



Amy Beasley Cronin
Secretary, Standards Council

10 August 2009

To: Interested Parties

Subject:

Standards Council Decision (Final):	D#09-4
Standards Council Agenda Item:	SC#09-8-1-c
Date of Decision*:	6 August 2009
NFPA 13, <i>Standard for the Installation of Sprinkler Systems</i> , 2010 edition	

Dear Interested Parties:

At its meeting of 4-6 August 2009, the Standards Council considered an appeal on the above referenced matter.

Attached is the final decision of the Standards Council on this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Amy Beasley Cronin".

Amy Beasley Cronin
Secretary, NFPA Standards Council

c: D. Berry, M. Brodoff, L. Fuller, J. Lake, J. Moreau-Correia
Members, TC on Sprinkler System Installation Criteria (AUT-SSI)
Members, TCC on Automatic Sprinkler Systems (AUT-AAC)
Members, NFPA Standards Council (AAD-AAA)
Individuals Providing Appeal Commentary

*NOTE: Participants in NFPA's codes and standards making process should know that limited review of this decision may be sought from the NFPA Board of Directors. For the rules describing the available review and the method for petitioning the Board for review, please consult section 1-7 of the NFPA Regulations Governing Committee Projects and the NFPA Regulations Governing Petitions to the Board of Directors from Decisions of the Standards Council. Notice of the intent to file such a petition must be submitted to the Clerk of the Board of Directors within 15 calendar days of the Date of Decision noted in the subject line of this letter.



Standards Council Decision (Final):	D#09-4
Standards Council Agenda Item:	SC#09-8-1-c
Date of Decision*:	6 August 2009
NFPA 13, <i>Standard for the Installation of Sprinkler Systems</i> , 2010 edition	

At its meeting of 4-6 August 2009, the Standards Council considered an appeal from David Burkhart from Code Consultants, Inc., requesting that the 2010 edition of NFPA 13, *Standard for the Installation of Sprinkler Systems*, be issued with the acceptance of Comment 13-136. Specifically, the appeal requests that a new Section 8.15.3.2.5 be added that allows sprinklers to be omitted from exterior stair towers when the tower is separated from the building by a noncombustible exterior landing that has openings equivalent to 50% of the stair tower perimeter and when the tower is entirely of noncombustible construction.

As background, Proposal 13-195 recommended adding a new section 8.15.3.2.5 that allowed sprinklers to be omitted from stair towers when the tower is separated from the building by an exterior landing that has openings equivalent to 50% of the stair tower perimeter. It was rejected by the Technical Committee on Sprinkler System Installation Criteria (TC) and the Technical Correlating Committee on Automatic Sprinkler Systems (TCC). Subsequently, Comment 13-136 sought again to revise Section 8.15.3.2.5 and recommended revisions to include that the stair landing is noncombustible and that the tower is entirely of noncombustible construction. This comment was rejected by the TC and TCC. A Certified Amending Motion (CAM 13-5) seeking acceptance of Comment 13-136 was made at the 2009 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). The amending motion was supported by the NFPA membership, but failed to pass the subsequent balloting of both the TC and the TCC. When a recommended amendment is not approved by the TC and TCC, the default recommendation of the codes and standards development process is that no change from the existing edition should occur, and the portion of the Report modified by the Association recommended amendment is returned to previous edition text. In this case, therefore, the default recommendation that comes to the Council is that no change be made to add the new Section 8.15.3.2.5 since it did not exist in the previous edition.

The appeal requests that the Standards Council overturn the action that was recommended by the full NFPA codes and standards development process. On appeal, the Standards Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA codes and standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process, only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results recommended by the NFPA codes and standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that new Section 8.15.3.2.5 allowing the omission of sprinklers in stair towers under certain conditions of separation and construction will not be added.

If the appellant or others wish to address this or other issues going forward, they can do so in the regular document revision process or as a Tentative Interim Amendment.