



Amy Beasley Cronin  
Secretary, Standards Council

10 August 2009

To: Interested Parties

Subject:

Standards Council Decision (Final):	<b>D#09-7</b>
Standards Council Agenda Item:	<b>SC#09-8-2-b</b>
Date of Decision*:	6 August 2009
NFPA 13D, <i>Standard for the Installation of Sprinkler Systems in One- and Two-Family Dwellings and Manufactured Homes</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 Residential Sprinkler Systems (AUT-RSS)  
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):	<b>D#09-7</b>
Standards Council Agenda Item:	<b>SC#09-8-2-b</b>
Date of Decision*:	6 August 2009
<i>NFPA 13D, Standard for the Installation of Sprinkler Systems in One- and Two-Family Dwellings and Manufactured Homes, 2010 edition</i>	

At its meeting of 4-6 August 2009, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Mike Cabral from REHAU Unlimited Polymer Solutions, Inc., requesting that NFPA 13D, *Standard for the Installation of Sprinkler Systems in One- and Two-Family Dwellings and Manufactured Homes*, be issued with the acceptance of group amending motions on Proposals 13D-27 and 13D-30. Specifically, the appeal seeks to revise text to allow for the use of pipe and fittings having a pressure rating of 130 psi for all systems when equipped with a pressure relief valve set to a maximum of 130 psi or connected to a domestic plumbing system.

As background, Proposals 13D-27 and 13D-30 were both rejected by the Technical Committee on Residential Sprinkler Systems (TC) and the Technical Correlating Committee on Automatic Sprinkler Systems (TCC). Subsequently, Comment 13D-21 attempted to support Proposal 13D-30 but provided no suggested text and was rejected by the TC and TCC. A Certified Amending Motion (CAM 13D-1) seeking acceptance of Proposals 13D-27 and 13D-30 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 the text of Sections 5.2.5.3 and 5.2.1.3 will remain unchanged from 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. 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 at each stage.

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 is that the text of Sections 5.2.5.3 and 5.2.1.3 will remain unchanged from the previous edition.

During the course of the testimony, there were questions raised by the appellant that the TC was out of balance. Upon review of the TC roster (see Regs. at 3.2.5), the Council found no basis to conclude that the committee was out of balance. If the appellant or others have specific concerns related to membership going forward, they may raise such concerns through appeals or other requests to the Council, as appropriate.