9 September 2015

To: Interested Parties

Subject: Standards Council Decision (Final): D#15-2
Standards Council Agenda Item: SC#15-8-6-b
Date of Decision: 19 August 2015

NFPA 72®, National Fire Alarm and Signaling Code, 2016 Edition

Dear Interested Parties:

At its meeting of August 17-19, 2015, the Standards Council considered an appeal on the above referenced matter. On August 20, 2015, NFPA issued the Council’s decision on the appeal in the form of a “Short” decision which briefly stated the outcome of the appeal and which indicated that a full Final decision on the appeal would be issued in due course and sent to all interested parties as soon as it became available.

The Council’s Final decision is now available and is attached herewith.

Sincerely,

Dawn Michele Bellis
Secretary, NFPA Standards Council

C: D. Berry, S. Everett, L. Fuller, B. Burke, D. Roux
Members, TC on Notification Appliances for Fire Alarm and Signaling Systems (SIG-NAS)
Members, CC on Signaling Systems for the Protection of Life and Property (SIG-AAC)
Members, NFPA Standards Council (AAD-AAA)
Individuals Providing Appeal Commentary
SUMMARY OF ACTION (for convenience only; not part of official decision): The Standards Council voted to deny the appeal to overturn the Association Action on CAM 72-2 which sought to restore the language of Section 18.5.3.2 to previous edition text, as proposed by the appellant.

DECISION:
At its meeting of August 17-19, 2015, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Vic Humm of Humm and Associates. The appeal requests that the Standards Council overturn the Association Action on CAM 72-2 and restore the language to previous edition text for the proposed 2016 edition of NFPA 72®, National Fire Alarm and Signaling Code.

Specifically, the appeal seeks to Reject Second Revision No. 71 resulting in the following:

18.5.3.2* A The maximum light pulse duration shall be 0.2 second milliseconds with a maximum duty cycle of 40 percent.

Exception: Lights used to meet the requirements of 18.5.5.5 shall be permitted to be listed and labeled to have pulse durations up to 100 milliseconds.

A.18.5.3.2 New research using lights with longer pulse durations shows that the existing tables for indirect signaling [Table 18.5.5.4.1(a) and Table 18.5.5.4.1(b)] are inadequate to assure reliable notification. Until additional work is done and incorporated into this Code, lights used for indirect signaling and having effective intensities specified in Table 18.5.5.4.1(a) or Table 18.5.5.4.1(b) need to be short duration, high intensity to be effective for the specified area of coverage. This limitation does not apply to direct signaling such as that used in corridors in accordance with 18.5.5.5. For direct signaling in corridors (18.5.5.5), longer pulse appliances (up to 100 ms) (SI?), such as LED lights, have been shown to be effective. Longer pulse durations might also be effective in large volume spaces that use direct signaling, as discussed in A.18.5.4.

As background, the appellant filed a Notice of Intent to Make a Motion (NITMAM) in compliance with NFPA Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards (Regs) which was certified by the Motions Committee for presentation at the 2015 NFPA Technical Meeting (Tech Session). Certified Amending Motion 72-2 sought to reject Second Revision No. 71, thereby returning Section 18.5.3.2 to previous edition text. Certified Amending Motion 72-2, was made at the 2015 Tech Session and failed on the floor.
When a Certified Amending Motion seeking to reject Technical Committee revisions fails on the floor of the Tech Session, the recommendation that comes to the Standards Council is to issue the standard as developed by the Technical Committee. The appeal requests the Standards Council overturn the action recommended by the standards development process. In this case, the recommendation yielded by the process is to accept Second Revision No. 71, thereby including such text in the 2016 edition of NFPA 72®, National Fire Alarm and Signaling Code.

On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will deviate from 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.

The present appeal requests that the Council overturn the action recommended by the standards development process. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis upon which to overturn the results yielded by the NFPA standards development process. Simply put, the text of Second Revision No. 71 gained sufficient support for inclusion in the 2016 edition of NFPA 72®, National Fire Alarm and Signaling Code.

The Council, having reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and having considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal, has voted to deny the appeal and issue NFPA 72®, National Fire Alarm and Signaling Code, 2016 Edition as amended.

The Council wishes to note and acknowledge that during the hearing on this appeal, the parties indicated that research regarding this matter and related technology remains ongoing. It is the expectation of the Council that the Technical Committee will diligently continue to monitor and consider new findings and take appropriate action, if necessary, as the results of this research becomes available.

Kerry M. Bell, Chair, and James E. Golinveaux, Member, recused themselves from the deliberations and vote on the appeal.