnerabilities of the system, it is important that these dampers be tested and verify that everything works together.

Created: 2020-06-18 05:52 (UTC)
Full Name: Russel Faleiro
Company: Gosafe Fire Security Safety
Affiliation: FIRE SYSTEM

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: AGREED

Created: 2020-06-18 01:12 (UTC)
Full Name: John Campbell
Company: Global Fire Protection Group,
Affiliation: Member

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: agree with the motion

Created: 2020-06-17 20:56 (UTC)
Full Name: Andrew Fosina
Company: Htfd No1
Affiliation: Government - Fire Service

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Practical

Created: 2020-06-17 20:21 (UTC)
Full Name: Todd Kidd
Company: Liberty Mutual Insurance Compa
Affiliation: Insurance

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Good text addition

Created: 2020-06-17 19:58 (UTC)
Full Name: Jason Ellis
Company: University Of Kentucky
Affiliation: AHJ

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: I agree that the change better reflects the intent of the standard

Created: 2020-06-17 19:38 (UTC)
Full Name: Danny Underwood
Company: Tanner Medical Ctr
Affiliation: Tanner Medical Center, Inc.

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: for

Created: 2020-06-17 18:58 (UTC)
Full Name: Scott Rockwell
Company: Fike Corporation
Affiliation: Manufacturer

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: As per the purpose of this standard, it is to verify and document the operation and function of all interconnected fire protection and life safety systems. Fire protection and life safety systems do not stop with just the active systems. The passive systems are just as critical to the protection of the building, equipment and personnel. A component may be a listed fire or life safety device/system, but when combined in usage with other devices/systems, the integrated approach may not be able to provide the intended protection. As long as a passive device has a method for testing it should be done in an integrated approach to the overall safety.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:48 (UTC)
Full Name: Bret Martin
Company: CNA Insurance
Affiliation: Self

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Integrated testing needs to be incorporated by both active and passive systems.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:32 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Pitschneider

Company: Shakopee City Of

Affiliation: Shakopee Fire

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Includes active and passive

Created: 2020-06-17 18:10 (UTC)

Full Name: Jonathan Griffin

Company: Cosco Fire Protection Inc.

Affiliation: NICET

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Agree with Committee

Created: 2020-06-17 17:27 (UTC)

Full Name: Scott Hammond

Company: NEMIC

Affiliation: certification

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Both active and passive fire life systems need to be tested and maintained.

Created: 2020-06-17 17:01 (UTC)

Full Name: Daniel Welkley

Company: Ameren Corp

Affiliation: NFPA Member

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Agree with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-17 16:51 (UTC)

Full Name: Archie McCartney

Company: Vcu Community Memorial Hospt

Affiliation: Member

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: I think this should be mandated

Created: 2020-06-17 16:49 (UTC)

Full Name: Curtis Jackson

Company: United Enertech

Affiliation: Engineering Manager

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: In the interest of safety, this makes sense

Created: 2020-06-17 16:29 (UTC)

Full Name: Brenda McNorton

Company: Kansas State Fire Marshal

Affiliation: Kansas State Fire Marshal

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: It provides clarification

Created: 2020-06-17 16:13 (UTC)

Full Name: Aaron Gunzner

Company: AMCA International

Affiliation: AMCA International

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Smoke and combination fire-smoke dampers are an integral part of a building's fire and smoke resistance. Smoke and combination fire-smoke dampers are considered passive protection but are quite often connected to the fire alarm panel and/or the building management system. During a fire event, these dampers are designed to close to prevent the spread of fire or smoke and/or to open to evacuate smoke from the facility. These dampers need to be tested with all the other systems being tested to verify that all the systems function together properly. If this section calls out only "active" integrated fire protection and does not include the "passive" fire protection, then not including the smoke and combination fire-smoke dampers will leave a vulnerability in the fire and smoke protection of the building.

Created: 2020-06-17 15:12 (UTC)

Full Name: Michael Ivanovich

Company: Amca International

Affiliation: AMCA International

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: First of all, the scope of NFPA 4 clearly intends to cover passive fire/smoke protection because it has the term "integrated" in its title, and the term "integrated" encompasses active and passive fire protection systems. Passive fire and smoke systems are vitally important to building fire and smoke protection as they enable egress to occupants and entry to fire fighters and other first responders. Although smoke and combination fire/smoke dampers are considered as passive elements of an integrated fire-protection system, they are usually connected to the fire-alarm panel and/or the building management/control system. During a fire event these dampers are designed to close to prevent the spread of a fire or smoke and/or open to Evac the smoke from the facility. These dampers need to be tested with all the other systems being tested to verify that everything works together. If the section calls out only "active" integrated fire protection and does not include the "passive" protection, then not including the smoke and combination fire smoke dampers will leave a vulnerability in the fire and smoke protection in the building.

Created: 2020-06-17 13:07 (UTC)

Full Name: Stephen Carey

Company: Tamco

Affiliation: TAMCO

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Common sense tells you that in regards to Life Safety, All the systems need to be tested to make sure one does not interfere with another one. Leaving "Active" in there only is like only inspecting a fire fighters hose since it puts out the fire but not inspecting the fire proof suit or oxygen mask he wears, nor the ax he carries, or any of the other equipment that he may use when called to react to a situation. Yes, the Active system is a good start, but how do you know if the Passive (a Life Safety System also) system will work for or against the Active system? Knowing that both systems are working together, this add to the ability for additional life to be saved and reduce the property cost of the situation.

Created: 2020-06-17 12:36 (UTC)
Full Name: Kent Maune
Company: Ruskin Manufacturing
Affiliation: AMCA

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Smoke and combination fire smoke dampers are a vital part of a building's fire and smoke resistance. Smoke and combination fire smoke dampers are considered as passive protection but are quite often connected to the fire alarm panel and/or the BMS. During a fire event these dampers are designed to close to prevent the spread of a fire or smoke and/or open to Evac the smoke from the facility. These dampers need to be tested with all the other systems being tested to verify that everything works together. If the section calls out only "active" integrated fire protection and does not include the "passive" protection, then not including the smoke and combination fire smoke dampers will leave a vulnerability in the fire and smoke protection in the building.

Created: 2020-06-16 22:40 (UTC)
Full Name: Al Som
Company:
Affiliation: Mayo Clinic

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Documentation of the active fire protection devices coordinate with the passive fire protection elements within the integrated fire alarm testing.

Created: 2020-06-16 21:25 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Baroncini
Company: Siemens, Inc.
Affiliation: Siemens, Inc.

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Addresses both active and passive when integrated.

Created: 2020-06-16 19:01 (UTC)
Full Name: Thomas Wysocki
Company: Guardian Services, Inc.
Affiliation: None

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: It is essential that interconnected fire protection systems, both active and passive, be tested for proper operation in so far as is practicable. This document should include guidance for the integrated testing of passive systems which are interconnected to active systems.

Created: 2020-06-16 17:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Vincent Quintero

Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha

Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marshal

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Update necessary

Created: 2020-06-16 16:19 (UTC)

Full Name: Norbert Makowka

Company: National Association Of Fire E

Affiliation: NAFED

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Some passive fire protection and life safety systems should be included in integrated testing procedures

Created: 2020-06-15 23:32 (UTC)

Full Name: Shamim Rashidsumar

Company: Natl Ready Mixed Concrete Assn

Affiliation: Build with Strength Coalition

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: This motion amends the scope of the standard as described to equally apply the minimum requirements for testing of integrated fire protection systems to both passive and active systems, supporting the balanced approach to fire protection.

Created: 2020-06-15 21:49 (UTC)

Full Name: Kimberly Gruner

Company: Fike Corporation

Affiliation: Manufacturer

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: I agree with the submitter and add the following: There are three terms important for this topic: Passive component, Integrated Systems, and Testing. If there are passive devices involved in integrated systems that have a method of testing, then Passive should not be removed from the scope.

Created: 2020-06-15 16:55 (UTC)

Full Name: Vincent Quintero

Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha

Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Update are necessary

Created: 2020-06-12 16:34 (UTC)

Full Name: Christian Pierson

Company: U.S. Department Of State

Affiliation: NFPA 3/4 Technical Committee

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Passive fire protection is essential to the overall fire and life safety of a given building. It is also part of the basis of design of a building. First, I point to Mr. Fisher's input regarding the cross referencing of NFPA 3 and 4. It is imperative that all aspects of the overall design be properly installed, inspected, tested, and accepted during the commissioning. It should also go without saying that the same importance applies to the requirements set forth for "Periodic Integrated Systems Testing" and "Existing System Modifications" in Chapter 6 of NFPA 4. Second, passive systems failures such as fire/smoke doors or fire/smoke dampers can effect pressure differentials needed or required for smoke control, elevator shaft pressurization, and stair pressurization. Simply verifying a change of state of a fire alarm control module is not testing or verifying the complete separation or pressure requirements. Lastly, the installation and performance of passive systems/features can impact the code compliance of active systems. Failure of, or absence of fire/smoke barriers (including fire/smoke dampers, fire/smoke doors and windows, and firestop assemblies) are of concern. Design and installation requirements of NFPA 72 include separation requirements for fire command centers and survivability of Class A and Class X circuits, just to name two. Omitting the testing of passive systems/features is a disservice to all parties involved; including, the building owner and the occupants. Integrated testing of all active and passive fire protection systems and components is required. I am in favor (FOR) CAM 4-1_4-5.

Created: 2020-06-12 15:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Jonathan Tarvin
Company: Alabama Power
Affiliation: nicet

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: ok

Created: 2020-06-11 18:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Pascal Pfeiffer
Company: Axa XL Risk Consulting
Affiliation: EUROPEAN SPRINKLER NETWORK

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Passive systems shall be reinstated in the scope of the document, so were they since the beginning of the work by the technical committee on this document. Passive systems cannot be considered outside of the scope of an integrated fire protection and life safety system as they play an essential role in many circumstances depending on the occupancy to achieve the overall goal of safer facilities and buildings. Parts of those passive systems can also be connected with other purely active systems such as many have outlined before me.

Created: 2020-06-11 17:18 (UTC)
Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler
Company: GBH International
Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Submitter's explanation is persuasive.

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)
Full Name: Kenneth Tyree
Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh
Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-10 22:57 (UTC)
Full Name: Bruce Kral
Company: West Metro Fire Prot Dist
Affiliation: West Metro Fire

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Removed terms not needed.

Created: 2020-06-10 20:29 (UTC)
Full Name: Scott Eckstein
Company: Richardson Fire Department
Affiliation: Inspector

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: no conflicts

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)
Full Name: Christopher Kachura
Company: Southeast Fire Protection
Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: A

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Thomas Parrish
Company: Telgian Corporation
Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: The inclusion of passive features is an important part of the building's fire protection goals and design. These passive components need to be confirmed as part of the system testing. The Automatic Fire Alarm Association (AFAA) Supports this Motion.

Created: 2020-06-10 15:02 (UTC)
Full Name: Michael Spaziani
Company: FM Global
Affiliation: FM Global

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Passive fire protection features are often an integral aspect of an active system. Active fire protection systems are designed and installed based on passive features present. A fire door is a passive system, its position will affect the performance of certain active systems. Therefore, it must be part of any test of an integrated system.

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Jameson Wendell
Company: Merck Co
Affiliation: User

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 18:55 (UTC)
Full Name: Russell Leavitt
Company: Telgian Corporation
Affiliation: Member of NFPA 4 Technical Committee

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: This revision restricts the inclusion of passive systems with integrated system systems. Many passive systems are interconnected with active systems and to eliminate the requirement to include passive systems as a part of the standard is shortsighted and clearly does not meet the purpose of the standard. It is clear that passive systems are intended to be included where integrated with active systems by the annex language in the 2018 edition which includes passive systems such as fire resistive and smoke-resistant assemblies. Passive systems often include "active" components such as smoke dampers, etc. Please support this CAM.

Created: 2020-06-09 16:39 (UTC)
Full Name: Jonathan Flannery
Company: AHA - ASHE
Affiliation: American Society for Healthcare Engineering

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Coordinating the passive fire protection features along with the active fire protection features is an important part of integrated systems testing.

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Shay Rankhorn

Company: Ballad Health

Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: For

Created: 2020-06-09 13:54 (UTC)

Full Name: Jason Beers

Company: JLL Healthcare Solutions

Affiliation: Healthcare

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: The change in scope reflects the needs in the field.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)

Full Name: Douglas Miller

Company: Local 190

Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Code reads better in pass vote.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)

Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas

Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-09 12:33 (UTC)

Full Name: Scott Hammond

Company: NEMIC

Affiliation: certification

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Due to a lack of enforcement of inspection of passive fire life safety systems (ie: fire dampers, smoke dampers, fire doors) this proposal may assist and create an awareness of the importance of testing the entire fire life safety system, not just the active integrated systems.

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)

Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed

Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp

Affiliation: member

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)

Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos

Company: City Of Tamarac

Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: I agree that this should apply to both active and passive systems.

Created: 2020-06-08 15:35 (UTC)

Full Name: Douglas Fisher

Company: Fisher Engineering, Inc.

Affiliation: Tech Committee

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: I agree with the CAM for all of the reasons noted by the submitter. I disagree with the technical committee statement. Passive components are not necessarily inspected or verified during the installation process. In addition, passive components are only included in NFPA 3 if specifically listed in NFPA 3 (and if NFPA 3 applies to the project). NFPA 3 references Integrated Testing per NFPA 4 as part of the commissioning process. If NFPA 4 eliminates passive components, then how will they become part of the commissioning process since NFPA 3 references NFPA 4. There are many instances where passive components are needed to be reviewed, inspected and included in integrated testing to not only ensure those passive features were installed correctly but also to ensure that the integrated system functions properly. For example, a stair pressurization system relies on the performance of passive firestop systems and gasketing to ensure pressure differentials are maintained. If those passive systems are not included in the integrated test, they can be overlooked under the assumption that someone else has reviewed them. Further, as noted by Mr. Koffel, the change proposed by the technical committee was not based on public input but, rather, a committee input intent on cleaning up the document. There has not been any public concern noted via the PI process to indicate that the public wants "passive" to be removed and have NFPA 4 only apply to active fire protection and life safety measures. For the above reasons, I strongly support the CAM.

Created: 2020-06-08 14:35 (UTC)
Full Name: Thomas Parrish
Company: Telgian Corporation
Affiliation: AFAA

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: The Automatic Fire Alarm Association (AFAA) supports this motion because there are many factors that influence fire spread in a building. NFPA 4 was developed to ensure that all of the integrated building features would work together within the building. These factors include both active and passive systems. The deletion of the word active is appropriate because we want the testing included within the scope of NFPA 4 to include all systems including the passive ones such as fire stop requirements. In most cases the NFPA 4 testing is our last chance to catch any deficiencies and there is absolutely no reason why this document should only apply to active systems. Respectfully submitted, Tom Parrish, V.P AFAA, Chair AFAA Codes and Standards.

Created: 2020-06-08 14:23 (UTC)
Full Name: Warren Olsen
Company: Fire Safety Consultants, Inc.
Affiliation: Illinois Fire Inspectors Association

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Passive integrated fire protection and life safety system components are an important part of the overall protection of a building and should be tested during the testing of active systems. Language that excludes passive systems should not be incorporated within NFPA 4 as was done by the technical committee.

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)
Full Name: Matthew Mertens
Company: North Shore Fire Department
Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: system integration affects both passive and active systems, and should be tested accordingly.

Created: 2020-06-19 18:26 (UTC)
Full Name: Gregory Ohnemus
Company: Anvil International
Affiliation: Anvil International & NFSA E&S

CAM 4-1_4-5

AGAINST

Reason: The committee statement for SR#4 clarified NFPA 4 is for integrated testing of active systems. Passive systems are inspected and cannot be tested as active systems are. Passive system commissioning is already covered by NFPA 3

Created: 2020-06-19 15:34 (UTC)
Full Name: Terry Victor
Company: Johnson Controls
Affiliation: Johnson Controls

CAM 4-1_4-5

AGAINST

Reason: PLEASE READ BEFORE VOTING! Passive fire protection is just as important as active fire protection, but we need to remember what NFPA 4 is to be used for, Integrated System Testing. In other words, testing of systems that are tied into each other with one system initiating a signal that requires a response from another system. By definition (NFPA 4-2018, 3.3.25.4) an Integrated System is a combination of systems that are required to operate together as a whole to achieve overall fire protection and life safety objectives. I emphasize that these systems are to “operate” together, which requires movement of some fashion, and ties into the definitions of active and passive fire protection systems. By definition, (NFPA 3-2018, 3.3.20.1*) an Active Fire Protection System is a system that uses moving mechanical or electrical parts to achieve a fire protection goal. The annex further explains: Examples of active systems include gaseous extinguishing systems, sprinklers, standpipes, dampers, or fire alarm systems. By definition, (NFPA 4-2018, 3.3.25.7*) a Passive Fire Protection System is any portion of a building or structure that provides protection from fire or smoke without any type of system activation or movement. The annex further explains: Examples of passive systems include, but are not limited to, floor-ceilings and roof, door, window, and wall assemblies, spray-applied fire resistant materials, and other fire and smoke control assemblies. Passive fire protection systems can include active components and can be impacted by active systems, such as fire dampers. While passive fire protection systems may include active components, only the active components can be tested during an integrated systems test. Examples and forms in NFPA 4 include active systems and their responses to each other. For instance, review FIGURE A.3.3.23(a) Sequence of Operation. Most of the arguments in support of CAM 4-1 and 4-5 reference the need for smoke and fire/smoke dampers to be tested during the integrated system test. These are active fire protection system components and would be tested as part of the integrated system test if they are integrated with other systems. However, the smoke or fire partition or ceiling assembly itself is not tested during the integrated systems test. Including passive fire protection systems in the integrated systems test doesn’t make sense and if included will require many more individuals participating in the test, require additional time to perform the integrated systems test, and cost additional man-hours, thus increasing project costs.

Created: 2020-06-18 22:44 (UTC)

Full Name: Oscar Torres

Company: Cohisa

Affiliation: 3431347

CAM 4-1_4-5

AGAINST

Reason: It is important to clarify the need for revising documentation, methods, and participants and responsibilities.

Created: 2020-06-18 18:56 (UTC)

Full Name: Raymond Grill

Company: Arup

Affiliation: Self

CAM 4-1_4-5

AGAINST

Reason: Passive fire protection systems such as fire rated walls should be constructed consistent with the original listing. What tests would be performed on a fire rated wall in the field? This isn't feasible. I believe the submitter was intending to address doors potentially, but the proposed language doesn't differentiate between a wall and a door.

Created: 2020-06-17 19:48 (UTC)

Full Name: John Taylor

Company: HCT, LLC

Affiliation: Healthcare Consulting

CAM 4-1_4-5

AGAINST

Reason: Integrated fire systems that require occupants to play a role in the overall system need to be included in the testing to verify staffing is properly trained and in adequate numbers to meet the design criteria.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:31 (UTC)

Full Name: Ron Ritchey

Company: NFSA

Affiliation: NFSA

CAM 4-1_4-5

AGAINST

Reason: The committee statement for SR#4 clarified NFPA 4 is for integrated testing of active systems. Passive systems are inspected and cannot be tested as active systems are. Passive system commissioning is already covered by NFPA 3.

Created: 2020-06-17 16:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Steve Tafoya

Company:

Affiliation: Fayette County BOC

CAM 4-1_4-5

AGAINST

Reason: no comment

Created: 2020-06-15 13:46 (UTC)

Full Name: Bridget Mourao

Company: Emory University

Affiliation: NFPA Technical Member

CAM 4-1_4-5

AGAINST

Reason: Integrated fire system operations vary. Depending on the system, these required tests could cause issues in interrupting business operations. After installation of integrated systems, commissioning should be the only requirement. Fire drills should not be delayed for integrated testing. Fire drills happen frequently and Mass Communications and planned scenario drills should occur and be planned separate from regular fire drills.

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Scott Newman

Company: Walgreens

Affiliation: None

CAM 4-1_4-5

AGAINST

Reason: In alignment with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-19 02:19 (UTC)

Full Name: James Priest

Company: Fermi National Accelerator Lab

Affiliation: Government

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: I agree with the new text. The AHJ can always agree to alternate provisions and don't agree with the Recommended Text if Motion fails.

Created: 2020-06-18 22:44 (UTC)

Full Name: Oscar Torres

Company: Cohisa

Affiliation: 3431347

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: It clarifies which methods are acceptable, diminishing the probability of not knowing what method is to be employed

Created: 2020-06-18 05:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Russel Faleiro

Company: Gosafe Fire Security Safety
Affiliation: FIRE SYSTEM

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: AGREED

Created: 2020-06-17 19:58 (UTC)
Full Name: Jason Ellis
Company: University Of Kentucky
Affiliation: AHJ

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-17 19:38 (UTC)
Full Name: Danny Underwood
Company: Tanner Medical Ctr
Affiliation: Tanner Medical Center, Inc.

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: for

Created: 2020-06-17 18:48 (UTC)
Full Name: Bret Martin
Company: CNA Insurance
Affiliation: Self

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: Agree in principle with the CAM by the specification of testing standards.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:32 (UTC)
Full Name: Thomas Pitschneider
Company: Shakopee City Of
Affiliation: Shakopee Fire

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: Adds clarification of testing requirements

Created: 2020-06-17 18:10 (UTC)

Full Name: Jonathan Griffin

Company: Cosco Fire Protection Inc.

Affiliation: NICET

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: Agree with Committee

Created: 2020-06-17 17:01 (UTC)

Full Name: Daniel Welkley

Company: Ameren Corp

Affiliation: NFPA Member

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: Agree with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-17 16:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Steve Tafoya

Company:

Affiliation: Fayette County BOC

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: no comment

Created: 2020-06-17 16:51 (UTC)

Full Name: Archie McCartney

Company: Vcu Community Memorial Hospt

Affiliation: Member

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: It makes sense to include this

Created: 2020-06-17 16:49 (UTC)

Full Name: Curtis Jackson

Company: United Enertech

Affiliation: Engineering Manager

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: In the interest of safety, this makes sense

Created: 2020-06-17 16:29 (UTC)

Full Name: Brenda McNorton

Company: Kansas State Fire Marshal

Affiliation: Kansas State Fire Marshal

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: Added clarification of testing requirements

Created: 2020-06-17 16:26 (UTC)

Full Name: Duane Rehmeyer

Company: Baker Engineering & Risk Consu

Affiliation: Consultant

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: Brings in appropriate reference material for definitions (NFPA, UL and ASTM).

Created: 2020-06-16 21:25 (UTC)

Full Name: Vincent Baroncini

Company: Siemens, Inc.

Affiliation: Siemens, Inc.

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: Expands on the requirements.

Created: 2020-06-16 17:52 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Quintero
Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marshal

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: Update necessary

Created: 2020-06-15 16:55 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Quintero
Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: Update is necessary

Created: 2020-06-15 13:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Bridget Mourao
Company: Emory University
Affiliation: NFPA Technical Member

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: Better clarity in the language is good. .

Created: 2020-06-12 15:15 (UTC)
Full Name: Jonathan Tarvin
Company: Alabama Power
Affiliation: nicet

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: ok

Created: 2020-06-11 17:18 (UTC)
Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler
Company: GBH International

Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: It is important to explain how fire resistance ratings are to be determined.

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)

Full Name: Kenneth Tyree

Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh

Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-10 20:29 (UTC)

Full Name: Scott Eckstein

Company: Richardson Fire Department

Affiliation: Inspector

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: no conflicts

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)

Full Name: Christopher Kachura

Company: Southeast Fire Protection

Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: A

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Jameson Wendell

Company: Merck Co

Affiliation: User

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)
Full Name: Douglas Miller
Company: Local 190
Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: More clear cut guidelines in the pass vote.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)
Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas
Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue
Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: Agree to more detailed text

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)
Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed
Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp
Affiliation: member

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)
Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos
Company: City Of Tamarac
Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: I agree with putting more information into the body of the standard than in the annex. Further explanation and references to specific approvals are beneficial.

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)
Full Name: Matthew Mertens
Company: North Shore Fire Department
Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: It is time to begin defining the test methods implied.

Created: 2020-06-18 01:12 (UTC)
Full Name: John Campbell
Company: Global Fire Protection Group,
Affiliation: Member

CAM 30-2

AGAINST

Reason: unnecessary additions

Created: 2020-06-17 20:56 (UTC)
Full Name: Andrew Fosina
Company: Htfd No1
Affiliation: Government - Fire Service

CAM 30-2

AGAINST

Reason: Fine the way it is.

Created: 2020-06-17 20:21 (UTC)
Full Name: Todd Kidd
Company: Liberty Mutual Insurance Compa
Affiliation: Insurance

CAM 30-2

AGAINST

Reason: Protection definitions for containers is already addressed.

Created: 2020-06-17 19:48 (UTC)
Full Name: John Taylor
Company: HCT, LLC
Affiliation: Healthcare Consulting

CAM 30-2

AGAINST

Reason: Support committee.

Created: 2020-06-15 13:54 (UTC)
Full Name: William Fitch
Company: Phyrefish.com
Affiliation: Phyrefish.com

CAM 30-2

AGAINST

Reason: Does not add valuable information to this standard

Created: 2020-06-15 13:19 (UTC)
Full Name: Mark Fasel
Company: Viega LLC
Affiliation: Viega

CAM 30-2

AGAINST

Reason: There are multiple other standards that can be used outside of ASTM E119 and UL 263. In this language, the other test methods would only be allowed if accepted by the AHJ.

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Scott Newman
Company: Walgreens
Affiliation: None

CAM 30-2

AGAINST

Reason: Disagree with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Thomas Parrish

Company: Telgian Corporation
Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 30-2

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)
Full Name: Shay Rankhorn
Company: Ballad Health
Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 30-2

AGAINST

Reason: Against

Created: 2020-06-19 20:19 (UTC)
Full Name: Ronald Smidt
Company: Atrium Health
Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: Based on ASHE recommendation

Created: 2020-06-19 02:19 (UTC)
Full Name: James Priest
Company: Fermi National Accelerator Lab
Affiliation: Government

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: This makes sense .

Created: 2020-06-18 22:44 (UTC)
Full Name: Oscar Torres
Company: Cohisa
Affiliation: 3431347

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: Provides necessary measures to be considered in furnishing

Created: 2020-06-18 05:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Russel Faleiro

Company: Gosafe Fire Security Safety

Affiliation: FIRE SYSTEM

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: AGREED

Created: 2020-06-17 20:56 (UTC)

Full Name: Andrew Fosina

Company: Htfd No1

Affiliation: Government - Fire Service

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-17 19:58 (UTC)

Full Name: Jason Ellis

Company: University Of Kentucky

Affiliation: AHJ

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-17 18:32 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Pitschneider

Company: Shakopee City Of

Affiliation: Shakopee Fire

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: Provides guidance on materials currently found in these occupancies.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:10 (UTC)
Full Name: Jonathan Griffin
Company: Cosco Fire Protection Inc.
Affiliation: NICET

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: Agree with Committee

Created: 2020-06-17 17:01 (UTC)
Full Name: Daniel Welkley
Company: Ameren Corp
Affiliation: NFPA Member

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: Agree with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-17 16:49 (UTC)
Full Name: Curtis Jackson
Company: United Enertech
Affiliation: Engineering Manager

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: In the interest of safety, this makes sense

Created: 2020-06-16 19:01 (UTC)
Full Name: Thomas Wysocki
Company: Guardian Services, Inc.
Affiliation: None

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: This is a reasonable recommendation which should have been accepted.

Created: 2020-06-16 17:52 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Quintero
Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marshal

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: Update necessary

Created: 2020-06-15 16:55 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Quintero
Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: Update is necessary

Created: 2020-06-15 16:39 (UTC)
Full Name: Elizabeth Shapiro
Company: American Dental Association
Affiliation: Provider

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: Agree with deletion.

Created: 2020-06-15 13:54 (UTC)
Full Name: William Fitch
Company: Phyrefish.com
Affiliation: Phyrefish.com

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: Additional information is needed

Created: 2020-06-15 13:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Bridget Mourao
Company: Emory University

Affiliation: NFPA Technical Member

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: the addition of 16.3 is a good addition.

Created: 2020-06-12 15:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Jonathan Tarvin

Company: Alabama Power

Affiliation: nicet

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: ok

Created: 2020-06-11 17:18 (UTC)

Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler

Company: GBH International

Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: The committee agreed that fixtures, furnishings and decorations add fire hazard and they are present in health care occupancies.

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)

Full Name: Kenneth Tyree

Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh

Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)

Full Name: Christopher Kachura

Company: Southeast Fire Protection

Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: A

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Jameson Wendell

Company: Merck Co

Affiliation: User

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Shay Rankhorn

Company: Ballad Health

Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: For

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)

Full Name: Douglas Miller

Company: Local 190

Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: Furnishings should be addressed in NFPA 99.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)

Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas

Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: Agree to new text

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)
Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed
Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp
Affiliation: member

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)
Full Name: Matthew Mertens
Company: North Shore Fire Department
Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: clarity and direction

Created: 2020-06-19 20:23 (UTC)
Full Name: Roland Kraiss
Company: UW Health
Affiliation: Health Care

CAM 99-5

AGAINST

Reason: Redundant and unnecessary.

Created: 2020-06-18 18:09 (UTC)
Full Name: Peter Carbone
Company: Proton Intl Hti Cancer Ctr
Affiliation: Proton International

CAM 99-5

AGAINST

Reason: ASHE Recommends

Created: 2020-06-18 01:12 (UTC)
Full Name: John Campbell
Company: Global Fire Protection Group,
Affiliation: Member

CAM 99-5

AGAINST

Reason: Unnecessary requirement

Created: 2020-06-17 20:21 (UTC)
Full Name: Todd Kidd
Company: Liberty Mutual Insurance Compa
Affiliation: Insurance

CAM 99-5

AGAINST

Reason: Not clear

Created: 2020-06-17 19:48 (UTC)
Full Name: John Taylor
Company: HCT, LLC
Affiliation: Healthcare Consulting

CAM 99-5

AGAINST

Reason: This is covered in NFPA 101. Do not duplicate requirements.

Created: 2020-06-17 19:38 (UTC)
Full Name: Danny Underwood
Company: Tanner Medical Ctr
Affiliation: Tanner Medical Center, Inc.

CAM 99-5

AGAINST

Reason: against

Created: 2020-06-17 18:48 (UTC)
Full Name: Bret Martin
Company: CNA Insurance

Affiliation: Self

CAM 99-5

AGAINST

Reason: Specifications for fixtures, furnishing, and decorations are covered in other documents.

Created: 2020-06-17 16:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Steve Tafoya

Company:

Affiliation: Fayette County BOC

CAM 99-5

AGAINST

Reason: no comment

Created: 2020-06-17 16:51 (UTC)

Full Name: Archie McCartney

Company: Vcu Community Memorial Hospt

Affiliation: Member

CAM 99-5

AGAINST

Reason: already covered in other codes.

Created: 2020-06-17 16:29 (UTC)

Full Name: Brenda McNorton

Company: Kansas State Fire Marshal

Affiliation: Kansas State Fire Marshal

CAM 99-5

AGAINST

Reason: Because CMS doesn't recognize NFPA 1

Created: 2020-06-16 22:40 (UTC)

Full Name: Al Som

Company:

Affiliation: Mayo Clinic

CAM 99-5

AGAINST

Reason: These requirements are included in other standards such as NFPA 101 and are not needed to be included in this section. The proposed text would include this requirement in the above stated section which would be redundant and unnecessary.

Created: 2020-06-16 21:25 (UTC)

Full Name: Vincent Baroncini

Company: Siemens, Inc.

Affiliation: Siemens, Inc.

CAM 99-5

AGAINST

Reason: Duplication found in other code

Created: 2020-06-15 13:19 (UTC)

Full Name: Mark Fasel

Company: Viega LLC

Affiliation: Viega

CAM 99-5

AGAINST

Reason: Does not add value to the code.

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Scott Newman

Company: Walgreens

Affiliation: None

CAM 99-5

AGAINST

Reason: Disagree with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Parrish

Company: Telgian Corporation

Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 99-5

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision

Created: 2020-06-09 16:39 (UTC)

Full Name: Jonathan Flannery

Company: AHA - ASHE

Affiliation: American Society for Healthcare Engineering

CAM 99-5

AGAINST

Reason: There is no added value of adding this requirement to NFPA 99. This requirement is already contained in NFPA 1 and NFPA 101 which are referenced by NFPA 99. Adding this to NFPA 99 would set up potential coordination issues for this requirement in the future.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:54 (UTC)

Full Name: Jason Beers

Company: JLL Healthcare Solutions

Affiliation: Healthcare

CAM 99-5

AGAINST

Reason: These requirements are included in other standards such as NFPA 101 and are not needed to be included in this section. The proposed text would be redundant and unnecessary.

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)

Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos

Company: City Of Tamarac

Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 99-5

AGAINST

Reason: This information is already found in the occupancy chapter of NFPA 101, section 19.7.5. If this is meant to be a stand-alone standard, then I would suggest adding the exact language found in section 19.7.5 of NFPA 101 into NFPA 99.

Created: 2020-06-19 20:23 (UTC)

Full Name: Roland Kraiss

Company: UW Health

Affiliation: Health Care

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: Agree.

Created: 2020-06-19 02:19 (UTC)

Full Name: James Priest

Company: Fermi National Accelerator Lab

Affiliation: Government

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: Seems clear and necessary and I guess it had to be spelled out

Created: 2020-06-18 22:44 (UTC)

Full Name: Oscar Torres

Company: Cohisa

Affiliation: 3431347

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: Provides necessary measures to be considered in furnishing

Created: 2020-06-18 05:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Russel Faleiro

Company: Gosafe Fire Security Safety

Affiliation: FIRE SYSTEM

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: AGREED

Created: 2020-06-17 20:56 (UTC)

Full Name: Andrew Fosina

Company: Htfd No1

Affiliation: Government - Fire Service

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-17 19:58 (UTC)
Full Name: Jason Ellis
Company: University Of Kentucky
Affiliation: AHJ

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-17 19:38 (UTC)
Full Name: Danny Underwood
Company: Tanner Medical Ctr
Affiliation: Tanner Medical Center, Inc.

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: for

Created: 2020-06-17 18:32 (UTC)
Full Name: Thomas Pitschneider
Company: Shakopee City Of
Affiliation: Shakopee Fire

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: Helps to reduce fire load in occupancies where these structures are located. Provides restrictions on where homemade structures can be used.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:21 (UTC)
Full Name: David Pursel
Company: Berkshire Systems Group, Inc.
Affiliation: SAF-BSF Technical Committee Member

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: It is a valid reference standard

Created: 2020-06-17 18:10 (UTC)
Full Name: Jonathan Griffin
Company: Cosco Fire Protection Inc.
Affiliation: NICET

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: Agree with Committee

Created: 2020-06-17 17:01 (UTC)
Full Name: Daniel Welkley
Company: Ameren Corp
Affiliation: NFPA Member

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: Agree with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-17 16:52 (UTC)
Full Name: Steve Tafoya
Company:
Affiliation: Fayette County BOC

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: no comment

Created: 2020-06-17 16:51 (UTC)
Full Name: Archie McCartney
Company: Vcu Community Memorial Hospt
Affiliation: Member

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: Makes sense

Created: 2020-06-17 16:49 (UTC)
Full Name: Curtis Jackson

Company: United Enertech
Affiliation: Engineering Manager

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: In the interest of safety, this makes sense

Created: 2020-06-16 21:25 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Baroncini
Company: Siemens, Inc.
Affiliation: Siemens, Inc.

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: Defines requirements.

Created: 2020-06-16 17:52 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Quintero
Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marshal

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: Update necessary

Created: 2020-06-15 16:55 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Quintero
Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: Update is necessary

Created: 2020-06-15 13:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Bridget Mourao
Company: Emory University
Affiliation: NFPA Technical Member

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: The addition of 11.13 is a good addition.

Created: 2020-06-12 15:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Jonathan Tarvin

Company: Alabama Power

Affiliation: nicet

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: ok

Created: 2020-06-11 17:18 (UTC)

Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler

Company: GBH International

Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: This is a pointer for those jurisdictions that adopt NFPA 101 but not NFPA 1.

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Scott Newman

Company: Walgreens

Affiliation: None

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: In alignment with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)

Full Name: Kenneth Tyree

Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh

Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)
Full Name: Christopher Kachura
Company: Southeast Fire Protection
Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: A

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Jameson Wendell
Company: Merck Co
Affiliation: User

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)
Full Name: Douglas Miller
Company: Local 190
Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: Play areas in NFPA 101 for life safety.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)
Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas
Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue
Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)
Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed
Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp
Affiliation: member

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)
Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos
Company: City Of Tamarac
Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: NFPA 1 has specific requirements for this indoor play structure which is lacking in NFPA 101. This is a good addition to reference and send code officials to the correct section/code.

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)
Full Name: Matthew Mertens
Company: North Shore Fire Department
Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: fire load and resistance is now directed.

Created: 2020-06-18 01:12 (UTC)
Full Name: John Campbell
Company: Global Fire Protection Group,
Affiliation: Member

CAM 101-9

AGAINST

Reason: recommended requirement is too broad in scope

Created: 2020-06-17 20:21 (UTC)
Full Name: Todd Kidd

Company: Liberty Mutual Insurance Compa
Affiliation: Insurance

CAM 101-9

AGAINST

Reason: Not clear

Created: 2020-06-17 19:48 (UTC)
Full Name: John Taylor
Company: HCT, LLC
Affiliation: Healthcare Consulting

CAM 101-9

AGAINST

Reason: Support committee.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:48 (UTC)
Full Name: Bret Martin
Company: CNA Insurance
Affiliation: Self

CAM 101-9

AGAINST

Reason: Agree in principle with committee. Referenced standard in other documents.

Created: 2020-06-17 16:29 (UTC)
Full Name: Brenda McNorton
Company: Kansas State Fire Marshal
Affiliation: Kansas State Fire Marshal

CAM 101-9

AGAINST

Reason: Because many JDs don't use NFPA 1

Created: 2020-06-15 13:54 (UTC)
Full Name: William Fitch
Company: Phyrefish.com
Affiliation: Phyrefish.com

CAM 101-9

AGAINST

Reason: These are not "Special Structures" as the term is used in NFPA 101

Created: 2020-06-13 23:13 (UTC)

Full Name: Catherine Stashak

Company: Illinois State Fire Marshal

Affiliation: Employee

CAM 101-9

AGAINST

Reason: This language will confuse the code user. Indoor Play Structures are properly called Multilevel Play Structures and are considered as Special Amusement Structures and are covered under Section 12.4.8 and 13.4.8 in this code.

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Parrish

Company: Telgian Corporation

Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 101-9

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Shay Rankhorn

Company: Ballad Health

Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 101-9

AGAINST

Reason: Against

Created: 2020-06-19 20:48 (UTC)

Full Name: Catherine Stashak

Company: Office Of The Illinois State F

Affiliation: Employee

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: I support this recommended change to NFPA 101. Valet trash may have been around for a long time but its presence has been in violation of fire codes and life safety codes. The model codes used in the U.S. including the I-Codes and NFPA 1 and NFPA 101 have prohibited corridors to be used for storage of hazardous items or to have items placed in corridors that represent a hazardous, flammable, or combustibile situation for decades. Valet trash represents unknown hazards to building occupants and first responders because there is no control over what is placed in those bags. There could be items that would contribute to a growing fire or present a hazardous challenge to first responders. Additionally, valet trash presents obstructions to the means of egress which has also been prohibited in the model codes (including the I-Codes and NFPA codes) for decades and decades. These codes have never permitted the addition of more hazardous items within a means of egress, or permitted travel through an area that presents a higher hazard. These same obstructions present challenges to first responders trying to set up operations. Valet trash may have been around for many years, but again, it has been an illegal and unsafe operation in accordance with the bulk of the codes adopted by jurisdictions throughout the U.S. This language should be kept out of both NFPA 1 and NFPA 101.

Created: 2020-06-18 05:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Russel Faleiro

Company: Gosafe Fire Security Safety

Affiliation: FIRE SYSTEM

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: AGREED

Created: 2020-06-18 01:12 (UTC)

Full Name: John Campbell

Company: Global Fire Protection Group,

Affiliation: Member

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: agree with the motion

Created: 2020-06-17 19:38 (UTC)

Full Name: Danny Underwood

Company: Tanner Medical Ctr

Affiliation: Tanner Medical Center, Inc.

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: for

Created: 2020-06-17 18:32 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Pitschneider

Company: Shakopee City Of

Affiliation: Shakopee Fire

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: Adding combustibles to protected exit corridors is a bad thing.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:10 (UTC)

Full Name: Jonathan Griffin

Company: Cosco Fire Protection Inc.

Affiliation: NICET

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: Agree with Committee

Created: 2020-06-17 17:01 (UTC)

Full Name: Daniel Welkley

Company: Ameren Corp

Affiliation: NFPA Member

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: Agree with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-17 16:51 (UTC)

Full Name: Archie McCartney

Company: Vcu Community Memorial Hospt

Affiliation: Member

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: Thanks

Created: 2020-06-17 16:49 (UTC)

Full Name: Curtis Jackson

Company: United Enertech

Affiliation: Engineering Manager

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: In the interest of safety, this makes sense

Created: 2020-06-15 13:46 (UTC)

Full Name: Bridget Mourao

Company: Emory University

Affiliation: NFPA Technical Member

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: Improved clarity is good.

Created: 2020-06-13 23:13 (UTC)

Full Name: Catherine Stashak

Company: Illinois State Fire Marshal

Affiliation: Employee

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: This language violates all the tenets and goals of the Life Safety package of an Apartment Building that have been in place for decades: one of those being protecting the means of egress so occupants can evacuate. As CAM 101-10 states, protecting the means of egress from obstructions and hazards is a sacred, tried, and true fire safety principle. The Life Safety Code specifically prohibits the introduction of high hazards into, or travel through an area with high hazards. I have heard supporters indicate that valet trash will prevent hoarding and that this concept permits the relocation of hazards from the area where occupants reside to the outside of their dwelling unit (in an apartment building). These discussions represent the exact opposite of what the life safety package's goal is all about. The Life Safety Code and AHJs have no control over what occupants of Apartment Buildings will be doing inside their apartments. Someone could be smoker with a bad habit of falling a sleep while smoking, or someone with risky cooking habits (whether food or maybe meth), we really have no control over what happens within the dwelling units of an Apartment Building. That is why we separate the corridors and the means of egress from those unknowns with fire-rated walls and doors and language that prevents the placement of hazardous materials within the corridors. Remember we also have no control over what will be in those garbage bags sitting out in those exit access corridors. Firefighter safety, one of the goals of the Life Safety Code, is also affected by this language. All these extra combustibles represent extra challenges, obstructions, and hazards to first responders...again we don't know what will be placed in these garbage bags or garbage cans.

Created: 2020-06-12 15:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Jonathan Tarvin

Company: Alabama Power

Affiliation: nicet

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: ok

Created: 2020-06-11 17:25 (UTC)

Full Name: Rick Swan

Company: IAFF Local 2881/CAL FIRE Fight

Affiliation: International Association of Fire Fighters

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: Allowing trash cans into the exit path will only cause more hazards to the very folk's supporters say why a trash valet is needed. Convenience should never be placed over safety. Allowing anything in the hallways is a hazard and should not be allowed. By supporting this CAM and opposing NFPA 1 CAM 1-8 will correlate the two documents, again, not allowing trash valet.

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Scott Newman

Company: Walgreens

Affiliation: None

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: In alignment with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-11 13:58 (UTC)

Full Name: James Narva

Company: NASFM

Affiliation: National Association of State Fire Marshals

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: The National Association of State Fire Marshal (NASFM) supports public comment 117 and 188 on removal of the proposed requirements on valet trash in apartment buildings. The introduction of trash in corridors of any occupancy goes against the basic principles of egress for occupant and creates a fire and life safety, property protection and fire fighter safety hazard, and is in direct violation of section 7.1.10.1 Maintenance. Means of egress shall be continuously maintained free of all obstructions or impediments to full instant use in the case of fire or other emergency. Also, sections 30 and 31.3.2.1.1 lists trash collection rooms as a hazardous area and requires protection over and above the occupancy requirements. Sections 30 and 31.7.2.2 prohibits contents and furnishings of a highly flammable character from use outside the dwelling unit. The NFPA 1 TC removed the provisions of valet trash and added new requirements prohibiting its use. The NFPA 101 Residential Technical Committee (TC) in their acceptance SR 6587 and 6588 failed to address the Correlating Committee note "Consider deleting the proposed valet trash pick-up requirements and either reference or extract criteria from NFPA 1. Valet trash requirements appear to be within the scope of NFPA 1 rather than NFPA 101." We agree with the Correlating Committee and believe it is as it's more than a life safety issue, which is supported by the scope of NFPA 1, specifically: •III1.1.1(1) the storage of additional fuel packages in the means of egress is a fire related life safety situation. •III1.1.1(8) the addition of trash storage in hallways will impede fire department operations. •III1.1.1(11) the additional combustible materials associated with storage of trash will contribute to fire spread and smoke production. •III1.1.1(15) the added fuel will create added hazards to firefighter safety due to fire, smoke, and heat production. •III1.1.1(16) trash in the hallway will affect the means of egress. The proposed text is in conflict with proven fire safety principles used for many years which prohibit combustible materials in egress corridors. Past fire history has shown how combustibles in the means of egress contributes to fire spread, hampers firefighting efforts, and limits the occupant's ability to egress. Materials, especially combustible materials, are fire fighter safety issues as it creates a new fire load when stored in the means of egress and may inhibit quick and effective firefighting operations. There are no permit requirement or any means for the AHJ to approve or prohibit the use of valet trash services based on other issues with the occupancy. There has been no technical justification on the container size or testing requirement. No fire testing or fire modeling has been performed to justify or validate the proposed requirements in the residential setting. Additionally, the container shall not be allowed to obstruct the minimum egress width but who will be able to enf

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)
Full Name: Kenneth Tyree
Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh
Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: IFMA moves public comment 117 and 188 on removal of the proposed requirements on valet trash in apartment buildings. The introduction of trash in corridors of any occupancy goes against the basic principles of egress for occupant and creates a fire and life safety, property protection and fire fighter safety hazard, and is in direct violation of section 7.1.10.1 Maintenance. Means of egress shall be continuously maintained free of all obstructions or impediments to full instant use in the case of fire or other emergency. Also 30 and 31.3.2.1.1 lists trash collection rooms as a hazardous area and requires protection over and above the occupancy requirements. 30 and 31.7.2.2 prohibits contents and furnishings of a highly flammable character from use outside the dwelling unit. The NFPA 1 TC removed the provisions of valet trash and added new requirements prohibiting its use. The NFPA 101 Residential TC in their acceptance SR 6587 and 6588 failed to address the Correlating Committee note "Consider deleting the proposed valet trash pick-up requirements and either reference or extract criteria from NFPA 1. Valet trash requirements appear to be within the scope of NFPA 1 rather than NFPA 101." We agree with the Correlating Committee and believe it is as it's more than a life safety issue, which is supported by the scope of NFPA 1, specifically: •III1.1.1(1) the storage of additional fuel packages in the means of egress is a fire related life safety situation. •III1.1.1(8) the addition of trash storage in hallways will impede fire department operations. •III1.1.1(11) the additional combustible materials associated with storage of trash will contribute to fire spread and smoke production. •III1.1.1(15) the added fuel will create added hazards to firefighter safety due to fire, smoke, and heat production. •III1.1.1(16) trash in the hallway will affect the means of egress. The proposed text by the Residential TC have many concerns for AHJ's as well as fire and life safety: The proposed text is in conflict with proven fire safety principles used for many years which prohibit combustible materials in egress corridors. Past fire history has shown how combustibles in the means of egress contributes to fire spread, hampers firefighting efforts, and limits the occupant's ability to egress. Materials, especially combustible materials, are fire fighter safety issues as it creates a new fire load when stored in the means of egress and may inhibit quick and effective firefighting operations. There are no permit requirement or any means for the AHJ to approve or prohibit the use of valet trash services based on other issues with the occupancy. There has been no technical justification on the container size or testing requirement, the industry has had discussion on these as well and pose a significant cost to the property owner or resident.

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Jameson Wendell

Company: Merck Co

Affiliation: User

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)

Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas

Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue
Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)
Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed
Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp
Affiliation: member

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)
Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos
Company: City Of Tamarac
Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: There is much debate over trash valet services and am not certain where this landed in the legislative session but I agree this service should be removed from the code as exits can be continuously blocked and this adds additional fuel loads into paths of egress.

Created: 2020-06-08 14:23 (UTC)
Full Name: Warren Olsen
Company: Fire Safety Consultants, Inc.
Affiliation: Illinois Fire Inspectors Association

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: Storage, of any type, should not be permitted within an egress corridor. I have been in my daughter's apartment building where valet trash collection is utilized and it is a constant struggle to maintain the corridor free of obstructions caused by the trash collection cans. Additionally, the composition (flammability or combustibility) of the trash within the can cannot be regulated.

Created: 2020-06-19 20:43 (UTC)
Full Name: Patrick Franks
Company: Go Doorstep, LLC
Affiliation: Go Doorstep, LLC

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: The industry is ok with common sense regulation like that in Florida House Bill 529. Requiring fire retardant cans would put many valet trash providers out of business because of the costs associated.

Created: 2020-06-19 17:41 (UTC)
Full Name: Robert Watson
Company: WSI of Utah, LLC
Affiliation: NTRVA

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: I would like the records to show that my original comment submitted for CAM 101-11/21 in error identifies CAM 1-8 as CAM 101-8. I apologize as this was in error and indeed addresses CAM 1-8. Thank you.

Created: 2020-06-19 17:35 (UTC)
Full Name: Justin Watson
Company: WSI of Utah, LLC
Affiliation: WSI of Utah, LLC

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Trash and recycling valet is an essential business that provides safety and access for multifamily communities. The COVID-19 pandemic has only reinforced the concept of trash and recycling valet as it drastically reduces viral loads within hallways and presents a safety feature to residents as it allows them to stay sheltered within their apartment and lower their risk of infection. Senior Living communities, who have experienced the greatest impact by COVID-19 and who carry the highest risks, in particular, are extraordinarily thankful that they can protect themselves and have assistance with removing trash that they are not physically able to carry. The voting members should also know that entire complexes are now constructed with this waste removal feature in mind and dismissing this service would nullify their ability to manage their waste systems altogether. Doorstep to compactor, in particular, is a situation that requires a trained professional in order to prevent injuries and damage to onsite equipment.

Created: 2020-06-19 16:57 (UTC)
Full Name: Sueze Watson
Company: WSI of New Mexico LLC

Affiliation: WSI of New Mexico, LLC

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: If this motion succeeds, all previous work we've done with this committee is thrown out and we start all over again. This is a complete waste of time for all of us.

Created: 2020-06-19 16:56 (UTC)

Full Name: John Watson

Company: WSI of Texas

Affiliation: WSI of Texas

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: If this motion passes then all previous work with the committees will be made null and void. All work will need to be restarted.

Created: 2020-06-19 13:53 (UTC)

Full Name: Kelly Veatch

Company: Valet Waste

Affiliation: Valet Living

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: It is no secret that factions within the valet trash provider community have expressed differing views about the fire-safety container requirements at a variety of code development meetings. What is significant about this language is that it represented the first and only time those factions sat down face-to-face in a working group with 101 committee members in St. Louis last July and agreed to any language on safety cans. That makes this point in the debate the ideal time to act.

Created: 2020-06-19 12:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Austin Butchart

Company: Spartan Trash Valet

Affiliation: Owner

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: We as a company put a huge importance on the safety of the residents, property as a whole, and our employees when they are onsite. However, what is being proposed here is completely overkill and will ultimately be the end of the Valet Trash industry and ruin the livelihood of the employees and owners of these company's. We have done extensive research on finding trash cans that meet these proposed requirements and we have come to two conclusions. Number one being that every supplier that we have spoken to, does not currently make trash cans that meet these requirements. Number two being that when they do get around to creating trash cans that meet these standards, they will be so expensive that it will put 99% of Valet Trash companies out of business. There is only one company in this industry that can afford to do this, Valet Living, and this will ultimately create a monopoly, which is illegal. There has been over 3 billion doors serviced over the last 25 years and there has never been a fire incident related to Valet Trash. If anything, we help mitigate the risk of fire hazards by removing trash and debris that residents leave out on a daily basis. Residents put out trash on their porch regardless if they have a Valet Trash service or not because they do not want it in their unit. That is where we come in on a nightly basis and remove that fire hazard. From personally servicing multiple apartment units, you should really be focused on residents that leave out couches, packages, bikes, etc that cause more of a fire hazard than our service. Our service helps people from hoarding trash in their unit because they are far away from the compactor or dumpster. There is zero logic behind trying to implement this legislation. People smoke, cook, light candles on a daily basis which are some of the greatest fire hazards apartment communities face. Completely crushing an industry will not solve anything, people will still leave trash out which will create a bigger fire hazard than you currently think there is. Thank you.

Created: 2020-06-19 05:25 (UTC)

Full Name: Robert Watson

Company: WSI of Utah

Affiliation: NTRVA

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Voting for CAM 101-11 & 21 Also Undermines the dedicated, conscientious hard work and open-minded construction of the 101-8 CAM that with due diligence to both safety and practicality was thoroughly scrutinized, voted upon and passed as a potential code by the 101 Life Safety Technical Committee in July of 2019 and effectively leaves the Multifamily Trash and Recycling Industry without the guidance that was prudently developed by the 101 Life Safety Technical Committee to be a framework going forward for regulation of this viable and needed industry. Voting against CAM 101-11 & 21 Also keeps the carefully crafted language and efforts of CAM 101-8 in place to move forward to provide even better solutions on a national level, instead of having this entire process become disjointed, very confusing and relegated to fractured non-cohesive policy on local levels across the country. The industry representatives willingly made significant compromises during the July Technical Meetings to attempt to provide consistency and clarity to all parties involved in potential regulation of the Multifamily Trash and Recycling Valet Industry and to eliminate unacceptable advantages of special interest within the industry. How do you have a CAM Proposal for and against a Code Proposal at the same time? This is extremely confusing for anyone trying to make sense of multiple conflicting CAM Proposals. Are there ulterior motives at play in this process? Please see 101-8 Public Comments from Robert Watson

Created: 2020-06-19 03:46 (UTC)

Full Name: Gary Frost
Company: Affinity Waste Solutions
Affiliation: Multi-Family Industry

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: This is a great start and a good example of what leadership looks like. People coming together to create a safe solution. This language is not perfect but allows the industry to stay in business.

Created: 2020-06-19 03:27 (UTC)

Full Name: Darren Ott
Company: Houston Fire
Affiliation: local 341

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: As a Houston Firefighter and Valet Trash Company owner, I believe we can improve and unify the process of the collection of valet trash. We can add some safety measures and improve clarity in the rules and regulations to make all companies more safe. NFPA 101 has created a Task Force for safety and worked in conjunction with Valet Trash companies. I personally believe this profession is not dangerous, but unification on procedures would be a good idea. I would never risk my fellow firefighters lives'.

Created: 2020-06-19 01:31 (UTC)

Full Name: Russell Skinner
Company: Skinner Waste Solutions
Affiliation: Florida Apartment Association

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Our company

Created: 2020-06-18 22:44 (UTC)

Full Name: Oscar Torres
Company: Cohisa
Affiliation: 3431347

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Removing it lessens the clarity, unless it refers to the measures in 30.7.5

Created: 2020-06-18 22:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Omar Soliman

Company:

Affiliation: TB

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: This is unreasonable and anti resident and does not create any fire hazard whatsoever. There is not 1 single case of this creating a fire or obstructing fire fighters from doing their jobs. Unreasonable and anti capitalist!

Created: 2020-06-18 21:39 (UTC)

Full Name: Martin Anderson

Company: Siemens Building Technologies,

Affiliation: AFAA

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: The Technical Committee met with personnel from the Valet Trash Collection industry and believe this provides an acceptable approach for fire and life safety protection. The industry has been in place for years and needs to be covered in the codes.

Created: 2020-06-18 19:35 (UTC)

Full Name:

Company:

Affiliation: National Apartment Association

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Valet trash services have been in existence since 1995. There have been over 3 billion collections with zero reported incidents.

Created: 2020-06-18 18:56 (UTC)

Full Name: Raymond Grill

Company: Arup

Affiliation: Self

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Criteria for valet trash collection is needed.

Created: 2020-06-18 18:44 (UTC)

Full Name: Mike Dean

Company: A1 Valet Trash, LLC

Affiliation: Atlanta Apartment Association

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Valet Trash has been around for 25 + years. It has been deemed an essential service and employs over 10,000 hard working Americans. The industry also serves over 2 million residents. Since then there has been ~3 billion pick-ups with ZERO incidents. This is a non-issue. I have sourced bin options that would meet the specifications, and findings confirm they reach a threshold that becomes unsustainable. This regulation is not feasible, and will drive my company and 10,000 other people out of work. It's a kitchen size trash can with household waste. It's on par with the risk we run from UBER Eats, Amazon and Dry Cleaning deliveries sitting on the doorstep. There is absolutely zero problem here. I'm on board for common sense regulation, but there is zero evidence or reason to ban the service or make it so costly the industry implodes.

Created: 2020-06-18 17:53 (UTC)

Full Name: Patrick Kelley

Company: Pro Valet Trash

Affiliation: Apartment Association

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Please be realistic about what an actual valet trash and recycling collection program consists of and its actual relevance to any fire safety or life threatening hazards that may arise out of it. Base it off real world application of how such a program works and any supporting data of instances where this specifically has caused any concerns.

Created: 2020-06-18 15:37 (UTC)

Full Name: Kevin Schwartz

Company:

Affiliation: Valet Living

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: You would have to vote AGAINST this CAM next week to get fire-safety cans and other regulatory provisions in the code for this practice. To vote for this CAM assures the practice continues unregulated other than by egress rules, which allow the service in a wide enough corridor. It is already a 25-year-old industry in more than 10 percent of all apartment homes nationwide with 2.1 million units being served.

Created: 2020-06-18 05:19 (UTC)

Full Name: Justin Frost

Company: Affinity Waste Solutions

Affiliation: National Trash and Recycling Valet Association

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: As the President of the National Trash and Recycling Valet Association please review my comments listed below as I attended both NFPA1 and NFPA101 technical meetings in Boston and in St Louis. NFPA-1 and NFPA 101 are contradicting each other and have the complete opposite opinion of the other. Valet trash and recycling needs a reasonable regulation and this is a great start. We appreciate the 101 committee for creating a task force and for allowing industry leaders the opportunity to have a seat at the table to discuss a reasonable and safe regulation. Valet trash and recycling is a billion dollar industry that has been around for 25 years and is an essential business that provides over 10,000 jobs servicing over 2 million residents a safe way to dispose of their trash and recyclables. This service helps military veterans, senior citizens, single moms, college kids, and all residents by picking up their trash in a leak proof container and taking it to the onsite dumpster which can be up to 1/2 a mile away from the residents unit or in the darkest area of the property creating a safety concern. Valet Trash services over 200 companies in 50 states. In 25 years over 3 billion doors have been serviced and there has never been a recorded fire issue related to "Valet Trash Services". There are many firefighters that work for or own valet trash companies that do not agree with the Association of fire fighters for trying to prohibit valet trash services. There are several Chief fire fighters throughout the entire country that believes that Apartments that have valet trash brings a safer environment to the community. Please see the facts listed below: *200 Family Owned Small businesses will go under *Over 10,000 people will lose their job *Amazon Packages that sit outside an apartment unit all day cause a bigger fire safety issue *This will affect every Apartment Community sale value by \$250,000 that has Valet Trash *Valet employees have saved residents lives by being on property 5 nights a week *Trash is only set outside their door for a maximum of 5 hours *Trash is placed inside a 13 gallon trash can with a lid and must be brought back inside after service *Valet trash prevents leakages in hallways preventing residents from slip and falls *Valet Trash has been voted in the past as the #1 Apartment amenity *Valet Trash helps prevent the spread of COVID 19 so 300 residents and their families a day don't touch the same compactor door potentially causing a entire community outbreak

Created: 2020-06-17 20:56 (UTC)

Full Name: Andrew Fosina

Company: Htfd No1

Affiliation: Government - Fire Service

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Code should remain.

Created: 2020-06-17 20:21 (UTC)
Full Name: Todd Kidd
Company: Liberty Mutual Insurance Compa
Affiliation: Insurance

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Reduces the protection measures

Created: 2020-06-17 19:58 (UTC)
Full Name: Jason Ellis
Company: University Of Kentucky
Affiliation: AHJ

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: I agree with the intent of the standard.

Created: 2020-06-17 19:48 (UTC)
Full Name: John Taylor
Company: HCT, LLC
Affiliation: Healthcare Consulting

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Support Committee.

Created: 2020-06-17 19:23 (UTC)
Full Name: Anthony Apfelbeck
Company: Altamonte Springs Building and Fire
Affiliation: City of Altamonte Springs

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Neither NFPA 101 or NFPA 1 currently prohibits the use of valet trash. If this amendment passes, there will be no clear regulations that would prohibit the use of valet trash services or regulate it in anyway. The NFPA 1 TC had a clear opportunity during the second draft meeting to write language the specifically prohibited the use of valet trash services. The 1 TC made a choice not to do so. By attempting to rely on vague and non-specific code sections in attempting to argue that value trash services is already prohibited, the proponents are ignoring the reality that combustibles are already allowed in exit accesses. An office is an exit access, a mercantile sales space is an exit access....every location leading to an exit is an exit access. No one is arguing for allowing valet trash in an "exit." That is clearly prohibited. Here we are solely talking about exit accesses. In addition, the testimony from industry was very clear with evidence that this service is already provided throughout the nation. Trying to prohibit this service, when it can occur safety with the above provisions, only forces this discussion to the states and local with non-model code language. This type of approaches serves no one and just endangers occupants and firefighters. A much better approach is the language in 31.7.5 which will provide safe and consistent provisions for the use of this service within the NFPA codes and standards.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:48 (UTC)

Full Name: Bret Martin

Company: CNA Insurance

Affiliation: Self

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Agree in principle with committee.

Created: 2020-06-17 16:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Steve Tafoya

Company:

Affiliation: Fayette County BOC

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: no comment

Created: 2020-06-17 16:29 (UTC)

Full Name: Brenda McNorton

Company: Kansas State Fire Marshal

Affiliation: Kansas State Fire Marshal

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Because of risk of fire, this needs regulated.

Created: 2020-06-17 14:23 (UTC)

Full Name: Kevin Schwartz

Company:

Affiliation: Valet Living, LLC

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason:

Created: 2020-06-16 23:50 (UTC)

Full Name: Jon Boyd

Company: Tide Valet Waste LLC

Affiliation: President

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Hi Industry Leaders, Below is what I wrote for in section 1-8. How did we get here? Last Thursday I jumped on a call with 15 participants lead by Robby Dawson of the NFPA and the President of the National Valet Trash and Recycling association. I was informed that my entire business and it's 150 employees, across 9 states, that rely on this opportunity to provide for their families could possibly go from an essential employee to unemployed and would be considered an illegal operation by this Friday. My world was turned upside down in the pouring rain that afternoon. I felt like I let my teammates down and created a schism within the NFPA community. I never grew up thinking I wanted to get into the trash business, because who does? But in 2013 I started a door to door valet trash company out of adversity called Tide Valet. I spilled trash in a brand new car going to the compactor at my apartment community and never looked back. All I want to do is take out your trash, safely. Currently, we service 25,000 homes a night and we are just a small fish in a big pond. Since our inception we have had 0 recordables with the thousands of people we have employed and serviced over the last 7 years. My 3rd in command of the company is a volunteer fire fighter in Long Island and some of my best employees are fire fighters. A firefighter on the call owns a valet trash company and operates out of Houston. This news came as a surprise to all of us let alone the dozens and dozens of valet trash companies that have no clue what is being proposed here. We (Tide Valet Waste, LLC) agree, some stationary bins are too large and we have lost business because we put safety first here. Our valet trash bin is about 3 pounds and holds a 13 gallon tall trash bag. It's placement hours are from 6-8pm, we start service at 8pm from 11pm and the bins are inside back inside the residence by 9am the next morning. In my experience, our presence has helped the community at large be a safer one. We want our discussions to be based around facts and trendlines to be drivers for change; I am not sure terms like "fuel package" and "allowing anything in the hallways is a hazard" are valet trash specific as some of this proposed language lines out. You all have my company's full corporation to find a better solution to allow us to keep working safely as our industry has for over 25 years. Safety is at the forefront of our focus daily and the data shows it. You all are my brothers and sisters and we are after the same goal. I will open my operations processes and technology that unequivocally shows how serious we are about safety and the safety of all. I am available 24/7 to help assist with internal concerns and review best practices. Faithfully,
Jon David Boyd |President of Tide Valet Waste LLC| JBoyd@tidevalet.com |843.990.8373

Created: 2020-06-16 21:25 (UTC)

Full Name: Vincent Baroncini

Company: Siemens, Inc.

Affiliation: Siemens, Inc.

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Requirements need to remain

Created: 2020-06-16 17:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Vincent Quintero

Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marshal

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Update necessary

Created: 2020-06-16 17:45 (UTC)
Full Name: Doug Borkowski
Company: Tide Valet
Affiliation: Valet Trash Vendor

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason:

Created: 2020-06-15 16:55 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Quintero
Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Why eliminate, to much harm for occupants and fire responders safety

Created: 2020-06-15 12:06 (UTC)
Full Name: Kevin Schwartz
Company:
Affiliation: Valet Living, LLC

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason:

Created: 2020-06-12 17:49 (UTC)
Full Name: Kevin Schwartz
Company:
Affiliation: Valet Living, LLC

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason:

Created: 2020-06-11 17:18 (UTC)

Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler

Company: GBH International

Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Valet trash services need to be regulated.

Created: 2020-06-10 22:57 (UTC)

Full Name: Bruce Kral

Company: West Metro Fire Prot Dist

Affiliation: West Metro Fire

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: The criteria, if this is allowed, should be in the fire code, NFPA 1. "Valet" trash is too similar to a trade name. Door Side or Door Step trash are better alternatives. An operational permit should be required so that AHJs can confirm the criteria are met on an annual basis. Indelible marking on the container and lid indicating the fire rating must be added including the testing laboratory. Lid should be "tightly fitting" to anticipate spillage from exiting occupants and/or firefighter operations. 22 gallons is much too large of a container especially in a public setting prone to vandalism and fire setting. Unsprinklered settings should have more stringent fire rated containers (150kW/m²). 30.7.5.3 should be removed. 1) Not knowing what's going to in those containers, all containers should be rated. This will also lead to the use of trash bags (15 gal container...) 2) "limited combustible exteriors" is too vague to consistently enforce. Again, in a more public exposed setting like a balcony, container ratings are more important.

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)

Full Name: Christopher Kachura

Company: Southeast Fire Protection

Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Should remain.

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Parrish

Company: Telgian Corporation

Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Shay Rankhorn

Company: Ballad Health

Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Against

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)

Full Name: Douglas Miller

Company: Local 190

Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Trash services if not regulated can pose a life safety hazards.

Created: 2020-06-08 22:51 (UTC)

Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler

Company: GBH International

Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: In the absence of regulation the type of valet trash collection service will not go away but simply remain unregulated and will be unsafe. This type of service has been going on for a long time and should be regulated for safety. The opposite action in 1-8 should be supported.

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)
Full Name: Matthew Mertens
Company: North Shore Fire Department
Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: While I oppose the idea of valet trash, if it is allowed in some juris, it needs to have parameters to be enforced. This language needs revision, but is better than having no direction at all.

Created: 2020-06-19 02:19 (UTC)
Full Name: James Priest
Company: Fermi National Accelerator Lab
Affiliation: Government

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: No issue with the text. Our buildings comply and feel the way its writen is good practice.

Created: 2020-06-18 22:44 (UTC)
Full Name: Oscar Torres
Company: Cohisa
Affiliation: 3431347

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: Improves control and communication measures

Created: 2020-06-18 05:52 (UTC)
Full Name: Russel Faleiro
Company: Gosafe Fire Security Safety
Affiliation: FIRE SYSTEM

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: AGREED

Created: 2020-06-18 01:12 (UTC)
Full Name: John Campbell

Company: Global Fire Protection Group,
Affiliation: Member

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: agree with the motion

Created: 2020-06-17 20:56 (UTC)
Full Name: Andrew Fosina
Company: Htfd No1
Affiliation: Government - Fire Service

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: Totally agree.

Created: 2020-06-17 20:21 (UTC)
Full Name: Todd Kidd
Company: Liberty Mutual Insurance Compa
Affiliation: Insurance

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: Good text addition

Created: 2020-06-17 19:58 (UTC)
Full Name: Jason Ellis
Company: University Of Kentucky
Affiliation: AHJ

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: I agree.

Created: 2020-06-17 19:38 (UTC)
Full Name: Danny Underwood
Company: Tanner Medical Ctr
Affiliation: Tanner Medical Center, Inc.

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: for

Created: 2020-06-17 18:32 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Pitschneider

Company: Shakopee City Of

Affiliation: Shakopee Fire

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: Provides for a better evacuation/relocation notification system for high-rise structures.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:10 (UTC)

Full Name: Jonathan Griffin

Company: Cosco Fire Protection Inc.

Affiliation: NICET

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: Agree with Committee

Created: 2020-06-17 17:01 (UTC)

Full Name: Daniel Welkley

Company: Ameren Corp

Affiliation: NFPA Member

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: Agree with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-17 16:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Steve Tafoya

Company:

Affiliation: Fayette County BOC

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: no comment

Created: 2020-06-17 16:51 (UTC)
Full Name: Archie McCartney
Company: Vcu Community Memorial Hospt
Affiliation: Member

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: I think this is needed

Created: 2020-06-17 16:49 (UTC)
Full Name: Curtis Jackson
Company: United Enertech
Affiliation: Engineering Manager

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: In the interest of safety, this makes sense

Created: 2020-06-17 16:29 (UTC)
Full Name: Brenda McNorton
Company: Kansas State Fire Marshal
Affiliation: Kansas State Fire Marshal

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: Added clarification for code professionals and facilities as well as improved firefighter safety

Created: 2020-06-16 17:52 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Quintero
Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marshal

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: Update necessary

Created: 2020-06-15 23:32 (UTC)
Full Name: Shamim Rashidsumar
Company: Natl Ready Mixed Concrete Assn
Affiliation: Build with Strength Coalition

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: This motion introduces the requirement for high-rise building notification, specifically emergency voice alarm communication systems, in existing high-rise residential apartment buildings. This supports the balanced approach to fire protection (fire/detection and alarm, fire suppression, and containment), which is equally important to existing buildings as it is to new construction. The proposed amendment offers a retrofit friendly approach in addition to the NFPA 72 compliant system option for emergency voice alarm communication systems.

Created: 2020-06-15 16:55 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Quintero
Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: New language is necessary

Created: 2020-06-15 13:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Bridget Mourao
Company: Emory University
Affiliation: NFPA Technical Member

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: High Rise specific notification requirements is good.

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)
Full Name: Kenneth Tyree
Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh
Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)
Full Name: Christopher Kachura
Company: Southeast Fire Protection
Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: A

Created: 2020-06-10 15:04 (UTC)
Full Name: Joel Edwards
Company: Reedy Creek Fire Dept
Affiliation: Fire Marshal

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: The proposed amendment would provide two reasonable options for existing high-rise residential buildings. While retroactive requirements in residential buildings are not popular, clear voice instructions are required to effectively execute the emergency action plan required in high-rise structures.

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Jameson Wendell
Company: Merck Co
Affiliation: User

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)
Full Name: Shay Rankhorn
Company: Ballad Health
Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: For

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)
Full Name: Douglas Miller
Company: Local 190
Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: These guidelines need to be in the code so fire announcement and evacuation have guidelines.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)
Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas
Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue
Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)
Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed
Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp
Affiliation: member

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)
Full Name: Matthew Mertens
Company: North Shore Fire Department
Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: movement for voice evac systems in high rise is past due. While the language may be interpreted to retroactively enforce voice in existing buildings, very few to any communities will enforce retroactive requirements on high-rise. However, it does provide direction that when replaced the voice system is the standard to be achieved.

Created: 2020-06-18 21:39 (UTC)
Full Name: Martin Anderson
Company: Siemens Building Technologies,
Affiliation: AFAA

CAM 101-17

AGAINST

Reason: Against based on Committee discussion and recommendation

Created: 2020-06-18 18:56 (UTC)
Full Name: Raymond Grill
Company: Arup
Affiliation: Self

CAM 101-17

AGAINST

Reason: Creates potential conflict with Section 11.8.

Created: 2020-06-17 19:48 (UTC)
Full Name: John Taylor
Company: HCT, LLC
Affiliation: Healthcare Consulting

CAM 101-17

AGAINST

Reason: Support committee.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:48 (UTC)
Full Name: Bret Martin
Company: CNA Insurance
Affiliation: Self

CAM 101-17

AGAINST

Reason: Already addressed in NFPA 72 and previously referenced to 72. No need to add more restrictive requirements.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:21 (UTC)

Full Name: David Pursel
Company: Berkshire Systems Group, Inc.
Affiliation: SAF-BSF Technical Committee Member

CAM 101-17

AGAINST

Reason: There is no requireCovantamen for supervision or reference to the requirements in NFPA 72

Created: 2020-06-16 21:25 (UTC)

Full Name: Vincent Baroncini
Company: Siemens, Inc.
Affiliation: Siemens, Inc.

CAM 101-17

AGAINST

Reason: Allowing standard Public Address systems weakens Life Safety in existing buildings as they do not have the required performance and reliability as addressed in NFPA 72. There are some provisions in NFPA 72 that can be followed.

Created: 2020-06-12 15:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Jonathan Tarvin
Company: Alabama Power
Affiliation: nicet

CAM 101-17

AGAINST

Reason: ok

Created: 2020-06-11 17:18 (UTC)

Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler
Company: GBH International
Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 101-17

AGAINST

Reason: I am concerned about the need for retrofit.

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Scott Newman

Company: Walgreens
Affiliation: None

CAM 101-17

AGAINST

Reason: Disagree with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-11 13:58 (UTC)
Full Name: James Narva
Company: NASFM
Affiliation: National Association of State Fire Marshals

CAM 101-17

AGAINST

Reason: If successful, this would require retrofitting existing high-rise buildings so the required fire alarm system shall be capable of occupant notification via voice communication or public address system. It is believed this is an excessive requirement that would not improve overall safety above the already existing fire alarm system.

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Thomas Parrish
Company: Telgian Corporation
Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 101-17

AGAINST

Reason: The Automatic Fire Alarm Association (AFAA) has determined that this proposal is attempting to cover installation requirements that presently exist in NFPA 72. What is being proposed is far less than what is currently required by the code. All alarm and communication systems shall be installed per NFPA 72. Public address systems are not listed for Fire Alarm use.

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)
Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos
Company: City Of Tamarac
Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 101-17

AGAINST

Reason: I believe this needs to be a requirement in chapter 30 to get into new buildings as I am not sure if the intent is to make this retro-active into existing buildings. We are having a hard enough time getting fire sprinklers past into existing buildings. Language appears to be good but not certain the intent.

Created: 2020-06-08 14:35 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Parrish

Company: Telgian Corporation

Affiliation: AFAA

CAM 101-17

AGAINST

Reason: ALL building fire alarm systems shall be installed per NFPA 72. NFPA 72 has very strict requirements that exceed what is being proposed above. This CAM should not allow for lesser systems to be installed in places that system survivability is paramount since you are doing partial or selective evacuation in high rises. You will have significantly longer evacuation and on-scene times for responding personnel. Tom Parrish, VP AFAA, Chair AFAA Codes & Standards

Created: 2020-06-18 22:44 (UTC)

Full Name: Oscar Torres

Company: Cohisa

Affiliation: 3431347

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: It is clearer

Created: 2020-06-18 18:59 (UTC)

Full Name: Michael Mattson

Company: Substation Standards

Affiliation: Salt River Project

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: Removes confusion existing in section 10.2.2

Created: 2020-06-18 05:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Russel Faleiro

Company: Gosafe Fire Security Safety

Affiliation: FIRE SYSTEM

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: AGREED

Created: 2020-06-18 01:12 (UTC)
Full Name: John Campbell
Company: Global Fire Protection Group,
Affiliation: Member

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: agree with the motion

Created: 2020-06-17 20:56 (UTC)
Full Name: Andrew Fosina
Company: Htfd No1
Affiliation: Government - Fire Service

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-17 19:58 (UTC)
Full Name: Jason Ellis
Company: University Of Kentucky
Affiliation: AHJ

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-17 19:38 (UTC)
Full Name: Danny Underwood
Company: Tanner Medical Ctr
Affiliation: Tanner Medical Center, Inc.

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: for

Created: 2020-06-17 18:32 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Pitschneider

Company: Shakopee City Of

Affiliation: Shakopee Fire

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: Some common sense in this proposal.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:10 (UTC)

Full Name: Jonathan Griffin

Company: Cosco Fire Protection Inc.

Affiliation: NICET

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: Agree with Committee

Created: 2020-06-17 17:01 (UTC)

Full Name: Daniel Welkley

Company: Ameren Corp

Affiliation: NFPA Member

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: Agree with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-17 16:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Steve Tafoya

Company:

Affiliation: Fayette County BOC

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: no comment

Created: 2020-06-17 16:29 (UTC)

Full Name: Brenda McNorton
Company: Kansas State Fire Marshal
Affiliation: Kansas State Fire Marshal

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: Clarity

Created: 2020-06-16 17:52 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Quintero
Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marshal

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: Update necessary

Created: 2020-06-15 16:55 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Quintero
Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: Update is necessary

Created: 2020-06-15 13:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Bridget Mourao
Company: Emory University
Affiliation: NFPA Technical Member

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: The language is updated to be more applicable.

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Scott Newman
Company: Walgreens
Affiliation: None

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: In alignment with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)

Full Name: Kenneth Tyree

Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh

Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-10 20:29 (UTC)

Full Name: Scott Eckstein

Company: Richardson Fire Department

Affiliation: Inspector

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: no conflicts

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)

Full Name: Christopher Kachura

Company: Southeast Fire Protection

Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: A

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Jameson Wendell

Company: Merck Co

Affiliation: User

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)
Full Name: Douglas Miller
Company: Local 190
Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: Code is better stated in pass vote.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)
Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas
Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue
Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)
Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed
Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp
Affiliation: member

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)
Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos
Company: City Of Tamarac
Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: Language clarifies existing language and provides additional guidance for the manufacturer and/or evaluator.

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)
Full Name: Matthew Mertens
Company: North Shore Fire Department
Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: makes sense

Created: 2020-06-19 02:19 (UTC)
Full Name: James Priest
Company: Fermi National Accelerator Lab
Affiliation: Government

CAM 790-8

AGAINST

Reason: Power cord is not defined and the presence of a power cord does not serve to quantitatively limit the system voltage or available fault current, since flexible cords (NFPA 70 Article 400) and plugs / receptacles exist rated for 480 volt 3-phase power at well over 100 Amperes per phase. Adding voltage and current restrictions to the proposed 10.2.1(1), e.g., 120 volts, single phase, 20 amperes, where overcurrent protection and conductor sizes effectively limit available fault current and arc fault incident energy, could make final inspection at the manufacture's location permissible.

Created: 2020-06-18 18:56 (UTC)
Full Name: Raymond Grill
Company: Arup
Affiliation: Self

CAM 790-8

AGAINST

Reason: Defer to the Committee recommendation.

Created: 2020-06-17 20:21 (UTC)
Full Name: Todd Kidd
Company: Liberty Mutual Insurance Compa
Affiliation: Insurance

CAM 790-8

AGAINST

Reason: Weakens the standard

Created: 2020-06-17 19:48 (UTC)

Full Name: John Taylor

Company: HCT, LLC

Affiliation: Healthcare Consulting

CAM 790-8

AGAINST

Reason: Field evaluation needs to take place in the field to ensure equipment meets its intended purpose with the connected equipment.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:48 (UTC)

Full Name: Bret Martin

Company: CNA Insurance

Affiliation: Self

CAM 790-8

AGAINST

Reason: Agree in principle with committee.

Created: 2020-06-17 16:58 (UTC)

Full Name: Julian Burns

Company: Quality Power Solutions, Inc.

Affiliation: IEC

CAM 790-8

AGAINST

Reason: Performing a "Field Evaluation" at a manufacture's location should not be permitted. An evaluation at a manufacture's location would be a "Listing" application. The 790 Standard's title is " Standard for Competency of Third-Party Field Evaluation Bodies. One purpose of a Field Evaluation is to verify that unlisted equipment is being used in an area suitable for it's application ie. not installed outdoors, if not rated, installed in a hazardous environment, if not rated for such an area etc.

Created: 2020-06-17 16:51 (UTC)

Full Name: Archie McCartney

Company: Vcu Community Memorial Hospt

Affiliation: Member

CAM 790-8

AGAINST

Reason: It doesn't make sense to me

Created: 2020-06-17 16:49 (UTC)

Full Name: Curtis Jackson

Company: United Enertech

Affiliation: Engineering Manager

CAM 790-8

AGAINST

Reason: I see no added value in this change.

Created: 2020-06-16 21:25 (UTC)

Full Name: Vincent Baroncini

Company: Siemens, Inc.

Affiliation: Siemens, Inc.

CAM 790-8

AGAINST

Reason: Manufacturer location is not appropriate for final evaluation

Created: 2020-06-12 15:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Jonathan Tarvin

Company: Alabama Power

Affiliation: nicet

CAM 790-8

AGAINST

Reason: ok

Created: 2020-06-11 17:18 (UTC)

Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler

Company: GBH International

Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 790-8

AGAINST

Reason: Evaluation should be at the installation site.

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Parrish

Company: Telgian Corporation

Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 790-8

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision

Created: 2020-06-09 20:21 (UTC)

Full Name: John Taylor

Company: HCT, LLC

Affiliation: Healthcare Consulting

CAM 790-8

AGAINST

Reason: Acceptable performance of equipment may be assured when evaluated at the installation site connected to the system it serves. Evaluating at the manufacturer's site only assures operation under ideal conditions.

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Shay Rankhorn

Company: Ballad Health

Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 790-8

AGAINST

Reason: Against

Created: 2020-06-08 20:26 (UTC)

Full Name: David Carpenter

Company: City of Florence, Alabama

Affiliation: Inspector

CAM 790-8

AGAINST

Reason: 10.2.1. I agree with for cord plug connection. 10.2.2. The language appears to remove FEB/AHJ responsibility on hardwired equipment. Not sure how a hardwired evaluation can be made at the factory since the facility/installation wiring method would be available for evaluation.

Created: 2020-06-08 17:27 (UTC)
Full Name: Julian Burns
Company: Quality Power Solutions, Inc.
Affiliation: IEC

CAM 790-8

AGAINST

Reason: The Standard 790 Title states" Standard for Competency of Third-Party Field Evaluation Bodies". To include the Manufacture's location would not be where equipment is installed. At the Manufacture's location would constitute a "Listing" application. One purpose for a field evaluation is to verify that the unlisted equipment is being used in an area suitable for its application ie. not installed outdoors if not rated or installed in a hazardous Class 1 Division 1 area if not rated. The 790 Committee rejected both the original PI and the PC. This CAM should be rejected.

Created: 2020-06-19 02:19 (UTC)
Full Name: James Priest
Company: Fermi National Accelerator Lab
Affiliation: Government

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: This makes more sense and easier to understand

Created: 2020-06-18 05:52 (UTC)
Full Name: Russel Faleiro
Company: Gosafe Fire Security Safety
Affiliation: FIRE SYSTEM

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: AGREED

Created: 2020-06-17 19:58 (UTC)
Full Name: Jason Ellis
Company: University Of Kentucky
Affiliation: AHJ

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-17 19:38 (UTC)

Full Name: Danny Underwood

Company: Tanner Medical Ctr

Affiliation: Tanner Medical Center, Inc.

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: for

Created: 2020-06-17 18:32 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Pitschneider

Company: Shakopee City Of

Affiliation: Shakopee Fire

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: No clear on intent and only adds requirements that are in some way included in other areas of the document.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:10 (UTC)

Full Name: Jonathan Griffin

Company: Cosco Fire Protection Inc.

Affiliation: NICET

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Agree with Committee

Created: 2020-06-17 17:01 (UTC)

Full Name: Daniel Welkley

Company: Ameren Corp

Affiliation: NFPA Member

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Agree with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-17 16:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Steve Tafoya

Company:

Affiliation: Fayette County BOC

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: no comment

Created: 2020-06-17 16:49 (UTC)

Full Name: Curtis Jackson

Company: United Eneritech

Affiliation: Engineering Manager

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: In the interest of safety, this makes sense

Created: 2020-06-16 01:58 (UTC)

Full Name: George Baxter

Company: West Islip Fire Dist

Affiliation: West Islip Fire District

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: The use of spot shores should not be allowed in any portion of trench rescue. If you need to shore a trench it's a reason, typically it's not for safety it's for rescue after the trench has collapsed to rely on a spot shore on a trench wall proves the material is unstable and should require full shoring.

Created: 2020-06-15 13:46 (UTC)

Full Name: Bridget Mourao

Company: Emory University

Affiliation: NFPA Technical Member

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Updating the language is good.

Created: 2020-06-12 15:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Jonathan Tarvin

Company: Alabama Power

Affiliation: nicet

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: ok

Created: 2020-06-12 02:53 (UTC)

Full Name: Mike Weiss

Company: EFRS

Affiliation: Captain

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Soil in a trench rescue situation is inherently unstable. Use of spot shoring on unstable soil is a dangerous practice.

Created: 2020-06-12 02:48 (UTC)

Full Name: Abe Schneider

Company:

Affiliation: Grand Rapids Fire

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Spot shoring is unsafe and unproven.

Created: 2020-06-11 21:38 (UTC)

Full Name: john tew

Company: fdny (ret)

Affiliation: Firefighter

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Not having any tabulated data is unsafe practice

Created: 2020-06-11 21:36 (UTC)
Full Name: John O'Neal
Company: Noblesville Fire Department
Affiliation: Noblesville FD

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Spot shores are unsafe in unstable soil.

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Scott Newman
Company: Walgreens
Affiliation: None

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: In alignment with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-11 12:55 (UTC)
Full Name: George Barrier
Company: Charlotte Fire Department
Affiliation: Charlotte Fire Department / NCOEM

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: I understand there is no engineering basis nor has there been any engineering performed by a licensed Professional Engineer in support of the use of spot shores and to allow the support of trench soils without use of uprights or panels. In addition, the language in this motion will mislead firefighters to assume that spot shoring is safe at any trench incident. Spot shoring does have limited applicability to a narrow range of specific conditions, but this motion fails to in any way address those specific scenarios with no guidance available. This Motion creates an UNSAFE workspace. More work is yet to be done. George D, Barrier, PE (704) 201-1487

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)
Full Name: Kenneth Tyree
Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh
Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Agree with above comments

Created: 2020-06-10 19:42 (UTC)

Full Name:

Company: Lambertville FD

Affiliation: Non-member

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Spot shoring not appropriate for unstable soil conditions found during trench rescue operations

Created: 2020-06-10 19:08 (UTC)

Full Name: Jeff Brady

Company: Midland Fire Department

Affiliation: Midland Fire Department

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Spot shoring is a dangerous practice not backed up by science that creates a false sense of safety to rescuers. The fire service should error on the side of caution and treat all soil as class C. We owe it to our rescuers to operate with safe practices. The safest practice is shoring and sheeting.

Created: 2020-06-10 18:43 (UTC)

Full Name: Jake Hoffman

Company: Toledo Fire Special Operations

Affiliation: Toledo Fire Special Operations

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Physics that apply to rescue spot shoring in Michigan do not cease to exist on the west coast. Get rid of it.

Created: 2020-06-10 18:33 (UTC)

Full Name:

Company:

Affiliation: Romeoville Fire Academy

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: No tab data to support the use of spot shores.

Created: 2020-06-10 18:24 (UTC)

Full Name: Eric Falk

Company: MA District 8 Technical Rescue Team

Affiliation: Coordinator

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Misleading language

Created: 2020-06-10 17:52 (UTC)

Full Name:

Company: Toronto Fire Services

Affiliation: TFS

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: The current language as it is written in the standard will promote the use of spot shoring at a trench rescue incident. There needs to be proper limitations or explanation in the language. Currently, as it is written it will mislead firefighters to thinking that spot shoring is safe at any "trench incident". This creates a serious and dangerous omission of facts.

Created: 2020-06-10 17:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Matt Sherrill

Company:

Affiliation: Fire Department

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Practice lacks science and misleads firefighters that the practice is safe.

Created: 2020-06-10 15:00 (UTC)

Full Name: Eric Saling

Company: West Metro Fire Rescue

Affiliation: West Metro Fire Rescue

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: In unstable soil, spot shoring will only provide a false sense of security. Strut manufactures do not provide tabulated data for spot shoring in unstable soils. Strut activations forces used against unstable soils can facilitate a more rapid collapse of unaffected walls.

Created: 2020-06-10 14:54 (UTC)

Full Name: Brandon Buckley

Company:

Affiliation: St Paul Park Refinery FD

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Spot shoring should not be used on unstable soils or other adverse conditions and should be worded as such or removed.

Created: 2020-06-10 14:44 (UTC)

Full Name: Richard Gregg

Company: Alabama Fire College

Affiliation: Training Supervisor

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Original Text would mislead rescuer into thinking spot shoring with any given trench rescue would be safe

Created: 2020-06-10 14:32 (UTC)

Full Name: Justin Foureur

Company:

Affiliation: None

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Spot shoring is not a suitable option and has no scientific basis for use in trench rescue. It WILL promote the idea to non-trained personnel that spot shoring is ok when it is not. This is not promoting safe work practices.

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Jameson Wendell

Company: Merck Co

Affiliation: User

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-10 14:05 (UTC)

Full Name: David mccarthy

Company: claymont Fire Co

Affiliation: Ff

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: The new text does not sufficiently provide FF information about unstable soils, furthermore it lacks sufficient background to support the changes

Created: 2020-06-10 13:54 (UTC)

Full Name: Chris Bentley

Company: Airdrie Fire Dept

Affiliation: Airdrie Fire Dept

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Language is misleading and will lead to dangerous practices.

Created: 2020-06-10 13:53 (UTC)

Full Name: Matthew Fanfalone

Company:

Affiliation: Waterford regional fire dept

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Spot shoring is unsafe and does not properly protect the rescuers and victim from secondary collapses. Nor is there any conforming data to support spot shoring!

Created: 2020-06-10 13:48 (UTC)

Full Name: nicholas whitlock

Company:

Affiliation: Jefferson township

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Spot shoring of unstable soil hasn't been proven effective

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)
Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed
Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp
Affiliation: member

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-18 22:44 (UTC)
Full Name: Oscar Torres
Company: Cohisa
Affiliation: 3431347

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Lessens understanding and limitations

Created: 2020-06-18 18:56 (UTC)
Full Name: Raymond Grill
Company: Arup
Affiliation: Self

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Defer to the Committee recommendation.

Created: 2020-06-18 01:12 (UTC)
Full Name: John Campbell
Company: Global Fire Protection Group,
Affiliation: Member

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Not clear as to why the verbiage should be deleted. Removes requirements that are inherent to the performance of the standard

Created: 2020-06-17 20:21 (UTC)

Full Name: Todd Kidd

Company: Liberty Mutual Insurance Compa

Affiliation: Insurance

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Weakens the standard

Created: 2020-06-17 19:48 (UTC)

Full Name: John Taylor

Company: HCT, LLC

Affiliation: Healthcare Consulting

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Support committee.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:48 (UTC)

Full Name: Bret Martin

Company: CNA Insurance

Affiliation: Self

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Agree in principle with committee.

Created: 2020-06-17 16:51 (UTC)

Full Name: Archie McCartney

Company: Vcu Community Memorial Hospt

Affiliation: Member

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Don't know

Created: 2020-06-17 16:29 (UTC)
Full Name: Brenda McNorton
Company: Kansas State Fire Marshal
Affiliation: Kansas State Fire Marshal

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Existing text is fine

Created: 2020-06-16 21:25 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Baroncini
Company: Siemens, Inc.
Affiliation: Siemens, Inc.

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Should not remove, compromises safety.

Created: 2020-06-16 17:52 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Quintero
Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marshal

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Update necessary

Created: 2020-06-15 16:55 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Quintero
Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Update is necessary

Created: 2020-06-12 23:24 (UTC)

Full Name: Francis Brennan
Company: Seattle Fire Department
Affiliation: Enforcer

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Spot shoring as an integral component to technician level work in trench rescue. This particular paragraph could be revised to reflect the term "single point shore" instead of spot shore. Complete removal of the paragraph is inappropriate.

Created: 2020-06-10 20:29 (UTC)
Full Name: Scott Eckstein
Company: Richardson Fire Department
Affiliation: Inspector

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Skills should not be removed

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)
Full Name: Christopher Kachura
Company: Southeast Fire Protection
Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Should remain.

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Thomas Parrish
Company: Telgian Corporation
Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)
Full Name: Shay Rankhorn

Company: Ballad Health
Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Against

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)
Full Name: Douglas Miller
Company: Local 190
Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Trench safety should be addressed.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)
Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas
Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue
Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Disagree to remove the language

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)
Full Name: Matthew Mertens
Company: North Shore Fire Department
Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: why would this basic skill be removed from the standard?

Created: 2020-06-18 22:44 (UTC)
Full Name: Oscar Torres
Company: Cohisa
Affiliation: 3431347

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: Not all fire departments from around the world have a vast inventory of power assisted patient cots

Created: 2020-06-18 05:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Russel Faleiro

Company: Gosafe Fire Security Safety

Affiliation: FIRE SYSTEM

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: AGREED

Created: 2020-06-17 20:21 (UTC)

Full Name: Todd Kidd

Company: Liberty Mutual Insurance Compa

Affiliation: Insurance

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: Makes sense for safety.

Created: 2020-06-17 19:58 (UTC)

Full Name: Jason Ellis

Company: University Of Kentucky

Affiliation: AHJ

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-17 19:48 (UTC)

Full Name: John Taylor

Company: HCT, LLC

Affiliation: Healthcare Consulting

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: Overly burdensome on small departments in geographic locations where this type of equipment does not function properly due to local environment.

Created: 2020-06-17 19:38 (UTC)

Full Name: Danny Underwood

Company: Tanner Medical Ctr

Affiliation: Tanner Medical Center, Inc.

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: for

Created: 2020-06-17 18:48 (UTC)

Full Name: Bret Martin

Company: CNA Insurance

Affiliation: Self

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: Would be too restrictive for existing fire service departments without power-assisted patient equipment.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:32 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Pitschneider

Company: Shakopee City Of

Affiliation: Shakopee Fire

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: Many smaller fire/EMS operations may not be able to afford to implement this requirement.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:10 (UTC)

Full Name: Jonathan Griffin

Company: Cosco Fire Protection Inc.

Affiliation: NICET

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: Agree with Committee

Created: 2020-06-17 16:29 (UTC)
Full Name: Brenda McNorton
Company: Kansas State Fire Marshal
Affiliation: Kansas State Fire Marshal

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: power lifts are a financial hardship to many services.

Created: 2020-06-15 16:55 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Quintero
Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: While I understand the concept, some of devices are necessary for the patient

Created: 2020-06-15 13:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Bridget Mourao
Company: Emory University
Affiliation: NFPA Technical Member

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: Good addition.

Created: 2020-06-12 15:15 (UTC)
Full Name: Jonathan Tarvin
Company: Alabama Power
Affiliation: nicet

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: ok

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)

Full Name: Kenneth Tyree
Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh
Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: Agree with above request

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)
Full Name: Christopher Kachura
Company: Southeast Fire Protection
Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: A

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Jameson Wendell
Company: Merck Co
Affiliation: User

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 20:21 (UTC)
Full Name: John Taylor
Company: HCT, LLC
Affiliation: Healthcare Consulting

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: Places undo hardship on departments of limited resources. The departments adversely affected additionally serve areas where this equipment is not rated or approved to operate.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)
Full Name: Douglas Miller
Company: Local 190

Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: I don't think the ems and fire need regulations on patient loading.

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)

Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed

Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp

Affiliation: member

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-18 18:56 (UTC)

Full Name: Raymond Grill

Company: Arup

Affiliation: Self

CAM 1500-1

AGAINST

Reason: Defer to the Committee recommendation.

Created: 2020-06-18 01:12 (UTC)

Full Name: John Campbell

Company: Global Fire Protection Group,

Affiliation: Member

CAM 1500-1

AGAINST

Reason: Removes requirement without offering alternative solution.

Created: 2020-06-17 20:56 (UTC)

Full Name: Andrew Fosina

Company: Htfd No1

Affiliation: Government - Fire Service

CAM 1500-1

AGAINST

Reason: Safety of EMS Crews and less back injuries.

Created: 2020-06-17 17:01 (UTC)

Full Name: Daniel Welkley

Company: Ameren Corp

Affiliation: NFPA Member

CAM 1500-1

AGAINST

Reason: 6.1.4.1 Fire departments that provide EMS transport should use a power-assisted patient cot to load patients into an automotive ambulance. 6.1.4.2 Power-assisted patient cot or self-loading cot shall be installed, mounted, and retained in accordance with the provisions in NFPA 1917.

Created: 2020-06-17 16:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Steve Tafoya

Company:

Affiliation: Fayette County BOC

CAM 1500-1

AGAINST

Reason: no comment

Created: 2020-06-17 16:51 (UTC)

Full Name: Archie McCartney

Company: Vcu Community Memorial Hospt

Affiliation: Member

CAM 1500-1

AGAINST

Reason: Is this necessary

Created: 2020-06-17 16:49 (UTC)

Full Name: Curtis Jackson

Company: United Enertech

Affiliation: Engineering Manager

CAM 1500-1

AGAINST

Reason: I see no added value to this.

Created: 2020-06-16 21:25 (UTC)

Full Name: Vincent Baroncini

Company: Siemens, Inc.

Affiliation: Siemens, Inc.

CAM 1500-1

AGAINST

Reason: Defines requirements.

Created: 2020-06-16 17:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Vincent Quintero

Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha

Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marshal

CAM 1500-1

AGAINST

Reason: Confused as to why the fire service wants to remove this from the code

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Scott Newman

Company: Walgreens

Affiliation: None

CAM 1500-1

AGAINST

Reason: Disagree with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-10 20:29 (UTC)

Full Name: Scott Eckstein

Company: Richardson Fire Department

Affiliation: Inspector

CAM 1500-1

AGAINST

Reason: power-assisted devices save personnel injuries

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Parrish

Company: Telgian Corporation

Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 1500-1

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Shay Rankhorn

Company: Ballad Health

Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 1500-1

AGAINST

Reason: Against

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)

Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas

Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 1500-1

AGAINST

Reason: Disagree to remove language

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)

Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos

Company: City Of Tamarac

Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 1500-1

AGAINST

Reason: I agree with the language as written as this looks out for the safety and well-being of our fire service members and reduces back injuries.

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)

Full Name: Matthew Mertens
Company: North Shore Fire Department
Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 1500-1

AGAINST

Reason: many work injuries are from excessive lifting. power cots save costs and injuries.

Created: 2020-06-18 22:44 (UTC)

Full Name: Oscar Torres
Company: Cohisa
Affiliation: 3431347

CAM 1700-1

FOR

Reason: If the information could be found in another guide, it could be deleted

Created: 2020-06-18 05:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Russel Faleiro
Company: Gosafe Fire Security Safety
Affiliation: FIRE SYSTEM

CAM 1700-1

FOR

Reason: AGREED

Created: 2020-06-17 19:38 (UTC)

Full Name: Danny Underwood
Company: Tanner Medical Ctr
Affiliation: Tanner Medical Center, Inc.

CAM 1700-1

FOR

Reason: for

Created: 2020-06-17 18:32 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Pitschneider
Company: Shakopee City Of
Affiliation: Shakopee Fire

CAM 1700-1

FOR

Reason: Decontamination is a rapidly changing process. Setting items in a Standard which is not regularly reviewed at least annual could cause the Standard to be out of date prior to publication.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:10 (UTC)

Full Name: Jonathan Griffin

Company: Cosco Fire Protection Inc.

Affiliation: NICET

CAM 1700-1

FOR

Reason: Agree with Committee

Created: 2020-06-17 16:52 (UTC)

Full Name: Steve Tafoya

Company:

Affiliation: Fayette County BOC

CAM 1700-1

FOR

Reason: no comment

Created: 2020-06-17 16:49 (UTC)

Full Name: Curtis Jackson

Company: United Enertech

Affiliation: Engineering Manager

CAM 1700-1

FOR

Reason: In the interest of safety, this makes sense

Created: 2020-06-15 13:46 (UTC)

Full Name: Bridget Mourao

Company: Emory University

Affiliation: NFPA Technical Member

CAM 1700-1

FOR

Reason: Structural Firefighting changes constantly. Deleting this section is good.

Created: 2020-06-12 15:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Jonathan Tarvin

Company: Alabama Power

Affiliation: nicet

CAM 1700-1

FOR

Reason: ok

Created: 2020-06-11 17:25 (UTC)

Full Name: Rick Swan

Company: IAFF Local 2881/CAL FIRE Fight

Affiliation: International Association of Fire Fighters

CAM 1700-1

FOR

Reason: The scope for NFPA 1700 states, This guide addresses structural fire-fighting strategy, tactics, and tasks as supported by science-based research. Chapter 11 is for Exposure and Hygiene Considerations, not only is Chapter 11 out of the scope of NFPA 1700 the material in Chapter 11 is already covered in NFPA 1500, and is within the scope of NFPA 1500 which states "This standard shall contain minimum requirements for a fire service-related occupational safety and health program." NFPA 1500 Chapter 1400 should be referenced in NFPA 1700 if that is the need.

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Scott Newman

Company: Walgreens

Affiliation: None

CAM 1700-1

FOR

Reason: In alignment with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)

Full Name: Christopher Kachura

Company: Southeast Fire Protection

Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 1700-1

FOR

Reason: A

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Jameson Wendell

Company: Merck Co

Affiliation: User

CAM 1700-1

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)

Full Name: Douglas Miller

Company: Local 190

Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 1700-1

FOR

Reason: Not sure that it is needed in NFPA 1700

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)

Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed

Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp

Affiliation: member

CAM 1700-1

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-19 02:19 (UTC)

Full Name: James Priest

Company: Fermi National Accelerator Lab

Affiliation: Government

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: While I agree Chapter 11 should be given its own standard or incorporated into NFPA 1584. Since this would take some time the guidance needs to remain in place or a Guidance document issued For the Exposure and Hygiene Considerations of Chapter 11. You can't just write out this information till the new standard is or incorporated into NFPA 1584. Maybe it should be moved to the appendix in the meantime.

Created: 2020-06-18 18:56 (UTC)

Full Name: Raymond Grill

Company: Arup

Affiliation: Self

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: Defer to the Committee recommendation.

Created: 2020-06-18 01:12 (UTC)

Full Name: John Campbell

Company: Global Fire Protection Group,

Affiliation: Member

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: No clear reason to delete an entire chapter from the standard. Believe that the committee kept this chapter in the standard for a reason and do not believe that it should be deleted.

Created: 2020-06-17 20:56 (UTC)

Full Name: Andrew Fosina

Company: Htfd No1

Affiliation: Government - Fire Service

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: Need to keep the section for fire fighter safety.

Created: 2020-06-17 20:21 (UTC)

Full Name: Todd Kidd

Company: Liberty Mutual Insurance Compa

Affiliation: Insurance

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: weakens the standard

Created: 2020-06-17 19:58 (UTC)
Full Name: Jason Ellis
Company: University Of Kentucky
Affiliation: AHJ

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-17 19:48 (UTC)
Full Name: John Taylor
Company: HCT, LLC
Affiliation: Healthcare Consulting

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: Support committee.

Created: 2020-06-17 18:48 (UTC)
Full Name: Bret Martin
Company: CNA Insurance
Affiliation: Self

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: Agree in principle with committee.

Created: 2020-06-17 16:51 (UTC)
Full Name: Archie McCartney
Company: Vcu Community Memorial Hospt
Affiliation: Member

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: Don't know

Created: 2020-06-17 16:29 (UTC)
Full Name: Brenda McNorton
Company: Kansas State Fire Marshal
Affiliation: Kansas State Fire Marshal

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: Necessary to remain

Created: 2020-06-16 21:25 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Baroncini
Company: Siemens, Inc.
Affiliation: Siemens, Inc.

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: No justification.

Created: 2020-06-16 17:52 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Quintero
Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marshal

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: Confused as to why the fire service wants to remove this from the code

Created: 2020-06-16 14:37 (UTC)
Full Name: Michael Anderson
Company: Travis County Emergency Services District #2 - Pflugerville Fire Dept.
Affiliation: TCESD#2

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: The Technical Committee reviewed this submission at the Second Draft meeting and rejected this motion. I support the TC Committee Decision to include the chapter in the guide.

Created: 2020-06-15 16:55 (UTC)
Full Name: Vincent Quintero
Company: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha
Affiliation: Rhode Island State Fire Marsha

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: Why are you deleting?

Created: 2020-06-11 17:18 (UTC)
Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler
Company: GBH International
Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: No justification was submitted to delete the chapter.

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)
Full Name: Kenneth Tyree
Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh
Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: It's only a guide and the Chapter is only a part of a guide and not a standard.

Created: 2020-06-10 20:29 (UTC)
Full Name: Scott Eckstein
Company: Richardson Fire Department
Affiliation: Inspector

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: Keep chapter

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Thomas Parrish
Company: Telgian Corporation

Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision

Created: 2020-06-10 12:40 (UTC)

Full Name: Joseph Jardin

Company: Fire Department City Of New Yo

Affiliation: FDNY

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: Support TC Position

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Shay Rankhorn

Company: Ballad Health

Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: Against

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)

Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas

Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: Disagree to delete

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)

Full Name: Matthew Mertens

Company: North Shore Fire Department

Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: without validation or purpose to remove an entire chapter does not make sense.
