



Amy Beasley Cronin
Secretary, Standards Council

7 August 2009

To: Interested Parties

Subject:

Standards Council Decision (Final):	D#09-5
Standards Council Agenda Item:	SC#09-8-1-h
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#09-5
Standards Council Agenda Item:	SC#09-8-1-h
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 13-104. Specifically, the appeal requests revising the requirements for the test connections from “main drain” to “water supply”.

As background, Proposal 13-235 recommended in Section 8.17.4.1 to change “main drain” to “water supply” and was rejected by both the Technical Committee on Sprinkler System Installation Criteria (TC) and the Technical Correlating Committee on Automatic Sprinkler Systems (TCC). Subsequently, Comment 13-104 sought again to revise 8.17.4.1, this time in a somewhat different form. This too was rejected by the TC and TCC. A Certified Amending Motion (CAM 13-7) seeking acceptance of Comment 13-104 was made at the 2009 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). The motion failed to obtain the support of the general NFPA membership in attendance, which means under NFPA rules, the default recommendation of the codes and standards development process is that Comment 13-104 continues to be rejected.

The appeal requests that the Standards Council overturn the action that was recommended by the full NFPA codes and standards development process. This recommendation represents the consensus judgment of the responsible technical committee and technical correlating committee, a judgment that was also supported by a vote of the NFPA membership at the 2009 Tech Session. The appellant has had the opportunity to advocate his position at each stage of the full codes and standards process, and failed to persuade the consensus process to adopt his position.

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.