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<p>| 17-8-1 | Act on the issuance of NFPA 1 <em>Fire Code</em>, with an issuance date of August 15, 2017 and an effective date of September 4, 2017, as acted on at the NFPA Technical Meeting, with three amendments and no appeals. |
| 17-8-1-a | Amendment No. 1-1 (CAM 1-1): Reject Second Revision No. 13 including any related portions of First Revision No. 112. This motion (CAM 1-1) passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. <em>(No TC Vote is required)</em> See Attachment 17-8-1-a |
| 17-8-1-b | Amendment No. 1-2 (CAM 1-4): Accept Public Comment No. 28. This motion (CAM 1-4) passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. (\text{PASSED TC Ballot} ) 30 voting members/17 agree/5 disagree/0 abstained/8 not returned) See Attachment 17-8-1-b |
| 17-8-1-c | Amendment No. 1-3 (CAM 1-5): Accept Public Comment No. 29. This motion (CAM 1-5) passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. (\text{PASSED TC Ballot} ) 30 voting members/18 agree/5 disagree/0 abstained/7 not returned) See Attachment 17-8-1-c |
| 17-8-2 | Act on the issuance of NFPA 30 <em>Flammable and Combustible Liquids Code</em>, with an issuance date of August 15, 2017 and an effective date of September 4, 2017. NFPA 30 was not acted on at the Association Meeting but has received one appeal. |
| 17-8-2-a | Appeal of S. Wolin, The Reliable Automatic Sprinkler Co., Inc, requesting the Standards Council overturn the ballot results of the Technical Committee on Storage and Warehousing of Containers and Portable Tanks on SRs 202, 203, 204, 206, 210, 211 and 212. See Attachment 17-8-2-a |
| 17-8-2-b | Comment received by J. LeBlanc, Chair of NFPA 30 (FLC-SWC), on the appeal of S. Wolin. See Attachment 17-8-2-b |
| 17-8-2-c | Comment received by D. Havens, Correlating Committee Chair of NFPA 30, (FLC-AAC) on the appeal of S. Wolin. See Attachment 17-8-2-c |
| 17-8-3 | Act on the issuance of NFPA 37, <em>Standard for the Installation and Use of Stationary Combustion engines and Gas Turbines</em>, with an issuance date of August 15, 2017 and an effective date of September 4, 2017, as acted on at the Association Meeting, with no amendments and no appeals. See Attachment 17-8-3 |
| 17-8-4-a | Amendment No. 54-1 (CAM 54-1): Accept Public Comment No. 94. This motion (CAM 54-1) passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. <em>(FAILED TC Ballot)</em> 31 voting members/4 agree/24 disagree/2 abstained/1 not returned) See Attachment 17-8-4-a |
| 17-8-5 | Act on the issuance of NFPA 59, <em>Utility LP-Gas Plant Code</em>, with an issuance date of August 15, 2017 and an effective date of September 4, 2017, as acted on at the Association Meeting, with no amendments and no appeals. See Attachment 17-8-5 |
| 17-8-6 | Act on the issuance of NFPA 99, <em>Health Care Facilities Code</em>, with an issuance date of August 15, 2017 and an effective date of September 4, 2017, as acted on at the NFPA Technical Meeting, with four amendments and no appeals. See related Standards Council Item 17-8-23 |
| 17-8-6-a | Amendment No. 99-1 (CAM 99-1): Accept Public Comment Number 79. This motion (CAM 99-1) passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. <strong>PASSED TC Ballot</strong> – 18 voting members/13 agree/0 disagree/2 abstained/3 not returned and <strong>PASSED CC Ballot</strong> – 19 voting members/15 agree/0 disagree/0 abstained/4 not returned) See Attachment 17-8-6-a |
| 17-8-6-b | Amendment No. 99-2 (CAM 99-2): Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Revision Number 306. This motion (CAM 99-2) passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. <strong>PASSED TC Ballot</strong> – 18 voting members/13 agree/0 disagree/2 abstained/3 not returned and <strong>PASSED CC Ballot</strong> – 19 voting members/15 agree/0 disagree/0 abstained/4 not returned) See Attachment 17-8-6-b |
| 17-8-6-c | Amendment No. 99-3 (CAM 99-3): Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Revision Number 305. This motion (CAM 99-3) passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. <strong>PASSED TC Ballot</strong> – 18 voting members/13 agree/0 disagree/2 abstained/3 not returned and <strong>PASSED CC Ballot</strong> – 19 voting members/15 agree/0 disagree/0 abstained/4 not returned) See Attachment 17-8-6-c |
| 17-8-6-d | Amendment No. 99-4 (CAM 99-4): Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Revision Number 305. This motion (CAM 99-4) passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. <strong>PASSED TC Ballot</strong> – 18 voting members/13 agree/0 disagree/2 abstained/3 not returned and <strong>PASSED CC Ballot</strong> – 19 voting members/15 agree/0 disagree/0 abstained/4 not returned) See Attachment 17-8-6-d |
| 17-8-7-a | Amendment No. 101-1 (CAM 101-3): Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision Number 30 including any Related Portions of First Revision Number 2002. This motion (CAM 101-3) passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. <strong>No CC/TC Vote is required</strong>. See Attachment 17-8-7-a |
| 17-8-7-a-1 | APPEAL | Appeals of D. Geenens, Fire Door Solutions, and K. Pardoe, Pardoe Consulting, LLC, individually requesting the NFPA Standards Council overturn the Association actions to Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision No. 30 Including any Related Portions of First Revision No. 2002 (CAM 101-3). This Motion passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. See attachment 17-8-7-a-1 NOTE: These appeals also apply to 17-8-7-c-1 and 17-8-7-d-1 |
| 17-8-7-a-1-a | Seven comments received on the appeal of D. Geenens and K. Pardoe. (2 Comments in Support/5 Opposed) See Attachment 17-8-7-a-1-a |
| 17-8-7-b | Amendment No. 101-2 (CAM 101-4): Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment Number 185. This motion (CAM 101-4) passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. <strong>FAILED TC Ballot</strong> – 22 voting members/12 agree/7 disagree/0 abstained/3 not returned and <strong>PASSED CC Ballot</strong> – 11 voting members/9 agree/2 disagree/0 abstained/0 not returned). See Attachment 17-8-7-b SA17-8-7-b |
| 17-8-7-c | Amendment No. 101-3 (CAM 101-5): Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision Number 32. This motion (CAM 101-5) passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. <strong>No CC/TC Vote is required</strong>. See Attachment 17-8-7-c |
| 17-8-7-c-1 | <strong>APPEAL</strong> | Appeals of D. Geenens, Fire Door Solutions, and K. Pardoe, Pardoe Consulting, LLC, individually requesting the NFPA Standards Council overturn the Association actions and Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision No. 32 (CAM 101-5). This Motion passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. See Attachment 17-8-7-a-1 |
| 17-8-7-d | <strong>Amendment No. 101-4 (CAM 101-6):</strong> Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision Number 50. This motion (CAM 101-6) passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. (No CC/TC Vote is required). See Attachment 17-8-7-d |
| 17-8-7-d-1 | <strong>APPEAL</strong> | Appeals of D. Geenens, Fire Door Solutions, and K. Pardoe, Pardoe Consulting, LLC, individually requesting the NFPA Standards Council overturn the Association actions and Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision No. 50 (CAM 101-6). This Motion passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. See Attachment 17-8-7-a-1 |
| 17-8-7-d-1-a | | Comment received by A. Murdock, Chair, NFPA 101 (SAF-MER), on the appeals of D. Geenens and K. Pardoe. See Attachment 17-8-2-b |
| 17-8-7-e | <strong>Amendment No. 101-5 (CAM 101-7):</strong> Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment Number 192. This motion (CAM 101-7) passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. (PASSED TC Ballot – 26 voting members/20 agree/3 disagree/0 abstained/3 not returned and PASSED CC Ballot – 11 voting members/9 agree/2 disagree/0 abstained/0 not returned). See Attachment 17-8-7-e |
| 17-8-7-f | <strong>Amendment No. 101-6 (CAM 101-10):</strong> Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment Number 191. This motion (CAM 101-10) passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. (PASSED TC Ballot – 26 voting members/17 agree/6 disagree/0 abstained/3 not returned and PASSED CC Ballot – 11 voting members/9 agree/0 disagree/0 abstained/2 not returned). See Attachment 17-8-7-f |
| 17-8-7-g | <strong>Amendment No. 101-7 (CAM 101-11):</strong> Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment Number 161. This motion (CAM 101-11) passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. (PASSED TC Ballot – 26 voting members/18 agree/4 disagree/0 abstained/4 not returned and PASSED CC Ballot – 11 voting members/9 agree/0 disagree/0 abstained/2 not returned). See Attachment 17-8-7-g |
| 17-8-7-h | <strong>Amendment No. 101-8 (CAM 101-12):</strong> Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment Number 166. This motion (CAM 101-12) passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. (PASSED TC Ballot – 26 voting members/16 agree/5 disagree/0 abstained/5 not returned and PASSED CC Ballot – 11 voting members/9 agree/0 disagree/0 abstained/2 not returned). See Attachment 17-8-7-h |
| 17-8-7-i | <strong>Amendment No. 101-9 (CAM 101-13):</strong> Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment Number 166. This motion (CAM 101-13) passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. (PASSED TC Ballot – 26 voting members/18 agree/4 disagree/0 abstained/4 not returned and PASSED CC Ballot – 11 voting members/9 agree/0 disagree/0 abstained/2 not returned). See Attachment 17-8-7-i |
| 17-8-7-j | <strong>Amendment No. 101-10 (CAM 101-14):</strong> Reject Second Correlating Revision Number 60. This motion (CAM 101-14) passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. (No CC/TC Vote is required). See Attachment 17-8-7-j |
| 17-8-7-k | <strong>Amendment No. 101-11 (Follow-up Motions to CAMs 101-10 and 101-12):</strong> With the passage of Motions 101-10 and 101-12, a Follow-up motion was made to Delete the following text from 38.1.7.2 and 39.1.7.2: The occupant load for business use shall be 150 ft² (13 m²) per person. Also, Revise Table 7.3.1.2 as follows: ( \frac{150}{9.3} ) to 14. These motions (CAMs 101-10 and 101-12) passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. (PASSED TC Ballot – 26... |
| 17-8-7-l | Amendment No. 101-12 (Follow-Up Motions to CAMs 101-11 and 101-13): With the passage of Motions 101-11 and 101-13, a Follow-up motion was made to Delete text in 38.1.7.2, A.38.1.7.2, 39.1.7.2, A.39.1.7.2. Also, Revise Table 7.3.1.2 Collaboration room/spaces &lt;450ft² (41.8m²) in area 39 2.8; Collaboration room/spaces &lt;450ft² (41.8m²) in area 15 1.4. Also, Add the following to the end of A.7.3.1.2: Collaboration rooms/spaces are common to office buildings. Their principal function is to permit collaboration among occupants in the privacy of a small room-space. These rooms/spaces are primarily used by occupants of the business occupancy to transition temporarily from their regular work-station area in order to obtain privacy and to avoid disturbing other employees located in the open office environment. Collaboration rooms/spaces have been commonly referred to as quiet rooms, focus rooms, huddle rooms, and team rooms. Collaboration rooms/spaces are not considered conference rooms, since a conference room’s principal function is to be used for assembly purposes. This motion passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. (PASSED TC Ballot – 26 voting members/18 agree/3 disagree/0 abstained/5 not returned and PASSED CC Ballot – 11 voting members/9 agree/0 disagree/0 abstained/2 not returned). See Attachment 17-8-7-k |
| 17-8-8 | Act on the issuance of NFPA 285, <em>Standard Fire Test Method for Evaluation of Fire Propagation characteristics of Exterior Non-Load-Bearing Wall Assemblies Containing Combustible Components</em>, with an issuance date of August 15, 2017 and an effective date of September 4, 2017, as acted on at the Association Meeting, with no amendments and two appeals. (see related Agenda Item 17-8-25-c-1) |
| 17-8-8-a | APPEAL | Appeals of J. Beitel, JENSEN HUGHES, and D. Johnston, EIFS Industry Members Association, individually requesting the Standards Council Overturn the Association action and Reject Second Revision No. 3, including any Related Portions of First Revision No. 8. This Motion (CAM 285-1) failed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. See Attachment 17-8-8-a |
| 17-8-8-b | Comment received by B. Badders, Chair, TC Fire Tests, on the appeal of J. Beitel and D. Johnston. See Attachment 17-8-8-b |
| 17-8-8-c | Four comment received on the appeals of J. Beitel and D. Johnston. (3 Comments in Support/1 Opposed) See Attachment 17-8-8-c |
| 17-8-9 | Act on the issuance of NFPA 730, <em>Guide for Premises Security</em>, with an issuance date of August 15, 2017 and an effective date of September 4, 2017, as acted on at the Association Meeting, with no amendments and no appeals. See Attachment 17-8-9 |
| 17-8-10 | Act on the issuance of NFPA 1144, <em>Standard for Reducing Structure Ignition Hazards from Wildland Fire</em>, with an issuance date of August 15, 2017 and an effective date of September 4, 2017, as acted on at the NFPA Technical Meeting, with one amendment and no appeals. No Attachment |
| 17-8-10-a | Amendment No. 1144-1 (CAM 1144-1): Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Revision Number 18 including any Related Portions of First Revision Number 2. This motion (1144-1) passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. (No TC Vote is required). See Attachment 17-8-10-a |
| 17-8-11 | Act on the issuance of NFPA 1403, <em>Standard on Live Fire Training Evolutions</em>, with an issuance date of August 17, 2017 and an effective date of September 4, 2017, as acted on at the Association Meeting, with no amendments and no appeals. See Attachment 17-8-11 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-8-12</td>
<td>Act on the issuance of NFPA 1951, <em>Standard on Protective Ensembles for Technical Rescue Incidents</em>, as acted on at the NFPA Technical Meeting, with two amendments and no appeals. No Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-12-a</td>
<td>Amendment No. 1951-1 (CAM 1951-1): Reject Second Revision Number 66. This motion (CAM 1951-1) passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. <em>(No TC Vote is required as this CAM was overridden by Follow-up Motion 17-8-12-b).</em> See Attachment 17-8-12-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-12-b</td>
<td>Amendment No. 1951-2 (Follow-up Motion to CAM 1951-1): With the passage of Motion 1951-1, a follow-up Motion was made to return NFPA 1951 to the Committee for further processing. This motion passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting, however, the successful CAM was overridden by the action on a follow-up motion. (TC Ballot – 25 voting members/18 agree/0 disagree/0 abstained/7 not returned). See Attachment 17-8-12-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-13</td>
<td>Act on the issuance of NFPA 2112, <em>Standard on Flame-Resistant Garments for Protection of Industrial Personnel Against Flash Fire</em>, with an issuance date of August 15, 2017 and an effective date of September 4, 2017, as acted on at the Association Meeting, with no amendments and one appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-13-a</td>
<td>Appeal of R. Parry, The DuPont Company, Inc., requesting the Standards Council Overturn the Association action and Reject Second Revision No. 76 and Second Revision No. 52. This Motion (CAM 2112-1) failed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. See Attachment 17-8-13-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-13-b</td>
<td>Comment received by S. Corrado, Chair, TC Flash Fire Protective Garments, on the appeal of R. Parry. See Attachment 17-8-1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-13-c</td>
<td>Five comments received on the appeal of R. Parry. (5 Comments Opposed) See Attachment 17-8-13-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-14</td>
<td>Act on the issuance of NFPA 5000, <em>Building Construction and Safety Code</em>, with an issuance date of August 15, 2017 and an effective date of September 4, 2017, as acted on at the NFPA Technical Meeting, with two amendments and no appeals. No Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-14-a</td>
<td>Amendment No. 5000-1 (CAM 5000-1): Accept Committee Comment Number 1002. This motion (CAM 5000-1) passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. <em>(PASSED TC Ballot – 31 voting members/18 agree/2 disagree/2 abstained/9 not returned and FAILED CC Ballot – 18 voting members/8 agree/4 disagree/0 abstained/6 not returned).</em> See Attachment 17-8-14-a SA17-8-14-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-14-a-1</td>
<td>Clarification letter ballot on Amendment No. 5000-1 to change the referenced section. <em>(PASSED TC Ballot – 31 voting members/17 agree/1 disagree/0 abstained/13 not returned)</em> SA17-8-14-1-a ADDITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-14-a-2</td>
<td>Appeal of S. Francis, American Wood Council, requesting the Standards Council overturn the Correlating Committee Ballot results and uphold CAM 5000-1 and accept Committee Comment No. 1002. This Motion passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. SA17-8-14-a-2 ADDITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-14-b</td>
<td>Amendment No. 5000-2 (CAM 5000-10): Reject Second Correlating Revision Number 35. This motion (CAM 5000-10) passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting. <em>(No CC/TC Vote is required).</em> See Attachment 17-8-14-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-15</td>
<td>Annual 2017 Revision Cycle Consent Standards that did not receive NITMAMs, will be letter balled by the Council with an issuance date of August 1, 2017 and an effective date of August 21, 2017:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NFPA 3: <em>Standard for Commissioning of Fire Protection and Life Safety Systems</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 10</td>
<td>Standard for Portable Fire Extinguishers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 30A</td>
<td>Code for Motor Fuel Dispensing Facilities and Repair Garages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 70E</td>
<td>Standard for Electrical Safety in the Workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 87</td>
<td>Standard for Fluid Heaters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 90A</td>
<td>Standard for the Installation of Air-Conditioning and Ventilating Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 90B</td>
<td>Standard for the Installation of Warm Air Heating and Air-Conditioning Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 99B</td>
<td>Standard for Hypobaric Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 220</td>
<td>Standard on Types of Building Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 221</td>
<td>Standard for High Challenge Fire Walls, Fire Walls, and Fire Barrier Walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 301</td>
<td>Code for Safety to Life from Fire on Merchant Vessels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 318</td>
<td>Standard for the Protection of Semiconductor Fabrication Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 403</td>
<td>Standard for Aircraft Rescue and Fire-Fighting Services at Airports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 703</td>
<td>Standard for Fire Retardant—Treated Wood and Fire–Retardant Coatings for Building Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 790</td>
<td>Standard for Competency of Third-Party Field Evaluation Bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 791</td>
<td>Recommended Practice and Procedures for Unlabeled Electrical Equipment Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 1123</td>
<td>Code for Fireworks Display</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 1143</td>
<td>Standard for Wildland Fire Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 1192</td>
<td>Standard on Recreational Vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 1500</td>
<td>Standard on Fire Department Occupational Safety and Health Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 1582</td>
<td>Standard on Comprehensive Occupational Medical Program for Fire Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 1801</td>
<td>Standard on Thermal Imagers for the Fire Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 1971</td>
<td>Standard on Protective Ensembles for Structural Fire Fighting and Proximity Fire Fighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 1994</td>
<td>Standard on Protective Ensembles for First Responders to CBRN Terrorism Incidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 1999</td>
<td>Standard on Protective Clothing and Ensembles for Emergency Medical Operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following 2017 Annual Revision Cycle Standards passed letter ballot of the Council as Consent Standards with the following issuance dates and effective dates:

| NFPA 51 | Standard or the Design and Installation of Oxygen-Fuel Gas Systems for Welding, Cutting, and Allied Processes |

**Issuance Date: July 22, 2016 and Effective Date: August 11, 2016**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-8-16</td>
<td>Act on the issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Section 11.7.2.2 of the 2015 edition of NFPA 1, <em>Fire Code</em> (TIA No. 1283).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-16-a</td>
<td>Text of proposed TIA No. 1283. See Attachment 17-8-16-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-16-b</td>
<td>Ballot results of TIA No. 1283. <em>(FAILED TC ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature -30 voting members/13 agree on technical merit/8 disagree/0 abstained/13 agree on emergency nature/8 disagree/0 abstained/9 ballot not returned. See Attachment 17-8-16-b)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-16-c</td>
<td>Four comments were received. <em>(4 Comments Support TIA) See Attachment 17-8-16-c</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-17</td>
<td>Act on the issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Section 6.1.3.10.6.1 of the 2018 edition of NFPA 10, <em>Standard for Portable Fire Extinguishers</em> (TIA No. 1268).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-17-a</td>
<td>Text of proposed TIA No. 1268. See Attachment 17-8-17-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-17-b</td>
<td>Ballot results of TIA No. 1268. <em>(PASSED TC ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature - 30 voting members/26 agree on technical merit/0 disagree/23 agree on emergency nature/3 disagree/0 abstained/4 ballot not returned. See Attachment 17-8-17-b)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-17-c</td>
<td>Two comments were received. <em>(1 Comment in Support/1 Opposed) See Attachment 17-8-17-c</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-18-a</td>
<td>Text of proposed TIA No. 1270. See Attachment 17-8-18-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-18-b</td>
<td>Ballot results of TIA No. 1270. <em>(PASSED TC ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature - 27 voting members/25 agree on technical merit/2 disagree/25 agree on emergency nature/2 disagree/0 abstained/0 ballot not returned. See Attachment 17-8-18-b)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-18-c</td>
<td>One comment was received. <em>(1 Comment in Opposition) See Attachment 17-8-18-c</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-19-a</td>
<td>Text of proposed TIA No. 1266. See Attachment 17-8-19-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-19-b</td>
<td>Ballot results of TIA No. 1266. <em>(PASSED Panel ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature – 10 voting members/10 agree on technical merit/0 disagree/0 abstained/8 agree on emergency nature/2 disagree/0 abstained/0 ballots not returned and PASSED CC ballot on both correlation and emergency nature – 12 voting members/11 agree on correlation/0 disagree/0 abstained/1 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/0 abstained/1 ballot not returned. See Attachment 17-8-19-b)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-19-c</td>
<td>Two comments were received. <em>(2 Comments in Opposition)</em> 17-8-19-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-20-a</td>
<td>Text of proposed TIA No. 1253R. See Attachment 17-8-20-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-20-b</td>
<td>Ballot results of TIA No. 1253R. <strong>(PASSED TC</strong> ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature – 26 voting members/19 agree on technical merit/5 disagree/0 abstained/18 agree on emergency nature/6 disagree/0 abstained/2 ballots not returned) and <strong>PASSED CC</strong> ballot on both correlation and emergency nature – 14 voting members/12 agree on correlation/0 disagree/0 abstained/12 agree on emergency/0 disagree/0 abstained/2 ballots not returned). See Attachment 17-8-20-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-20-c</td>
<td>One comment was received. (1 Comment in Support) See Attachment 17-8-20-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-21</td>
<td>Act on the issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Sections 110.4(A), 130.2(A)(3), 130.6(C)(2), 130.6(F) and 130.6(G) of the Proposed 2018 edition of NFPA 70E, <em>Standard for Electrical Safety in the Workplace</em> (TIA No. 1265).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-21-a</td>
<td>Text of proposed TIA No. 1265. See Attachment 17-8-21-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-21-b</td>
<td>Ballot results of TIA No. 1265. <strong>(PASSED TC</strong> ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature – 26 voting members/24 agree on technical merit/0 disagree/0 abstained/24 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/0 abstained/2 ballots not returned) and <strong>PASSED CC</strong> ballot on both correlation and emergency nature – 12 voting members/12 agree on correlation/0 disagree/0 abstained/12 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/0 abstained/0 ballots not returned). See Attachment 17-8-21-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-21-c</td>
<td>No comments were received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-22</td>
<td>Act on the issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to delete Section 10.5.3 and revise Section 11.1.4 of the 2017 edition of NFPA 96, <em>Standard for Venting Systems for Cooking Appliances</em> (TIA No. 1257).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-22-a</td>
<td>Text of proposed TIA No. 1257. See Attachment 17-8-22-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-22-b</td>
<td>Ballot results of TIA No. 1257. <strong>(PASSED TC</strong> ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature – 29 voting members/24 agree on technical merit/1 disagree/0 abstained/20 agree on emergency nature/5 disagree/0 abstained/4 ballots not returned). See Attachment 17-8-22-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-22-c</td>
<td>One comment was received. (1 Comment in Opposition) See Attachment 17-8-22-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-23</td>
<td>Act on the issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to delete Sections 5.1.1.5 and 5.2.1.3 of the proposed 2018 edition of NFPA 99, <em>Health Care Facilities Code</em> (TIA No. 1252).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-23-a</td>
<td>Text of proposed TIA No. 1252. See Attachment 17-8-23-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-23-b</td>
<td>Ballot results of TIA No. 1252. <strong>(PASSED TC</strong> ballot on technical merit and <strong>FAILED TC</strong> ballot on emergency nature - 31 voting members/22 agree on technical merit/3 disagree/0 abstained/18 agree on emergency nature/7 disagree/0 abstained/6 ballots not returned) and <strong>PASSED CC</strong> ballot on correlation; <strong>FAILED CC</strong> ballot on emergency nature – 18 voting members/15 agree on correlation/1 disagree/0 abstained/9 agree on emergency nature/7 disagree/0 abstained/2 ballots not returned). See Attachment 17-8-23-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-23-c</td>
<td>No comments were received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-24-a</td>
<td>Text of proposed TIA No. 1263. See Attachment 17-8-24-a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 17-8-24-b | Ballot results of TIA No. 1263. **(PASSED TC** ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature – 29 voting members/24 agree on technical merit/0 disagree/0 abstained/24 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/0 abstained/5 ballots not returned and **PASSED CC** ballot on both correlation and emergency nature – 11 voting members/10 agree on correlation/1 disagree/0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-8-24</td>
<td>No comments were received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-25-a</td>
<td>Text of proposed TIA No. 1264. See Attachment 17-8-25-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-25-b</td>
<td>Ballot results of TIA No. 1264. <em>(FAILED TC ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature - 27 voting members/19 agree on technical merit/5 disagree/2 abstained/18 agree with emergency nature/7 disagree/1 abstained/1 ballot not returned).</em> See Attachment 17-8-25-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-25-c</td>
<td>One comment was received. <em>(1 Comment in Opposition)</em> See Attachment 17-8-25-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-26</td>
<td>Act on the issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Sections 3.3.116, 20.1.3.24.1*, and 28.8.2 of the 2017 edition of NFPA 921, <em>Guide for Fire and Explosion Investigations (TIA No. 1269).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-26-a</td>
<td>Text of proposed TIA No. 1269. See Attachment 17-8-26-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-26-b</td>
<td>Ballot results of TIA No. 1269. <em>(PASSED TC ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature – 33 voting members/29 agree on technical merit/0 disagree/0 abstained/28 agree on emergency nature/1 disagree/0 abstained/4 ballots not returned).</em> See Attachment 17-8-26-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-26-c</td>
<td>No comments were received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-27</td>
<td>Act on the issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Section 4.16.3.3 of the proposed 2018 edition of NFPA 1127, <em>Code for High Powered Rocketry (TIA No. 1260).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-27-a</td>
<td>Text of proposed TIA No. 1260. See Attachment 17-8-27-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-27-b</td>
<td>Ballot results of TIA No. 1260. <em>(PASSED TC ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature - 31 voting members/26 agree on technical merit/0 disagree/0 abstained/24 agree on emergency nature/2 disagree/0 abstained/4 ballots not returned).</em> See Attachment 17-8-27-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-27-c</td>
<td>One comment was received. <em>(1 Comment in Opposition)</em> See Attachment 17-8-27-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-28</td>
<td>Act on the issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Section 9.13.6.1* of the proposed 2018 edition of NFPA 1582, <em>Standard on Comprehensive Occupational Medical Program for Fire Departments (TIA No. 1258).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-28-a</td>
<td>Text of proposed TIA No. 1258. See Attachment 17-8-28-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-28-b</td>
<td>Ballot results of TIA No. 1258. <em>(PASSED TC ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature – 32 voting members/24 agree on technical merit/1 disagree/0 abstained/24 agree on emergency nature/1 disagree/0 abstained/7 ballots not returned).</em> See Attachment 17-8-28-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-28-c</td>
<td>No comments were received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-29</td>
<td>Act on the issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Sections 2.3.8, 14.1.1, 14.4, A.14.4, A.14.4.3.4, A.14.1.1(new), and E.1.2.4 of the 2016 edition of NFPA 1906, <em>Standard for Wildland Fire Apparatus (TIA No. 1267).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-29-a</td>
<td>Text of proposed TIA No. 1267. See Attachment 17-8-29-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-29-b</td>
<td>Ballot results of TIA No. 1267. <em>(PASSED TC ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature – 29 voting members/18 agree on technical merit/2 disagree/3 abstained/18 agree with emergency nature/2 disagree/3 abstained/6 ballots not returned).</em> See Attachment 17-8-29-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-29-c</td>
<td>Three comments were received. (1 Comment in Support/2 Opposed) See Attachment 17-8-29-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-30</td>
<td>Act on the issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to add new Sections 3.3.26 and A.3.3.26, revise 4.1.3.5.1, and add new Section 4.8 of the 2015 edition of NFPA 1931, Standard for Manufacturer’s Design of Fire Department Ground Ladders (TIA No. 1254).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-30-a</td>
<td>Text of proposed TIA No. 1254. See Attachment 17-8-30-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-30-b</td>
<td>Ballot results of TIA No. 1254. (PASSED TC ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature – 18 voting members/14 agree on technical merit/3 disagree/0 abstained/14 agree with emergency nature/3 disagree/0 abstained/1 ballot not returned). See Attachment 17-8-30-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-30-c</td>
<td>Six comments were received. (6 Comments in Support) See Attachment 17-8-30-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-31</td>
<td>Act on the issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Section 2.3.2 of the Proposed 2018 edition of NFPA 1951, Standard on Protective Ensembles for Technical Rescue Incidents (TIA No. 1271).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-31-a</td>
<td>Text of proposed TIA No. 1271. See Attachment 17-8-31-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-31-b</td>
<td>Ballot results of TIA No. 1271. (PASSED TC ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature – 25 voting members/21 agree on technical merit/0 disagree/0 abstained/21 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/0 abstained/4 ballots not returned and PASSED CC ballot on both correlation and emergency nature – 31 voting members/23 agree on correlation/0 disagrees/0 abstained/22 agree on emergency nature/1 abstained/0 disagree/8 ballots not returned). See Attachment 17-8-31-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-31-c</td>
<td>No comments were received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-32-a</td>
<td>Text of proposed TIA No. 1277. See Attachment 17-8-32-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-32-b</td>
<td>Ballot results of TIA No. 1277. (PASSED TC ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature – 35 voting members/23 agree on technical merit/0 disagree/0 abstained/23 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/0 abstained/12 ballots not returned and PASSED CC ballot on both correlation and emergency nature – 31 voting members/23 agree on correlation/0 disagrees/0 abstained/23 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/0 abstained/8 ballots not returned). See Attachment 17-8-32-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-32-c</td>
<td>No comments were received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-33</td>
<td>Act on the issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Section 2.3.2 of the Proposed 2018 edition of NFPA 1971, Standard on Protective Ensembles for Structural Fire Fighting and Proximity Fire Fighting, (TIA No. 1272).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-33-a</td>
<td>Text of proposed TIA No. 1272. See Attachment 17-8-33-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-33-b</td>
<td>Ballot results of TIA No. 1272. (PASSED TC ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature - 35 voting members/25 agree on technical merit/0 disagree/0 abstained/25 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/0 abstained/10 ballots not returned and PASSED CC ballot on both correlation and emergency nature – 31 voting members/23 agree on correlation/0 disagrees/0 abstained/22 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/1 abstained/8 ballots not returned). See Attachment 17-8-33-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-33-b-1</td>
<td>Clarification letter ballot on NFPA 1971 TIA Log 1272 correcting section references to include Sections 2.3.2 ASTM Publications, 8.4.4, Table B.4 in two instances and C.1.2.2. ASTM Publications. (See 17-8-33-b-2 for ballot results). SA 17-8-33-b-1 ADDITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-33-b-2</td>
<td>Clarification letter ballot No. 2 on NFPA 1971 TIA Log 1272 includes reference to Table B.5, which also requires revision to reflect the change described in the TIA. (PASSING TC ballot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
on both technical merit and emergency nature – 35 voting members/26 agree on technical merit/0 disagree/0 abstained/25 agree on emergency nature/1 disagree/0 abstained/9 ballots not returned). **SA 17-8-33-b-2** ADDITION

17-8-33-c

No comments were received.

17-8-34

Act on the issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Section 2.3.4 of the 2016 edition of NFPA 1977, *Standard on Protective Clothing and Equipment for Wildland Fire Fighting*. (TIA No. 1273).

17-8-34-a

Text of proposed TIA No. 1273. See Attachment 17-8-34-a

17-8-34-b

Ballot results of TIA No. 1273. **(PASSED TC ballot** on both technical merit and emergency nature – 22 voting members/13 agree on technical merit/0 disagree/0 abstained/13 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/0 abstained/9 ballots not returned and **PASSED CC ballot** – 31 voting members/23 agree on correlation/0 disagrees/0 abstained/22 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/1 abstained/8 ballots not returned).** See Attachment 17-8-34-b

17-8-34-b-1

Clarification letter ballot on NFPA 1977 TIA Log 1273 incorporating Section 8.23.4.1 into the change recommended by the TIA. **(PASSED TC ballot** on both technical merit and emergency nature – 22 voting members/15 agree on technical merit/0 disagree/0 abstained/14 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/1 abstained/7 ballots not returned). **SA 17-8-34-b-1** ADDITION

17-8-34-c

No comments were received.

17-8-35


17-8-35-a

Text of proposed TIA No. 1274. See Attachment 17-8-35-a

17-8-35-b

Ballot results of TIA No. 1274. **(PASSED TC ballot** on both technical merit and emergency nature- 30 voting members/26 agree on technical merit/0 disagree/0 abstained/26 agree with emergency nature/0 disagree/0 abstained/4 ballots not returned and **PASSED CC ballot** – 31 voting members/22 agree on correlation/0 disagrees/0 abstained/21 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/1 abstained/9 ballots not returned).** See Attachment 17-8-35-b

17-8-35-b-1

Clarification letter ballot on NFPA 1992 TIA Log 1274 correcting section references to include Sections 2.3.3 ASTM Publications, 5.3.2(a),8.11.3.1 and 8.11.4. **(PASSED TC ballot** on both technical merit and emergency nature – 30 voting members/19 agree on technical merit/0 disagree/0 abstained/19 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/0 abstained/11 ballots not returned). **SA17-8-35-b-1** ADDITION

17-8-35-c

No comments were received.

17-8-36


17-8-36-a

Text of proposed TIA No. 1278. See Attachment 17-8-36-a

17-8-36-b

Ballot results of TIA No. 1278. **(PASSED TC ballot** on both technical merit and emergency nature – 30 voting members/24 agree on technical merit/0 disagree/1 abstained/24 agree with emergency nature/0 disagree/1 abstained/5 ballots not returned and **PASSED CC ballot** – 31 voting members/21agree on correlation/0 disagrees/0 abstained/21 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/0 abstained/10 ballots not returned).** See Attachment 17-8-36-b

17-8-36-c

No comments were received.

17-8-37

Act on the issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Section 2.3.4 of the proposed 2018 edition of NFPA 1994, *Standard on Protective Ensembles for First Responders to Hazardous Materials Emergencies and CBRN Terrorism Incidents*, (TIA No. 1275).
<p>| 17-8-37-a | Text of proposed TIA No. 1275. See Attachment 17-8-37-a |
| 17-8-37-b | Ballot results of TIA No. 1275. (PASSED TC ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature - 30 voting members/27 agree on technical merit/0 disagree/0 abstained/26 agree with emergency nature/0 disagree/1 abstained/3 ballots not returned and PASSED CC ballot on both correlation and emergency nature – 31 voting members/21 agree on correlation/0 disagrees/0 abstained/20 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/1 abstained/10 ballots not returned). See Attachment 17-8-37-b SA17-8-37-b |
| 17-8-37-b-1 | Clarification letter ballot on NFPA 1994 TIA Log 1275 correcting section references to include Sections 2.3.4 ASTM Publications, 5.3.2(a), 8.14.3.1 and 8.14.4. (PASSED TC ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature – 30 voting members/19 agree on technical merit/0 disagree/0 abstained/19 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/0 abstained/11 ballots not returned). See Attachment 17-8-37-b-1 ADDITION |
| 17-8-37-c | No comments were received. |
| 17-8-38 | Act on the issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Sections 7.4.5.1, 7.5.5.1, 7.6.5.1 and 7.7.5.1 of the proposed 2018 edition of NFPA 1994, Standard on Protective Ensembles for First Responders to Hazardous Materials Emergencies and CBRN Terrorism Incidents, (TIA No. 1279). |
| 17-8-38-a | Text of proposed TIA No. 1279. See Attachment 17-8-38-a |
| 17-8-38-b | Ballot results of TIA No. 1279. (PASSED TC ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature – 30 voting members/25 agree on technical merit/1 disagree/0 abstained/25 agree with emergency nature/1 disagree/0 abstained/4 ballots not returned) and PASSED CC ballot on both correlation and emergency nature – 31 voting members/21 agree on correlation/0 disagree/0 abstained/21 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/0 abstained/10 ballots not returned). See Attachment 17-8-38-b |
| 17-8-38-c | No comments were received. |
| 17-8-39 | Act on the issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Sections 7.1.1.2, 8.3.5.1, 8.3.6.2 and 8.3.7.1 of the proposed 2018 edition of NFPA 1994, Standard on Protective Ensembles for First Responders to Hazardous Materials Emergencies and CBRN Terrorism Incidents, (TIA No. 1280). |
| 17-8-39-a | Text of proposed TIA No. 1280. See Attachment 17-8-39-a |
| 17-8-39-b | Ballot results of TIA No. 1280. (PASSED TC ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature – 30 voting members/24 agree on technical merit/3 disagree/0 abstained/24 agree with emergency nature/3 disagree/0 abstained/3 ballots not returned and PASSED CC ballot on both correlation and emergency nature – 31 voting members/21 agree on correlation/0 disagrees/0 abstained/21 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/0 abstained/10 ballots not returned). See Attachment 17-8-39-b |
| 17-8-39-c | No comments were received. |
| 17-8-40 | Act on the issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to add a new Section 8.5.2.3 of the proposed 2018 edition of NFPA 1994, Standard on Protective Ensembles for First Responders to Hazardous Materials Emergencies and CBRN Terrorism Incidents, (TIA No. 1288). |
| 17-8-40-a | Text of proposed TIA No. 1288. See Attachment 17-8-40-a |
| 17-8-40-b | Ballot results of TIA No. 1288. (PASSED TC ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature – 30 voting members/25 agree on technical merit/0 disagree/0 abstained/25 agree with emergency nature/0 disagree/0 abstained/5 ballots not returned and PASSED CC ballot on both correlation and emergency nature - 31 voting members/20 agree on correlation/0 disagrees/0 |
| 17-8-40-c | No comments were received. |
| 17-8-41 | Act on the issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Sections 8.7.1.7, 8.7.2.1, 8.7.10, 8.7.15 (New), and 8.20.21 (New) of the proposed 2018 edition of NFPA 1994, <em>Standard on Protective Ensembles for First Responders to Hazardous Materials Emergencies and CBRN Terrorism Incidents</em>, (TIA No. 1289). |
| 17-8-41-a | Text of proposed TIA No. 1289. See Attachment 17-8-41-a |
| 17-8-41-b | Ballot results of TIA No. 1289.  <strong>(PASSED)</strong> TC ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature – 30 voting members/24 agree on technical merit/2 disagree/0 abstain/24 agree with emergency nature/2 disagree/0 abstained/4 ballots not returned and <strong>PASSED CC</strong> ballot on both correlation and emergency nature – 31 voting members/20 agree on correlation/0 disagrees/0 abstained/20 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/0 abstained/11 ballots not returned. See Attachment 17-8-41-b |
| 17-8-41-c | No comments were received. |
| 17-8-42-a | Text of proposed TIA No. 1290. See Attachment 17-8-42-a |
| 17-8-42-b | Ballot results of TIA No. 1290.  <strong>(PASSED TC)</strong> ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature – 30 voting members/23 agree on technical merit/1 disagree/1 abstained/23 agree with emergency nature/2 disagree/0 abstained/5 ballots not returned and <strong>PASSED CC</strong> ballot on both correlation and emergency nature – 31 voting members/20 agree on correlation/0 disagrees/0 abstained/20 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/0 abstained/11 ballots not returned. See Attachment 17-8-42-b |
| 17-8-42-c | No comments were received. |
| 17-8-43-a | Text of proposed TIA No. 1291. See Attachment 17-8-43-a |
| 17-8-43-b | Ballot results of TIA No. 1291.  <strong>(PASSED TC)</strong> ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature – 30 voting members/24 agree on technical merit/0 disagree/1 abstained/24 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/1 abstained/5 ballots not returned and <strong>PASSED CC</strong> ballot on both correlation and emergency nature – 31 voting members/25 agree on correlation/0 disagree/0 abstained/25 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/0 abstained/6 ballots not returned. See Attachment 17-8-43-b |
| 17-8-43-c | No comments were received. |
| 17-8-44 | Act on the issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Sections 8.7.6.1, Table A.8.7.4.4, A.8.7.6.1, Tables A.8.7.6.1(a) and (b) of the proposed 2018 edition of NFPA 1994, <em>Standard on Protective Ensembles for First Responders to Hazardous Materials Emergencies and CBRN Terrorism Incidents</em>, (TIA No. 1292). |
| 17-8-44-a | Text of proposed TIA No. 1292. See Attachment 17-8-44-a |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-8-44-b</td>
<td>Ballot results of TIA No. 1292. <em>(FAILED TC) ballot on technical merit but <strong>PASSED TC</strong> ballot on emergency nature – 30 voting members/15 agree on technical merit/10 disagree/0 abstained/22 agree with emergency nature/3 disagree/0 abstained/5 ballots not returned and <strong>PASSED CC</strong> ballot on both correlation and emergency nature – 31 voting members/23 agree on correlation/1 disagree/1 abstained/24 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/1 abstained/6 ballots not returned</em>. See Attachment 17-8-44-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-44-b-1</td>
<td><strong>APPEAL</strong> Appeal of J. Stull, International Personnel Protection, Inc., requesting the NFPA Standards Council deny the issuance of proposed TIA No. 1292, NFPA 1994. <a href="#">SA17-8-44-b-1</a> <strong>ADDITION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-44-b-2</td>
<td>Comments received by C. Baxter, Committee Chair of NFPA 1994 (FAE-HAZ) and W. Haskell, Correlating Committee Chair of NFPA 1944 (FAE-AAC) on the appeal of J. Stull. <a href="#">SA17-8-44-b-2</a> <strong>ADDITION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-44-c</td>
<td>No comments were received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-45</td>
<td>Act on the issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Section 2.3.3 of the proposed 2018 edition of NFPA 1999, <em>Standard on Protective Clothing Ensembles for Emergency Medical Operations</em>, (TIA No. 1276).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-45-a</td>
<td>Text of proposed TIA No. 1276. See Attachment 17-8-45-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-45-b</td>
<td>Ballot results of TIA No. 1276. <em>(PASSED TC) ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature – 19 voting members/14 agree on technical merit/0 disagree/1 abstained/15 agree with emergency nature/0 disagree/0 abstained/4 ballots not returned and <strong>PASSED CC</strong> ballot on both correlation and emergency nature – 31 voting members/22 agree on correlation/0 disagree/0 abstained/22 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/0 abstained/9 ballots not returned</em>. See Attachment 17-8-45-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-45-b-1</td>
<td>Clarification letter ballot on NFPA 1999 TIA Log 1276 correcting section references to include Sections 2.3.3 ASTM Publications and 8.18.4 as shown in the attached TIA on the Proposed 2018 Edition. <em>(PASSED TC) ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature – 18 voting members/13 agree on technical merit/0 disagree/0 abstained/13 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/0 abstained/5 ballots not returned</em>. <a href="#">SA 17-8-45-b-1</a> <strong>ADDITION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-45-c</td>
<td>No comments were received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-46</td>
<td>Act on the issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Sections 7.6.1, 8.3.3.2 and 8.3.7 of the proposed 2018 edition of NFPA 1999, <em>Standard on Protective Clothing Ensembles for Emergency Medical Operations</em>, (TIA No. 1281).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-46-a</td>
<td>Text of proposed TIA No. 1281. See Attachment 17-8-46-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-46-b</td>
<td>Ballot results of TIA No. 1281. <em>(PASSED TC) ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature – 19 voting members/14 agree on technical merit/0 disagree/1 abstained/14 agree with emergency nature/0 disagree/1 abstained/4 ballots not returned and <strong>PASSED CC</strong> ballot on both correlation and emergency nature – 31 voting members/20 agree on correlation/0 disagree/1 abstained/20 agree on emergency nature/0 disagree/1 abstained/10 ballots not returned</em>. See Attachment 17-8-46-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-46-c</td>
<td>No comments were received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-47</td>
<td>Act on the issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Sections 2.3.35, 3.3.296 (New), 3.3.670 (New), 38.9.15 (New), and Annex G (New Material) of the proposed 2018 edition of NFPA 5000, <em>Building Construction and Safety Code®</em>, (TIA No. 1261).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-47-a</td>
<td>Text of proposed TIA No. 1261. See Attachment 17-8-47-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-8-47-b</td>
<td>Ballot results of TIA No. 1261. <em>(PASSED TC) ballot on both technical merit and emergency nature – 20 voting members/15 agree on technical merit/2 disagree/0 abstained/15 agree with...</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
emergency nature/2 disagree/0 abstained/3 ballots not returned and **PASSED CC** ballot on both
correlation and emergency nature - 18 voting members/14 agree on correlation/1 disagree/0
abstained/12 agree on emergency nature/2 disagree/1 abstained/3 ballots not returned). See
Attachment 17-8-47-b

17-8-47-c No comments were received.

**17-8-48** Consider requests from NFPA Committees to change revision cycles for the
following documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>2013 A2022</td>
<td>A2022 to A2021</td>
<td>One Time Move</td>
<td>5 yr rev to 4 yr rev</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>2013 A2022</td>
<td>A2022 to A2021</td>
<td>One Time Move</td>
<td>5 yr rev to 4 yr rev</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>2014 A2020</td>
<td>A2020 to F2019</td>
<td>One Time Move</td>
<td>3 yr rev to 2 ½ yr rev</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901</td>
<td>2016 F2020</td>
<td>F2020 to F2019</td>
<td>One Time Move</td>
<td>5 yr rev to 4 yr rev</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Attachment 17-8-48

**17-8-49** Consider the request of Kenneth Linder, Chair, Automatic Sprinkler Systems Correlating
Committee, and, NFPA Staff to merge NFPA 16, *Standard for the Installation of Foam-Water
Sprinkler and Foam-Water Spray Systems* into a chapter in NFPA 11, *Standard for Low-, Medium-, and High-Expansion Foam* at the start of the next revision cycle for NFPA 11, which is Fall 2020. See Attachment 17-8-49

**17-8-50** Consider the request of the Technical Committee on Energy Storage Systems to enter new
document, NFPA 855, *Standard for the Installation of Stationary Energy Storage Systems* into a
unique revision cycle set up for NFPA 855. The Council approved the establishment of this
proposed document in August 2015 (See Minute Item 15-8-27). The Committee is also
requesting the Council approve the following committee scope:

**Committee Scope:** This committee shall have primary responsibility for documents on
the fire prevention, fire protection, design, construction, installation, commissioning,
operation, maintenance, and decommissioning of stationary, mobile and temporary
energy storage systems.

See Attachment 17-8-50 \(\text{SA17-8-50}\)

**17-8-51** Consider the request of the Technical Committee on Fundamentals of Fire Control Within
Structure Utilizing Fire Dynamics to enter new document, NFPA 1700, *Guide for Structural
Fire Fighting*, into a unique revision cycle set up for NFPA 1700. The Council approved the
establishment of this proposed document in August 2015. (Minute Item 15-8-27).

See Attachment 17-8-51 \(\text{SA17-8-51}\)

**17-8-52** Consider the request of the Technical Committee on Unmanned Aerial Systems to enter new
document, NFPA 2400, *Standard for Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems (sUAS) used for Public
Safety Operations*, into a unique revision cycle set up for NFPA 2400. The Committee has also
requested that the Council approve revisions to the Committee Title and Committee Scope. The
Council approved the establishment of this proposed document in August 2016 (Minute Item 16-
8-26).

See Attachment 17-8-52 \(\text{SA17-8-52}\)

**17-8-53** Report of the Committee Membership Task Group (M. Snyder, Chair).

**17-8-53-a** Act on pending applications for Committee Members. **SA 17-8-53-a**

**17-8-53-b** Consider the request of NFPA Staff to withdraw a new committee on Low Pressure Dispensing
Containers due to the lack of participants. **SA 17-8-53-b**
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>17-8-53-c</strong></td>
<td>Discussion on Vote Limited members. <strong>SA 17-8-53-c</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17-8-53-d</strong></td>
<td>Consider a request to from NFPA Staff to absorb the membership of the Technical Committee on Wildland Fire Fighting Professional Qualifications (PQU-WSP) into the membership of the Technical Committee on Wildland Fire Management (WFM-AAA). <strong>SA 17-8-53-d</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17-8-54</strong></td>
<td>Report of the Recording Secretary on the April 2017 Minutes. No Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17-8-55</strong></td>
<td>The Council will review the dates and locations of upcoming Council meetings, as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 5-6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Galveston, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 10-11, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miami Beach, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August 13-15, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quincy, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17-8-56</strong></td>
<td>The Council notes that TIA No. 1241 on NFPA 99, <em>Health Care Facilities Code</em>, was proposed for the 2015 and the 2018 editions. Section 5.10 of the <em>Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards</em> <em>(Regs)</em> states that TIAs shall apply to the NFPA standard existing at the time of issuance, except in the case of a document undergoing revisions where a TIA can apply to the existing and proposed editions. Since the 2015 edition of TIA No. 1241 to NFPA 99 has already been issued by the Council (see Minute Item 16-11-4), the Council will now issue the 2018 edition concurrently with the 2018 edition of NFPA 99. <strong>SA17-8-56  ADDITION</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

(AMENDMENT)

TO: Technical Committee on Hyperbaric and Hypobaric Facilities

FROM: Elena Carroll, Project Administrator

DATE: July 7, 2017


Amendment 99-1: Accept Public Comment No. 79

In accordance with the Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards, the final results show the Amendment HAS achieved the 2/3 majority vote needed to recommend approval of the Association Action by the Technical Committee. The Committee has voted to support Amendment 99-1. As a result, the recommendation to the Standards Council is to support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session.

18 Members Eligible to Vote
3 Ballots Not Returned (Chipps, Newton, Workman)

13 Agree
0 Disagree
2 Abstentions (Ferrari, To)

The number of votes needed to recommend approval of the Association Action is 9.

(18 eligible to vote - 3 not returned - 2 abstentions = 13 × 0.66 = 8.58)

Ballot comments are attached for your review, if applicable.

The Regs at 1.6.2.(b) state: An appeal relating to an Association Technical Meeting Amendment that has been submitted shall be filed no later than 5 days after the notice of the amendment final ballot results are published in accordance with 4.2.6.

Appeal Closing Date for this Amendment is July 12, 2017.
MEMORANDUM

(AMENDMENT)

TO: Correlating Committee on Health Care Facilities

FROM: Elena Carroll, Project Administrator

DATE: July 7, 2017


In accordance with the Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards, the final results show the Amendments HAVE achieved the ¾ majority vote needed to recommend approval of the Association Action by the Correlating Committee. As a result, the recommendation to the Standards Council is to support the Amendments recommended by the membership votes at the Tech Session.

19 Members Eligible to Vote
4 Ballots Not Returned (Brooks, Dagenais, Hijazi, Versteeg)

15 Agree
0 Disagree
0 Abstentions

The number of votes needed to recommend approval of the Association Action is 12.

(19 eligible to vote - 4 not returned - 0 abstentions = 15 × 0.75 = 11.25)

The transcripts from the Annual 2017 NFPA Tech Session are now available at: www.nfpa.org/techsession.

The Regs at 1.6.2.(b) state: An appeal relating to an Association Technical Meeting Amendment that has been submitted shall be filed no later than 5 days after the notice of the amendment final ballot results are published in accordance with 4.2.6.

Appeal Closing Date for this Amendment is July 12, 2017.
Microphone number 5.

CERTIFIED AMENDING MOTION 99-1

MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH International for NFPA and move CAM number 5, accept Public Comment Number 79.

MR. O'CONNOR: There is a motion on the floor to accept Public Comment Number 79. Is there a second?

PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. O'CONNOR: I hear a second. We do have a second.

Please proceed with discussion on the motion.

MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH International, speaking for NFPA, in favor of the motion.

This is the first of four motions that all include the needed -- just correct errors.

The committee was unaware that NFPA 261 does not contain requirement that any reference always need to say what is to be measured, just like it says in this case for NFPA 260. The committee thought that this was included in the standard, deleted for that reason from the previous edition.

Note that you will hear this is about various other
things. It is not. It is simply about correcting
an error, making the section able to be enforced.
Without the change there's nothing that can be done
with the section regarding NFPA 261.

The first problem is that it is missing
two critical concepts. The test involved cannot
assess flame emissions. The test for the materials
exposed to cigarettes can only assess whether the
smoldering emission occurs.

We know that flaming emission and
smoldering emission occur by different mechanisms.

The second part says the component shall
meet class 1. Part 2 says just they shall be
tested, using a method that just says how you test,
but not how you pass the test. That means it could
be possible to test NFPA 261, have the components
smolder vigorously, and that would comply with the
requirement, which is not logical. Currently not
ones that were invented, but ones that stand the
criteria for compliance of smoldering resistance by
this test and were in the previous edition, and
they're also in NFPA 101.

Thank you very much.

MR. O'CONNOR: Mr. Crowley, would you like
to offer the committee's position?
MR. CROWLEY: Yes. I will have Technical Committee Chair, Mr. Bell, respond.

MR. O'CONNOR: Microphone number 4.

MR. BELL: Microphone number 4. My name is Jim Bell. I work for Intermountain Healthcare and I'm representing the Technical Committee for Chapter 14 of 99.

First I want to say thank you to Dr. Hirschler for bringing this to our attention. And I would -- then I will read you what the committee did. The -- we -- we removed the ASTM standards in the original because they differ from NFPA standards by the type of ignition source used.

The ASTM standards were deemed inadequate by other Technical Committees. It's anticipated they will soon be withdrawn.

The prescriptive test requirements listed in the reference test standards, including them we thought was considered redundant; therefore, we removed them. But Dr. Hirschler has informed us that they are not in there.

And then the committee continues to include NFPA testing on the upholstered furniture until a specific test is designed for hyperbaric conditions and oxygen-enriched atmospheres.
We removed the language regarding cigarettes because they're not allowed in hyperbaric chambers, and that language included smoldering tests are necessary, since other smoldering ignition sources are possible.

The voting was -- we had 16 eligible voters, 11 affirmative, five no response.

**MR. O'CONNOR:** Thank you, gentlemen. With that we will open up debate on the motion. Please provide your name, affiliation, and whether you are speaking in support or against the motion.

**MR. HOPPER:** Howard Hopper, UL, speaking in support of the motion.

From a testing and certification standpoint, some products standards include acceptance criteria within the standard. So a code only merely needs to reference that standard. But fire test standards, such as NFPA 261, only really tell you how to conduct a fire test. They don't include necessarily acceptance criteria. So by merely referencing the fire test, any product that's tested to that and the results obtained, whether they're good or bad, you comply with the code.

So Mr. Hirschler here, his motion will add
necessary acceptance criteria into the code and sets
definite pass/fail criteria.

Support the motion. Thank you.

MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you, sir.

Microphone -- hard to see with the lights
here, 7, please.

MR. PETERKIN: Jim Peterkin, TLC

Engineering representing the health care section,
speaking in favor of the motion.

During the business meeting yesterday the
health care section met to discuss this issue and
voted to support the Certified Amending Motion 99-1.

Thank you.

MR. O'CONNOR: Is there any further
discussion?

Microphone number 1.

MR. BADDERS: Yes, Barry Badders, Intertek
Testing Service, speaking in support of the motion.

First of all, Marcelo Hirschler is correct
in that there needs to be stated criteria.

Second, with regard to smoldering and the
cigarette as a standardized smoldering means, it's
not meant to imply that cigarette smoking, or it's
only applicable where cigarette smoking is going to
occur. It's standardized ignition method.
Thank you.

MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you.

Is there any further discussion on Motion 99-1 to accept Public Comment Number 79?

Seeing none, we'll move to a vote. Before we vote, let me restate the motion.

The motion on the floor is to accept Public Comment Number 79. To vote, touch the vote button.

If you wish it vote in favor of the motion and recommend the text on screen 1, touch yes. If you wish to vote against the motion and recommend the text on screen 2, touch no. Please record your vote.

The balloting will be closed in five seconds. The balloting is closed. Thank you.

The results of the vote are 299 for the motion and recommend the text on screen 1. The motion passes.
MEMORANDUM

(AMENDMENT)

TO: Technical Committee on Hyperbaric and Hypobaric Facilities

FROM: Elena Carroll, Project Administrator

DATE: July 7, 2017


Amendment 99-2: Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Revision No. 306

In accordance with the Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards, the final results show the Amendment HAS achieved the 2/3 majority vote needed to recommend approval of the Association Action by the Technical Committee. The Committee has voted to support Amendment 99-2. As a result, the recommendation to the Standards Council is to support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session.

18 Members Eligible to Vote
3 Ballots Not Returned (Chipps, Newton, Workman)

13 Agree
0 Disagree
2 Abstentions (Ferrari, To)

The number of votes needed to recommend approval of the Association Action is 9.

\[ (18 \text{ eligible to vote} - 3 \text{ not returned} - 2 \text{ abstentions} = 13 \times 0.66 = 8.58) \]

Ballot comments are attached for your review, if applicable.

The Regs at 1.6.2.(b) state: An appeal relating to an Association Technical Meeting Amendment that has been submitted shall be filed no later than 5 days after the notice of the amendment final ballot results are published in accordance with 4.2.6.

**Appeal Closing Date** for this Amendment is **July 12, 2017**.
MEMORANDUM

(AMENDMENT)

TO: Correlating Committee on Health Care Facilities

FROM: Elena Carroll, Project Administrator

DATE: July 7, 2017


In accordance with the Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards, the final results show the Amendments HAVE achieved the ¾ majority vote needed to recommend approval of the Association Action by the Correlating Committee. As a result, the recommendation to the Standards Council is to support the Amendments recommended by the membership votes at the Tech Session.

19 Members Eligible to Vote
4 Ballots Not Returned (Brooks, Dagenais, Hijazi, Versteeg)

15 Agree
0 Disagree
0 Abstentions

The number of votes needed to recommend approval of the Association Action is 12.

(19 eligible to vote - 4 not returned - 0 abstentions = 15 × 0.75 = 11.25)

The transcripts from the Annual 2017 NFPA Tech Session are now available at: www.nfpa.org/techsession.

The Regs at 1.6.2.(b) state: An appeal relating to an Association Technical Meeting Amendment that has been submitted shall be filed no later than 5 days after the notice of the amendment final ballot results are published in accordance with 4.2.6.

Appeal Closing Date for this Amendment is July 12, 2017.
CAM 99-2

Let's now proceed with the discussion on

Certified Amending Motion 99-2.

Microphone 5, please.

CERTIFIED AMENDING MOTION 99-2

MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH International for NFPA, and I move to reject an
MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you.

There's a motion on the floor to reject an identifiable part of second revision 306. Is there a second?

PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you.

MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH International for NFPA, in support of the motion.

This motion is the second of four motions I will be making this morning and regarding where both what is being measured and the criteria are missing.

ASTM E1537 is the same test as California TB133. ASTM E1537 just indicates how to test for heat release, unless what is tested, heat release, and the criteria are included. Upholstered furniture can be tested, ASTM E57 -- E1537 and produce not the heat release, but be compliant with requirement of NFPA 99. The proposals are ones that I include in NFPA 101 and also in California TB 133.

Just like the previous motion, this is simply clarification and correction of error. Text approved by the committee cannot be enforced.

Thank you.
MR. O'CONNOR: Mr. Crowley, would you like
to offer the committee's position?

MR. CROWLEY: Yes. Mr. Bell, our
committee chairman, will respond. Thank you.

MR. O'CONNOR: Again, microphone 4.

MR. BELL: Again, I'm Jim Bell. I work
for Intermountain Healthcare. I'm representing the
committee, Chapter 14 of the NFPA 99.

I appreciate Dr. Hirschler and, again, my
thanks for bringing this to our attention. We did
not realize that the acceptance criteria was not
part of that standard. The committee action was --
what we said was California Technical Bulletin 133
was an alternate option as equivalent as to ASTM
E1537 and assesses heat release.

Since the test standards describe
requirements, including the requirements in this
code is considered redundant, therefore they were
removed.

We had 16 eligible voters, 11 affirmative
and five were not returned.

MR. O'CONNOR: Thanks, gentlemen. With
that we will open up debate on the motion. Please
provide your name, affiliation, and whether you are
speaking in support of or against the motion.
Microphone 3, please.

MR. HOPPER: Howard Hopper, UL, in support of the motion.

This is the same issue as last time. It's adding necessary pass/fail criteria. So we support the motion. Also we'd support 99-3 and 99-4, but I won't get up to testify on those because it's the same issue.

Thank you.

MR. O'CONNOR: Microphone number 1, please.

MR. DAGENAIS: Dave Dagenais, speaking on behalf of the health care section in support of the motion. At the health care section business meeting yesterday our membership voted to support this motion unanimously. The health care section feel that this provided better clarity and allows it to be enforceable. So we urge you to support this motion.

MR. O'CONNOR: So is there any further discussion on Motion 99-2 to reject an identifiable part of second revision number 306?

Mr. Chair, to do you have any final comments?

MR. CROWLEY: No, sir.
MR. O'CONNOR: Okay. Seeing none, we'll
move to a vote. Before we vote, let me restate the
motion.

The motion on the floor is to reject an
identifiable part of second revision number 306. To
vote, touch the vote button.

If you wish to vote in favor of the motion
and recommend the text on screen 1, touch yes. If
you wish to vote against the motion and recommend
the text on screen 2, vote no. Please record your
vote.

You have five seconds. The balloting is
closed. Thank you.

The results of the vote are 317 for the
motion and recommend the text on screen 1, 41
against the motion. The motion has passed.
MEMORANDUM

(AMENDMENT)

TO: Technical Committee on Hyperbaric and Hypobaric Facilities
FROM: Elena Carroll, Project Administrator
DATE: July 7, 2017

Amendment 99-3: Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Revision No. 305

In accordance with the Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards, the final results show the Amendment HAS achieved the 2/3 majority vote needed to recommend approval of the Association Action by the Technical Committee. The Committee has voted to support Amendment 99-3. As a result, the recommendation to the Standards Council is to support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session.

18 Members Eligible to Vote
3 Ballots Not Returned (Chipps, Newton, Workman)

13 Agree
0 Disagree
2 Abstentions (Ferrari, To)

The number of votes needed to recommend approval of the Association Action is 9.

(18 eligible to vote - 3 not returned - 2 abstentions = 13 × 0.66 = 8.58)

Ballot comments are attached for your review, if applicable.

The Regs at 1.6.2.(b) state: An appeal relating to an Association Technical Meeting Amendment that has been submitted shall be filed no later than 5 days after the notice of the amendment final ballot results are published in accordance with 4.2.6.

Appeal Closing Date for this Amendment is July 12, 2017.
MEMORANDUM

(AMENDMENT)

TO: Correlating Committee on Health Care Facilities

FROM: Elena Carroll, Project Administrator

DATE: July 7, 2017


In accordance with the Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards, the final results show the Amendments HAVE achieved the ¾ majority vote needed to recommend approval of the Association Action by the Correlating Committee. As a result, the recommendation to the Standards Council is to support the Amendments recommended by the membership votes at the Tech Session.

19 Members Eligible to Vote
4 Ballots Not Returned (Brooks, Dagenais, Hijazi, Versteeg)

15 Agree
0 Disagree
0 Abstentions

The number of votes needed to recommend approval of the Association Action is 12.

(19 eligible to vote - 4 not returned - 0 abstentions = 15 × 0.75 = 11.25)

The transcripts from the Annual 2017 NFPA Tech Session are now available at: www.nfpa.org/techsession.

The Regs at 1.6.2.(b) state: An appeal relating to an Association Technical Meeting Amendment that has been submitted shall be filed no later than 5 days after the notice of the amendment final ballot results are published in accordance with 4.2.6.

Appeal Closing Date for this Amendment is July 12, 2017.
CERTIFIED AMENDED MOTION 99-3


PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you.

Is there a motion -- is there a motion on
the floor to reject an identifiable part of second
revision number 305. I believe I heard a second.
Can I hear it again?

PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you. We do have a
second.

We can proceed with discussion on the
motion. Mr. Hirschler.

MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH
International speaking for NFPA, in favor of the
motion.

This is a third case of four that two
issues in this NFPA 260 and 16 CFR 1632 do not test
mattresses. They only test mattress components.
Testing criteria is missing.

Just as in the earlier ones, without the
added text, mattress components can be tested,
produce significant charring and comply with NFPA
99. Criteria are the same as those in NFPA 101.
This is, once more, just a correction of enforceable
text.

Thank you.

MR. O'CONNOR: Mr. Crowley, the
committee's position?

MR. CROWLEY: I defer to my Technical
Committee Chair, Mr. Bell.

MR. O'CONNOR: Position 4, please.

MR. BELL: Thank you. Again, I'm Jim Bell, Intermountain Healthcare. I'm Chair of 99, Chapter 14.

Again, my thanks to Dr. Hirschler for bringing this to our attention. I would make a comment that 99-3 and 99-4, as far as the second revision were dealt with as one by the committee, so I don't know how you want to manage that. Shall we just step by step?

MR. O'CONNOR: Yes.

MR. BELL: All right. So this will be a repeat for the next one.

The committee's action, we revised the wording in attempt to continue to allow a variety of tests to meet the requirements which can be applied to both mattresses and mattress components. 16 CFR Part 1633 and California Technical Bulletin 129 were moved to section B since they were heat release rate tests and not ignition tests.

The prescriptive requirement's already included in the reference standards, which now I understand we were incorrect, stating test requirements in the code were considered redundant.
Also, some of the prescriptive
requirements were in conflict to our other test
standards listed in this section. Therefore,
descriptive language was removed and users will meet
the requirements of whichever standard they test to.

These test standards were used because
there's no test designed specifically for ignition
and/or heat release of mattresses and hyperbaric
chambers.

There were 16 eligible voters, five not
returned, 11 affirmative.

MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you, Jim.

With that we'll open up debate on the
motion. Please provide your name, affiliation, and
whether you are speaking in support or against the
motion.

Microphone number 7, please.

MR. PETERKIN: Yes. Jim Peterkin, TLC
Engineering representing the health care section,
speaking in favor of the motion. And I realize
nobody's really speaking against it, but formalities
say...

During the business meeting yesterday the
health care session discussed this issue and voted
to support the Certified Amending Motion of 99-3.
MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you.

Is there any further discussion on Motion 99-3 to reject an identifiable part of second revision number 305?

Mr. Chair, any final comments?

MR. CROWLEY: No, sir.

MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you.

Seeing none, we will move to a vote.

Before we vote, let me restate the motion.

The motion on the floor is to reject an identifiable part of second revision number 305. To vote, touch the vote button.

If you wish to vote in favor of the motion and recommend the text on screen 1, touch yes. If you wish to vote against the motion and recommend the text on screen 2, touch no. Please record your vote.

Five seconds. Balloting is concluded.

Thank you.

Okay. The results of the vote are 323 in favor of the motion and recommends the text on screen 1, and 39 against the motion. The motion passes. Thank you.
MEMORANDUM

(AMENDMENT)

TO: Technical Committee on Hyperbaric and Hypobaric Facilities

FROM: Elena Carroll, Project Administrator

DATE: July 7, 2017


Amendment 99-4: Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Revision No. 305

In accordance with the Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards, the final results show the Amendment HAS achieved the 2/3 majority vote needed to recommend approval of the Association Action by the Technical Committee. The Committee has voted to support Amendment 99-4. As a result, the recommendation to the Standards Council is to support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session.

18 Members Eligible to Vote
3 Ballots Not Returned (Chipps, Newton, Workman)

13 Agree
0 Disagree
2 Abstentions (Ferrari, To)

The number of votes needed to recommend approval of the Association Action is 9.

(18 eligible to vote - 3 not returned - 2 abstentions = 13 × 0.66 = 8.58)

Ballot comments are attached for your review, if applicable.

The Regs at 1.6.2.(b) state: An appeal relating to an Association Technical Meeting Amendment that has been submitted shall be filed no later than 5 days after the notice of the amendment final ballot results are published in accordance with 4.2.6.

Appeal Closing Date for this Amendment is July 12, 2017.
MEMORANDUM

(AMENDMENT)

TO: Correlating Committee on Health Care Facilities

FROM: Elena Carroll, Project Administrator

DATE: July 7, 2017


In accordance with the Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards, the final results show the Amendments HAVE achieved the ¾ majority vote needed to recommend approval of the Association Action by the Correlating Committee. As a result, the recommendation to the Standards Council is to support the Amendments recommended by the membership votes at the Tech Session.

19 Members Eligible to Vote
4 Ballots Not Returned (Brooks, Dagenais, Hijazi, Versteeg)

15 Agree
0 Disagree
0 Abstentions

The number of votes needed to recommend approval of the Association Action is 12.

(19 eligible to vote - 4 not returned - 0 abstentions = 15 × 0.75 = 11.25)

The transcripts from the Annual 2017 NFPA Tech Session are now available at: www.nfpa.org/techsession.

The Regs at 1.6.2.(b) state: An appeal relating to an Association Technical Meeting Amendment that has been submitted shall be filed no later than 5 days after the notice of the amendment final ballot results are published in accordance with 4.2.6.

Appeal Closing Date for this Amendment is July 12, 2017.
Microphone 5, please.

CERTIFIED AMENDING MOTION 99-4

MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH International for NFPA and I move CAM 99-4, please.

MR. O'CONNOR: There is a motion on the floor to reject an identifiable part of second revision number 305. Is there a second?

PARTICIPANT: Second.

MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you. We do have a second. Please proceed with discussion on the motion.

MR. HIRSCHLER: Marcelo Hirschler, GBH International for NFPA, in support of the motion.

This is the fourth and last case here on 99. This is similar to the previous one for upholstered furniture. Three issues are involved in this particular one.

Number one, what is being tested, which is heat release, needs to be mentioned.

Second, ASTM E59, same test at California TB 129, plus 16 CFR 1633 is not equivalent to either ASTM E59 or California TB 129.

Finally, as before, the testing criteria are missing and without them simply testing while getting very high heat release would meet the NFPA
measurement requirements. The criteria are the same as contained in NFPA 101. This is the same as the previous motions. It's simply an unenforceable text that's been corrected.

Thank you.

**MR. O'CONNOR:** Mr. Crowley, would you like to offer the committee's position?

**MR. CROWLEY:** Mr. Chair, I defer to our Technical Committee Chair, Mr. Bell.

**MR. BELL:** Thank you. Again, this is a repeat of what we just said. My name is Jim Bell. I work for Intermountain Healthcare. I'm the Chair of 99, Chapter 14, the Technical Committee. And, again, thank you, Dr. Hirschl, for bringing this to our attention.

The wording was revised in an attempt to continue to allow a variety of tests to meet the requirements which can be applied to mattresses and mattress components. 16 CFR Part 1633 and California Technical Bulletin 129 were moved to section B since it's a heat release test and not an ignition test.

The prescriptive requirements were already included in the reference standards, which is shown to be incorrect. The -- stating test requirements
in the code was considered redundant.

Also, some of the prescriptive requirements were in conflict to other test standards listed in this section. Therefore, the prescriptive language was removed and users will meet the requirements of whichever standard they test to.

These test standards are used since there is no test designed specifically for ignition and/or heat release of mattresses and hyperbaric chambers. Mattresses are components, I guess.

There were 16 eligible voters, five not returned, 11 affirmative.

**MR. O’CONNOR:** Thank you, gentlemen. With that we will open up debate on the motion. Please provide your name, affiliation, and whether you are speaking in support of or against the motion.

Microphone number one. Please.

**MR. DAGENAIS:** Dave Dagenais speaking on behalf of the health care section, in favor of the motion. At the health care section meeting yesterday our members voted to support this unanimously. The health care section feels it will give greater clarity to the users, as well as make it enforceable.
We urge you to support this motion.

MR. O'CONNOR: Is there any further discussion on Motion 99-4 to reject an identifiable part of second revision number 305?

Mr. Chair?

MR. CROWLEY: No comment. Thank you.

MR. O'CONNOR: Seeing none, we will move to a vote. Before we vote, let me restate the motion.

The motion on the floor is to reject an identifiable part of second revision number 305. To vote, touch the vote button.

If you wish to vote in favor of the motion and recommend the text on screen 1, touch yes. If you wish to vote against the motion and recommend the text on screen number 2, touch no. Please record your vote.

Voting will close in five seconds. Ballot is closed. Thank you.

The result of the vote are 319 for the motion and recommend the text on screen 1, 38 against the motion. The motion has passed.

It's nice when everybody gets along, right?

(Laughter)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Technical Committee on Educational and Day-Care Occupancies
FROM: Kelly Carey, Project Administrator
DATE: June 9, 2017

At the NFPA Technical Meeting (Tech Session), held June 7, 2017, NFPA 101 was recommended for issuance with the following:

**Amendment 101-3:** Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision No. 30 including any related portions of First Revision No. 2002

**Amendment 101-5:** Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision No. 32

Pursuant to section 4.6 and Table 1 of the *Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards (Regs)*, the following are not subject to Committee ballot:

- An Amendment to Reject a Second Revision and related portions of a First Revision.
- Or
- An Amendment to Reject a Second Revision where no First Revision or related part of a First Revision exists.

As a result, NFPA 101 shall be forwarded to the Standards Council for action in accordance with section 4.5.3.7 and 4.7 of the *Regs*.

The transcripts from the Annual 2017 NFPA Technical Meeting (Tech Session) will be available within two weeks after the Tech Session at: [www.nfpa.org/techsession](http://www.nfpa.org/techsession).

**Note:**

In accordance with 1.6.2(a) of the *Regs*, anyone who is dissatisfied with the results of the floor motions from the June 2017 NFPA Technical Meeting may appeal the results. Appeals shall be filed no later than twenty days after the NFPA Technical Meeting at which Association action on the issuance of the Standard was recommended. The final date to file any such appeal is **June 27, 2017**.
in favor of the motion and recommend the text on screen 1, please touch yes. If you wish to vote against the motion and recommend text on screen 2, touch no. Please record your votes now.

All right. The balloting will close in five seconds. The balloting is now closed.

The results of the vote are 131 for the motion, recommending the text on screen 1, and 161 against the motion, recommending the text on screen 2. The motion has failed.

Let's proceed with the discussion on Certified Amending Motion 101-3.

Microphone 5, please.

CERTIFIED AMENDING MOTION 101-3


MS. MANLEY: Thank you.

There is a motion on the floor to reject an identifiable part of second correlation revision number 30, including any related portions of first revision number 2002. I heard a laugh. Is there a second?

PARTICIPANT: Second.

MS. MANLEY: All right. We do have a
second.

Please proceed with the discussion on the motion. Sir.

MR. WOESTMAN: Thank you very much, Ms. Moderator. Pardon me. Wow. Good way to get started.

Hey, this Certified Amending Motion and the next four are all related. So I think we'll have most testimony on this one and then move on from there.

But this is a group of motions and this is all related to violence in schools. And the issue here is one small item that's part of a larger group of work that was done by these committees. And really good work.

One of the provisions that we wanted to bring to the membership for consideration is the topic of this Certified Amending Motion, and that is the longstanding life safety requirement is that doors in the means of egress need to be openable in the means of egress, in the direction of egress with no more than one motion to release the door for unlatching, unlocking so you can egress from the building.

And this requirement here is -- what's
modified here is to allow up to two motions to
unlatch, unlock a door in the means of egress. So
big, big change from our longstanding life safety
requirement for many, many years.

And we, and I'm saying "we" and I'm part
of the we, there's some unintended implications of
allowing up to two motions that weren't adequately
discussed, vetted, et cetera.

So I'll leave it at that for now. Thank
you.

**MS. MANLEY:** All right.

Mr. Koffel, would you like to offer the
committee's position?

**MR. KOFFEL:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

While this motion relates to a second
correlating revision, the Correlating Committee
really just made some editorial changes to this item
so that the language would be consistent with the
manual style.

So, therefore, I would ask that you
recognize Vic Dubrowski as chair of the responsible
Technical Committee.

**MS. MANLEY:** All right. I'm assuming 2.

Thank you.

**MR. DUBROWSKI:** Thank you. And thank you,
Bill.

I'm the chair of the Technical Committee on Educational and Daycare Occupancies. And this topic has been discussed for almost three years in our committee, because it goes back to NFPA's kind of landmark workshop on School Safety Codes and security which was held in late 2014. And that workshop gathered stakeholders throughout the country to explore this important topic.

The final report from that workshop recognized that an approved second releasing device may be needed in existing schools, primarily to push back against the dangerous locking means that are being promulgated in the marketplace by those unfamiliar at all with egress requirements.

After receiving public inputs in 2015 regarding classroom door locking, the Technical Committee generated a first revision to resolve the public input and add additional criteria to allow classroom door locking to prevent unwanted entry.

The revision received many public comments during the second draft stage, and the resulting text is what you see on screen 2.

As indicated in our committee statement regarding these changes, our Technical Committee
reached a consensus that the proposed language will
provide much needed guidance for the protection of
occupants while ensuring the classroom doors are
both operable for egress as well as operable from
the corridor side by authorized first responders.

There are currently close to 100,000
existing public school buildings across the country
without this guidance. Noncompliant and dangerous
installations will continue to occur.

The intent of Chapter 15 for existing
schools is to provide those other measures necessary
to ensure that a comprehensive package of features
is provided for these existing educational
occupancies.

Perhaps the most important feature of this
package is in the charging statement itself. It
says: "Any locking means must be approved." It's
ultimately up to the local authority having
jurisdiction to approve any locking arrangement.

Approval of a locking device may depend on
individual scenarios, such as classroom use,
occupant load and staffing. The AHJ has control
over this process.

The language permits not more than two
releasing operations. It certainly doesn't require
two releasing operations.

The committee supported this as a package requirement that together provide the necessary guidance needed for classroom door locking in existing occupancies without requiring a wholesale replacement of all existing door hardware in these 100,000 schools. And throughout this reasonable approach we hope to reduce the incentive to use the dangerous locking, blocking and jamming devices which are currently out in the marketplace.

Although well debated, as a final note I wanted to say that our final ballot among all our interest categories was 20 in favor, one opposed and one not returned.

MS. MANLEY: Thank you, gentlemen.

With that we're going to open up debate on the motion. Please provide your name, affiliation and whether you're speaking in support or against the motion.

Let's go to microphone 5, please.

MS. GRIFFIN: Hi. My name's Christine Griffin and I'm the executive director of the Disability Law Center which is the protection and advocacy organization here in Massachusetts. I'm here to speak in support of the motion.
I'm also here to deliver remarks on behalf of our national organization, the National Disability Rights Network, which is the voluntary nonprofit membership organization for the federally mandated protection and advocacy systems.

National Disability Rights Network works to create a society in which individuals with disabilities are afforded equality of opportunity, choice and self determination. And supports people with a wide range of disabilities, including those with cognitive, intellectual, mental, sensory and physical disabilities.

Collectively the protection advocacy agencies are the largest provider of legally-based advocacy services for persons with disabilities in the United States. There are 57 protection advocacy organizations, one in every state and territory.

We have a legal obligation, as you do, to ensure that whatever you do complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act, which is the comprehensive civil rights law protecting the rights of people with disabilities.

I'm here today to tell you that their opinion and any opinion of any experts in the field of Life Safety Code and Emergency Evacuation and
1 Egress, the code changes proposed for classrooms
2 security would violate the Americans with
3 Disabilities Act.
4
5 Laurie Green, the manager of codes
6 resources legion said the following in an article
7 she recently wrote: "Classroom doors are not exempt
8 from the federal and or state accessibility
9 requirements that apply to door on an accessible
10 route. To ensure the classroom doors are usable by
11 everyone, the accessibility standard must apply at
12 all times, particularly in the event of an
13 emergency."
14
15 Ms. Green also points out in her article
16 that guidance issued by many federal agencies on
17 developing high quality school emergency operations
18 plans must comply with the Americans with
19 Disabilities Act, and we agree.
20
21 In addition to Ms. Green's opinion, your
22 other NFPA Technical Committee on Means of Egress
23 has opposed this very code change because increasing
24 the number of lock/latch releasing operations is
25 dangerous and could create a hazard to occupants.
26
27 So it's not too late. You're here today.
28
29 You can make sure you support this motion on the
30 floor.
Thank you.

MS. MANLEY: Thank you.

Microphone 3, please.

MR. COLLINS: Good afternoon. Dave Collins, I'm an architect from Cincinnati, Ohio. I'm Chair of the Means of Egress Committee, Technical Committee. The TC on --

MS. MANLEY: I'm assuming you're in support?

MR. COLLINS: I'm sorry. Yes, I am in support of the motion.

MS. MANLEY: Thank you.

MR. COLLINS: The TC on Means of Egress did take a position on the door locking issue by deleting the exemption for existing educational occupancies in section 721510.7, which was overturned by the Correlating Committee.

It is the position of the TC Means of Egress that increasing the number of latch lock releasing operations is dangerous and could create a hazard to occupants. Technology exists that will meet the current code requirements for most -- not more than one latch lock releasing operation.

The need for multiple operations is contrary to decades of experience resulting in
fatalities in schools and other buildings. Single
action egress is an important aspect of life safety
for all emergencies.

I urge your support of the position.

MS. MANLEY: I'm going to look over to
microphone 7, please.

MR. POPE: Yes. Good afternoon. Thank
you. Roger Pope, National Association of State Fire
Marshals, Model Code Committee speaking in favor of
this motion.

Back in 2015 NSAFM published a document
reciting a lot of instances of concern with this
moving forward, allowing two unlocking motions.

It's interesting that the language remains
"must be approved," and of course that burden would
then fall upon local AHJ's. And should this motion
be defeated, there will be a proliferation of
devices coming to market expressly for the purpose
of providing that secondary device.

It would be very, very problematic in the
enforcement world to root through the many schools
and doors contained within these schools.

I would concur with some of the previous
comments in support of this motion. And I would
just add that when reduced to it's very essence it
just seems somewhat counterintuitive to create numerous new safety issues in an effort to solve another.

Thank you.

**MS. MANLEY:** Thank you.

Microphone 9, please.

**MR. QUINTERNO:** Good afternoon, Chairman.

My name is Vincent Quinterno and I'm with the Rhode Island State Fire Marshals office. I'm here in favor of the motion, but I'm also here to deliver a message from the Rhode Island State Fire Marshal, who wishes to oppose the use of secondary locking devices for educational establishments.

While we recognize the need for better security measures to promulgate the defense of unwanted intruders, we also must be coherent to the need of the occupant safety should a potential fire or the need to quickly exit the classroom arise.

Multiple locking devices can and will be challenging to all occupants during all foreign terrorist acts and under numerous emergency conditions.

While the Rhode Island State Fire Marshal office is conic of the fact today's societal matters are different from years past, and some of these
existing life safety features may -- and at times
may need to be modified and/or corrected to suit the
hazards of today. However, in an attempt to make
these modifications we cannot be absorbed with
additional noncompliant Band-Aid devices and
overlooking the existence of noncompliant
conditions.

Chapter 7 already identifies specific
locking mechanisms which could be utilized to avoid
the situation.

So in closing, Rhode Island State Fire
Marshal wishes to conclude by, again, opposing the
use of secondary locking mechanism and voting for
this motion.

Thank you.

MS. MANLEY: All right. Microphone 5,
please.

MR. WOESTMAN: John Woestman, BHMA, in
support of the motion.

Just a couple things. On behalf of the
committee there was a discussion that there was a
group of requirements that were included -- proposed
to be included. Absolutely very good work by the
committee. Needed to be included in NFPA 101.

This motion is about one very small but
very important aspect of that recommendation. And
that is, changing the Life Safety Code or the
language as it is today. If you were to go forward
with opposing this motion, please don't. But if you
support the motion you would retain in the Life
Safety Code the requirement that doors be
unlockable, un latchable and means of egress with no
more than one releasing operation. The language
proposed by the committee allow two. Why is that
not so good? Imagine in the dark with a door that
has a secondary locking operation, power's out, in
the dark. How would you know there's a second
locking operation that you have to manipulate to get
out that door? The door you're not familiar with?
How would a blind person know any time? Any day?

    Another example, if you have a school that
has, let's say a lever operated handle on the door
from the inside, turn the lever, the spring -- the
latch retracts, you can walk out. One is good.
Let's put a second one on there that's lockable from
inside the room, because that's the number one
recommendation from the Sandy Hook Advisory
Commission, make doors and schools lockable from
inside the room so that the bad guy can't get in.

    Now, if you or this language would allow
two lever operated handles, one on top of the other, and now you need simultaneous actions by the person to unlatch the door to walk out. That's not -- that's not even covered by accessibility. It's never been comprehended.

These are some of the items that are the unintended implications of what this language would allow.

I urge your support of this motion and support of the motion that reinserts one, no more than one allowable motion.

Thank you.

**MS. MANLEY:** All right. Is there any further discussion on Motion 101-3 to reject an identifiable part of second correlating revision number 30, including any related portions of first revision number 2002?

All right. Seeing none, any final comments?

**MR. KOFFEL:** Yes. Again, I would just note that we are dealing with existing occupancies. As Victor pointed out, this was raised during the section that was held on security. It was actually raised by some fire officials that asked us to do something to address the issue, because absent this
there's a higher probability of aftermarket products being added to the door that would not meet any of this criteria.

I would also encourage you to look at the entire list of criteria that the latching mechanism must be operable without any special knowledge, efforts, tools or keys. There's mounting height criteria. So, again, in the mind of the committee and the Correlating Committee this was a reasonable, acceptable way to address the issue in existing buildings.

MS. MANLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Before we vote, let me restate the motion.

The motion on the floor is to reject an identifiable part of second correlating revision number 30, including any related portions of first revision number 2002. To vote, touch the vote button. If you wish to vote in favor of the motion and recommend the text on screen 1, touch yes. If you wish to vote against the motion and recommend the text on screen 2, touch no. Please record your vote now.

All right. Balloting is going to close in five seconds. All right. The balloting is now closed. Thank you very much.
The results of the vote are 180 for the motion and recommend the text on screen 1 and 107 against the motion, recommending the text on screen 2. The motion has passed.
June 12, 2017

Ms. Dawn Bellis
Division Manager, Codes & Standards Administration
National Fire Protection Association
1 Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02169-7471

Appeal to NFPA 101 Successful Motions

Thank you for receiving this appeal directed toward actions of the June 7th NFPA assembly during which the words “not more than two releasing operations” were excerpted from the pending language in the 2018 edition of NFPA 101, represented by CAM 101-3, CAM 101-5, and CAM 101-6. Specifically, in section 15.2.2.2.4 for Classroom Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry sub-part (3), these words were deleted. We ask that the Technical Committee and the NFPA Standards Council reconsider this decision on the basis presented hereafter.

As is the case with most door assemblies, their functions, and the people who use the door assemblies, issues are more nuanced than what they appear on the surface. It’s easy and understandable to continue to hold ease of egress in case of fire as the preeminent purpose of the Life Safety code. Unfortunately, the world has changed enough that fire is not the biggest threat to human life. While occurrences of fire may be more frequent, and ease of egress is a priority in this life-threatening situation, occurrences of active shooters in educational and business occupancies are on the rise and the risk of fatalities is significant. This reality warrants further consideration of clear and convincing language in NFPA 101 about what door hardware is allowed to protect the lives of those faced with an intruder intending to do harm and their need to secure-in-place.

A significant nuance related to most secure-in-place hardware is that absent door placement or actuation, single-motion egress is honored, so in case of fire, a single-motion, no-tool egress is allowed. Now, if door barricade hardware is put in place and/or actuated, egress often requires two motions. Only in the case of a simultaneous fire/active shooter/intruder event would a second-motion be relevant or required to exit an occupancy. Absent a fire, that second motion creates necessary time and distance to save the lives of occupants. Most of the concerned public would opt for the secure-in-place security, choosing the potential second-motion egress in the rare case of a simultaneous fire/active shooter event. It is the concerned public for which the NFPA code is written to protect and serve. This, enough, should be grounds for reconsidering the language excerpted from section 15.2.2.2.4, sub-part (3).

This alteration of pending language in NFPA 101 significantly affects existing classroom and commercial occupancies. Door hardware mounted or used supplemental to non-rated door

16200 Foster, Stilwell, Kansas 66085 (855) 714-3473 www.firedoorsolutions.com
assemblies is the only economically feasible way to provide secure-in-place life safety, absent buying new doors, re-fabricating the door and frame for new latching/locking hardware, and re-keying that hardware throughout a facility. The nuance here is that most facilities will forego the expense of this required upgrade, and by doing so, put the occupants at risk of an active shooter. While perhaps over-dramatic, code language changed to allow only single-motion egress, effectively prohibiting occupancies from protecting their occupants from active shooters/intruders creates, not just a legal liability, but a question of moral conscious.

An argument can be made for the inverse; where occupants in a fire must exit an occupancy with a second motion for egress, and possibly perish. I know as a parent and business owner, I would choose the risk of a simultaneous fire/active shooter event happening and second-motion egress requirement, over not having my family members protected from an active shooter/intruder absent a fire due to a myopic view of threats to life by fire alone. I believe I side with the majority of the concerned public. If you question this, please survey the concerned public and ask their opinion before ratifying the proposed language in NFPA 101.

As a consequence of the appeal outlined above, we ask that the NFPA 101 Technical Committee and the Standards Council consider reinstated the wording excerpted in Sections 15.2.2.2.4, sub-part (3) that states, “… not more than two releasing operations.”

Fire Door Solutions is a well-respected ISO 17020 third-party inspection body committed to helping others, help others survive life threatening events. The effort made in writing this appeal is toward that end. Thank you for your consideration. I can be reached at (913) 206-6026 or at dgeenens@firedoorsolutions.com with any questions about this appeal.

My best,

[Signature]

cc: Jeff Perry
    Ray Harper
    Kevin Mock

Dave Geenens
President:
Fire Door Solutions
June 9, 2017

Ms. Dawn Bellis
Division Manager, Codes & Standards Administration
National Fire Protection Association
1 Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02169-7471

RE: Appeal of Successful Motions

Pursuant to Section 1.6 of the Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards, I respectfully submit the following appeal regarding actions that were taken on June 7th at the NFPA assembly concerning pending language in the 2018 edition of NFPA 101, Life Safety Code, for locking of classroom doors in existing educational occupancies (Chapter 15), as well as doors in existing business occupancies (Chapter 39) and existing day care occupancies (Chapter 17). Specifically, I am appealing the decisions to accept CAM 101-3, CAM 101-5, and CAM 101-6 to delete the provision allowing “...not more than two releasing operations” for existing doors in the respective occupancy chapters.

Below is the pending language excerpted from the 2018 edition of NFPA 101 that covers locking of classroom doors in existing educational occupancies (Chapter 15); the comments that follow can be applied to the other occupancies covered in the CAMs:

15.2.2.2.4* Classroom Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry. Classroom doors shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that the locking means is approved and all of the following conditions are met:

(1) The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
(2) The unlocking and unlatching from the classroom side of the door can be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(3) The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations.
(4) The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
(5) Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the classroom side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(6) The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.
(7) The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.
(8) Modifications to fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.
(9) The emergency action plan, required by 15.7.1, shall address the use of the locking and unlocking means from within and outside the room.
(10) Staff shall be drilled in the engagement and release of the locking means, from within and outside the room, as part of the emergency egress drills required by 15.7.2.
As it stands, the above-cited actions taken at the NFPA assembly deleted the provision allowing “...not more than two releasing operations” (see item 3 above). If allowed to stand, these actions will have severe unintended consequences for the affected facilities. For example, many existing school districts are comprised of buildings constructed before the Columbine High School shooting tragedy in 1999. Classroom doors in buildings of that era (and many constructed since then) have standard/traditional classroom function locking components (e.g., mortise and bored locks). Traditional classroom locks were designed to reduce incidents where students could “lock out” teachers; doors are locked or unlocked by inserting a key in the corridor-side of the locking component and rotating the key 360 degrees—the operating knobs/levers in the corridors are either in the locked or unlocked conditions. Traditional classroom function locks cannot be locked from inside the classroom.

My point in explaining how the traditional classroom locks function is that IF the classroom door locking provisions for existing doors limits releasing operation to only one, and requires doors to be “lockable” from inside the classroom, ALL EXISTING CLASSROOM LOCKING HARDWARE will need to be replaced. In other words, none of the traditional classroom locking hardware devices meet the operational requirements of 15.2.2.2.4 (1). None.

Consider the cascading sequence of changes that would be necessary to complete the transition from traditional classroom locking hardware to new locking components to comply with the pending language. In many cases, changing out the existing locking hardware will require some form of modification to the door, which might be as simple as boring new function holes—some doors will require more significant work. When the affected doors are fire-rated, the doors need to be modified in accordance with NFPA 80, Standard for Fire Doors and Other Opening Protectives. Where the modification work falls into the category of installation work that is permitted by NFPA 80, the work can be readily performed in the field. However, doors that require more significant modification will need to be taken to an authorized-licensed shop, modified under NFPA 80’s Field Modifications provisions, or have the modified doors re-labeled by one of the testing labs. Alternatively, existing door leaves can be replaced with new door leaves that are properly prepared to receive new locking hardware components. The point is that each of these options adds another level of expense to the facility.

Additionally, new locking hardware will need to be keyed either into an existing master key system or a new master key system. In the latter case, establishing a new master key system requires doors other than the affected existing classroom to be rekeyed. Either way, it’s another cost that the facilities will need to absorb.

For the sake of discussion, consider the cost impact to school districts that have 500 existing classroom doors (and other doors that might fall under these requirements). If the combined cost of the new locking hardware, labor to modify the doors, and labor to install the locks is $1,000 per door (conservatively), the single releasing requirement for existing classroom doors will cost in the neighborhood of a half million dollars per school district. Many school districts have more than 500 existing doors, and the costs could be a much as $2,500 per door where the door leaves need to be replaced with new.
There are many school districts in the nation that are not financially able to absorb the costs of upgrading their classroom (and related) doors. It makes no sense to replace serviceable classroom locking hardware and in some cases doors, with new components when there are other auxiliary locking devices that can be used to meet NFPA 101’s requirements for locking classroom doors.

By not allowing a second releasing operation on classroom doors, the Code will force school districts to choose between doing nothing (at the risk of future incidents) with their existing doors or making significant and costly changes to upgrade their doors to single-release operation. No doubt, some school districts will be forced to choose the former option since they do not have the necessary resources for the full upgrade; whereas, they would have been able to do take some action by adding a secondary locking device if the Code permitted two releasing operations.

There is precedence in the Code under the health care occupancies that can be applied to issue of locking of classroom doors. For instance, health care occupancies allow for the locking of doors “...where the clinical needs of the patients require specialized security measures...” (see paragraph 18.2.2.5.2), provided all of the listed criteria are met. Patient room doors are not required to be fire-rated, due to a number of factors. Key to both of these conditions is that the health care facilities have trained staff on duty to handle emergency conditions.

The Code allows more than one releasing operation on apartment, dormitory, hotel, and motel unit entry doors because the people using these doors are familiar with how the doors operate under normal and emergency conditions. In other words, people are trained on how to lock, unlock, and open the doors.

Items 15.2.2.2.4 (9) and (10) require schools to have an emergency plan and trained faculty and staff to guide students through emergency situations. Substitute teachers (and others) would be required to be trained before they can teach. Very much like the provisions in health care occupancies, items (9) and (10) create the same type of trained staff. For this reason, a second releasing operation for classroom doors is a reasonable and low-risk solution.

At this juncture (albeit slightly off topic), I’ll point out that 15.2.2.2.4 (4) conflicts with the requirements of 7.2.1.5.10.1 (1) which states: “The releasing mechanism for any latch shall be located as follows: (1) Not less than 34 in. (865 mm) above the finished floor for other than existing installations.” [Underlining added for emphasis.] It’s worth noting that this provision is not prefaced with the “where permitted by Chapters...” or “where required by Chapters...” qualifier statements, thus allowing the height of the releasing mechanisms to be lower than 34 in. above the floor on existing doors.

Mounting heights of latching hardware devices in some older elementary schools were permitted to be as low as 30 in. above the floor. Strictly enforcing 15.2.2.2.4 (4) will require those door assemblies to be completely replaced, which is another unintended consequence of these new provisions. And, while this condition does not involve one or two releasing operations, it does go to the argument of the cost impact these new provisions will have on existing schools. Replacing entire door assemblies might cost facilities upwards of $5,000 each when you consider repairing wall and floor coverings, in addition to material costs and the labor to remove existing doors.
Bearing the above in mind, consider how the elimination of the second releasing operation affects doors in existing business occupancies. Owners have the discretion of choosing which doors in their facilities they want to equip with hardware that complies with 39.2.2.2.2, provided such application is approved by the AHJ. Even so, eliminating the second releasing operation prevents owners from employing an auxiliary locking device that might comply with 39.2.2.2.2 otherwise; increasing their costs unnecessarily.

Doors in business occupancies include college/university “classroom doors,” as well as doctor and dentist offices, and a host of other types of doors that are found in business occupancies; it has far-reaching consequences for many types of buildings. Similar to school faculty and staff, office workers/staff in business occupancies become familiar with the operation of their doors.

I am compelled to point out that a second releasing operation is already permitted under 7.2.1.5.10.6 where the doors serve “…an occupant load not exceeding three, provided that releasing does not require simultaneous operation.” A door such as the one described in this provision could very well be in a business occupancy (e.g., an examination room in a family practice doctor’s office, an office door, or a storage room door). The requirements of 7.2.1.5.10.6 are not restricted to any particular occupancy chapter. (Digressing for a moment, this type of door could also be a janitor’s closet or storage room in educational occupancies, which would conflict with 15.2.2.2.4 IF single releasing operation were required.)

Regarding CAM 101-4 and CAM 101-7 seeking to insert a new requirement for limiting releasing operation on classroom doors to one operation, I think the committees should “resolve” these proposals in favor of the original language put forth by respective committees.

For all of the reasons articulated in this appeal, I urge the respective technical committees and the Standards Council to consider the financial burden that will be created for school districts, colleges and universities, businesses, and day care facilities in order to comply with single releasing operation on their existing doors. Setting aside the emotional aspects surrounding this topic, there simply is no technical justification for requiring facilities to upgrade their existing doors to meet the single-release operation requirement.

In my opinion, the technical committees got it right with their Second Draft revision language. The provision for a second releasing operation for existing doors makes sense; it’s reasonable, achievable, technically justifiable, and enforceable. Facilities that have the financial and human resources to upgrade the affected doors to single-release operation are free to do so under the original language approved by the technical committees. Likewise, facilities that have limited financial and human resources can add a secondary locking device to their existing doors. Doing something proactive is better than doing nothing; and doing nothing might be the only choice for some facilities if the Code requires single releasing operation for existing doors.

In summary, however well-intended the reasoning behind restricting existing classroom doors (and the other affected doors) to a single releasing operation might be, doing so creates an undue burden—both financially and human resource-wise—for the respective school districts, colleges and universities, businesses, and day care facilities. Moreover, the single-release operation for existing doors results in requirements that are unreasonable, potentially unachievable (due to significant costs involved), and technically unjustifiable.
Accordingly, I would like the Standards Council to reinstate the proposed language put forth by the respective technical committees for Educational, Business, and Day Care Occupancies.

Lastly, to add context and perspective to my appeal, you should know that I have over 30 years of experience in the swinging door industry. I am a Fire Door Assembly Inspector (FDAI), a Distinguished Architectural Hardware Consultant (DAHC), and a Certified Door Consultant (CDC). I am the former Director of Education and Certification for the Door and Hardware Institute (DHI) and the former Vice President of Technical Services of the Door Security & Safety Foundation (positions I held for more than 18 years until I retired in 2014). I have been a technical instructor for DHI for more than 20 years—and continue to teach DHI technical classes. Over the years, I have contributed to NFPA’s door-related provisions and requirements, especially door inspection requirements in NFPA 80, 101, and 105. Additionally, I chair NFPA’s Technical Committee on Fire Doors and Windows—the committee responsible for NFPA 80, *Standard for Fire Doors and Other Opening Protectives*, and NFPA 105, *Standard for Smoke Door Assemblies and Other Opening Protectives*. Today, I am an independent consultant specializing in the field of swinging egress and fire doors, helping facilities better maintain their doors.

Please contact me with questions regarding this appeal. You can reach me by phone at (540) 316-9077 or by email at kpardoe@pardoeconsultingllc.com. Should the Standards Council decide to conduct a hearing on this issue, I would like the opportunity to attend and participate in the hearing.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Keith E. Pardoe, FDAI, DAHC, CDC
President/CEO
Pardoe Consulting, LLC.
July 17, 2017

Ms. Dawn Bellis
Division Manager, Codes & Standards Administration
National Fire Protection Association
1 Battery march Park
Quincy, MA 02169-7471

Reference: Appeal of CAM Numbers 101-3, 101-5, and 101-6
Subject: Additional Substantiation

The following information is offered for your consideration of the above-referenced appeal that will be heard on August 15th during the NFPA Standards Council Meeting:

1) Technical Committee on Educational and Day-Care Occupancies—Disagreeing comments from the final letter ballot:

   1) Mark Aaby—“Conflicts with (3) and will create interpretation and enforcement confusion.”

   2) Samuel Dannaway—“This requirement is reasonable for existing occupancies given the requirements for staff training.”

   3) Victor L. Dubrowski—“I believe that the second releasing operation was a critical component of the solution package for existing Educational occupancies.”

   4) Max L. Grandy—“Second look—The agree wording is confusing. The original wording is the more realistic approach for the schools to do something to an existing facility.”

   5) Alfred J. Longhitano—“In existing facilities with limited funding a simple slide bolt may be their only option and it certainly is not too complicated for trained staff.”

   6) Catherine Stashak—“The multiple provisions of the proposed 15.2.2.4 will weed out the dangerous hardware and locking means being promoted in the marketplace by those unfamiliar with traditional means of egress science found in the model codes. The majority of the security/intruder devices being promoted are even more dangerous, not allowing students the ability to open doors in the event of a fire so they can evacuate or preventing first responders from gaining entry. These devices are also cumbersome or complicated for students to figure out how to use or beyond their reach. If the codes do not start providing guidance on safe ways to deal with security concerns, these more dangerous devices will continue to be used, because the codes do not provide a better alternative. The Committee recognizes that hardware does exist, and could be used that allows two locking mechanisms with one releasing operation (as existing codes require), such as residential ‘hotel’ locking systems, but the proposed language addresses the inevitable...
existing conditions that cannot utilize the ‘hotel locks.’ The AHJs need to be more sensitive to the budgetary constraints that have become a fact of life in government and public institutions. Schools often cannot afford the expense of retrofitting ‘hotel’ locks and in some instances existing doors cannot accommodate a new locking system so the entire door needs to be replaced. The language calls for drills and training which historically educational facilities are active in performing. The language calls for the locking device to be at a level that can be reached by students with the need for a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort. This language provides the opportunity for a second lock that will be consistent with the means of egress design required for the primary lock. This conflict between security and life safety has come to a head in recent years and it can no longer be ignored. There have been too many incidents that have created substantial concern with families or students and the staff that occupy educational buildings and fire authorities need to be able to address these fears in a consistent and viable manner. The efforts of the NFPA working with security organizations (ASIS), and multiple first responder organizations such as fire, police, FBI, and educational representatives to resolve this conflict resulted in a statement that security and life safety authorities need to work together, inserting language in the already existent model codes that will create buildings that work both ways: Prevent unwanted intruders but also permit safe and timely egress in needed-with human and life safety as the first priority.”

7) Aleksy L. Szachnowicz—“I am advocating a return to the text originally promulgated by the well informed and balanced SAF-END Technical Committee (pre Tech Session modification floor vote). The Technical Committee put a tremendous amount of time, effort, vetting, and deliberation toward arriving at a sound, reasonable, actionable, practical, defensible, affordable, and implementable solution. It well balances (emphasis added) the need for fire safety, life safety and security in an existing (emphasis added) educational facility. In a new facility, there is no question/argument that the owner/operator have the ability to fully comply with the ‘one releasing’ requirement. Case closed! But in an existing facility, the answer is not as cut and dry. The Life Safety Code has had a long history of allowing differentiation between new and existing facilities based upon many well justifiable and supportable reasons. I can personally attest to many such debates over applications of new vs. existing code provisions as a first-hand participant in the NFPA TC process since 1993. That is exactly the case in this matter, and the SAF-END TC got this one right. The old aphorism of ‘never allow the perfect to get in the way of good’ applies here. Forcing existing educational occupancy building owners/operators to comply with the Tech Session’s version of the code language will at best dissuade them from making any enhancements to the classroom doors/hardware, and at worst, they will opt to utilize the many cheaper, unproven, untested, and potentially downright dangerous aftermarket door locking/jamming/blocking devices that have hit the market. Not making any enhancements will in no way improve the security of the building occupants during an unwanted intruder/active shooter scenario. Utilizing the many cheaper, unproven, untested, and potentially downright dangerous aftermarket door locking/jamming/blocking devices that have hit the marketplace will jeopardize the safety of the building’s occupants during a fire scenario. There are over 100,000 K-12 schools in the USA. Competing interests and scarcity of resources are the norm in the vast majority of said facilities. Don’t place the owners/operators of these facilities in this Hobson’s choice predicament.
Reason and reasonableness must be allowed to prevail and the differentiation of provisions between new and existing occupancy applications must be allowed to stand in this matter.

By way of background and frame of reference for my commentary, I am at present the Chief Operating Officer (COO) and former Chief Facilities Officer (CFO) for the 42nd largest public school district in the USA. I have been a Principal Member of the SAF-END TC since 1997 in the User Category. I am also a registered professional fire protection engineer (PE) by licensure and a fire protection engineer by training/education via attending both a Bachelor’s and Master’s Degree in Fire Protection Engineering from the University of Maryland.”

2) Technical Committee on Mercantile and Business Occupancies—Disagreeing comments from the final letter ballot:

1) Mark J. Aaby—“Conflicts with (3) and will create interpretation and enforcement confusion.”

2) Kevin L. Deer, PE—“I disagree with the proposed amendment as supported by the membership vote at the Technical Session because the proposed requirement to allow a maximum of two locking methods was to address a concern of aftermarket devices that are dangerous, including devices attached to door closers out of the reach of potential occupants and the need to address security concerns in existing occupancies. The two locking methods is based on a recommendation from a workshop on school safety by a diverse group of stakeholders. Even though the workshop as associated with schools, the risk associated with workplace violence in business occupancies is similar to the issues discussed for schools.”

3) David A. Dodge—“When I write and lecture about product safety (my area of expertise) I advocate planning for unintentional misuses of a product. Likewise, I think that we should anticipate that the empty space in an office will be filled at some time in the life expectancy of that building and we should plan for that. It seems to me that buildings should be designed to be used under reasonably foreseeable conditions of use. It further seems to me that it is entirely foreseeable that office workers in some buildings will be asked to work in a space, open or not, that is 10 feet by 10 feet rather than a space that is 10 feet by 15 feet. That is what the existing Code requires which also states that the occupant load may be determined as the ‘maximum probable population of the space’ (38.1.7)”

4) Amy J. Murdock—“In my professional opinion, two releasing operations in a business occupancy should be maintained. Considering the reason for this locking arrangement provision in the first place, we are discussing BOTH fire and security. In the situation of BOTH fire and security, two releasing operations can easily be engaged or disengaged quickly within a business occupancy by occupants. The releasing mechanisms would have to fully comply with the code in regards to location, reach ranges, and ability to easily identify that these mechanisms are in place. All eight (8) provisions in this section properly protect for BOTH fire and security. The FACT is that building owners/users are buying and installing their own secondary methods for locking a door. Those such devices pose a MUCH GREATER hazard that the inclusion of a second locking device in accordance with the provisions 1-8 outlined herein. The Technical Committee originally approved the two (2)
releasing mechanisms and I continue to strongly support two (2) releasing mechanisms. In the testimony at the hearings, someone mentioned that the ADA standards would not allow two releasing operations mechanisms. That is INACCURATE! Nothing in the 2010 Standards requires one (1) releasing mechanism: 2010 Standards Section 404.2.7 covers this topic but does not include provisions regarding the number of releasing mechanisms. The DOJ commentary states that any locking or latching mechanism that requires simultaneous finger and movements to be avoided. Two releasing mechanisms is an option without simultaneous finger and hand movement: panic hardware bar and a deadbolt. In the testimony at the hearings, someone mentioned that two releasing operations will kill/harm fire fighters. I disagree with that statement with the same example: panic hardware bar and a deadbolt; both are easy to unlock for egress.”

3) Applications for a Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) for Section 15.2.2.2.4 and Section 17.2.2.2.6 have been submitted—and a TIA application for Section 39.2.2.2.2 will be submitted shortly—which (in part) support the basis for this appeal:

Should the single releasing operation requirement be allowed to stand for these new locking provisions, inevitably there will be requests from school districts, day care facility owners and operators, and owners of all types businesses for variances to have two releasing operations for their existing doors. Accordingly, the Code needs to provide code enforcement officers and other AHJs an option for making such allowances; where they deem two releasing operations are acceptable. Mandating a single releasing operation for all generations of existing classroom doors is unreasonable and unsustainable; there are always exceptions to the rule. For this reason, the language proposed in the TIAs (see below) regarding the releasing operation(s) is designed to default to a single releasing operation, but allows for applications where two releasing operations are acceptable to the AHJ.

“(4) Not more than one releasing operation shall be required to open doors from the classroom side of the door assemblies, unless two separate non-simultaneous releasing operations are approved by the AHJ.”

Reinstating the Second Draft Revision language that permits two releasing operations for existing is the best path forward, at least in the short term; that is, assuming the TIAs are successful. Understanding that the 2018 edition of NFPA 101 will not have any direct application until it is adopted, the single releasing operation could cause its adoption to be delayed in some jurisdictions.

4) A fair interpretation of the charging statement of Section 15.2.2.2.4 is that existing classroom doors (of all generations; dating back to the 1950s and earlier) would be required to comply with these new provisions if they are equipped with the traditional classroom function locksets. If, in fact, that is the case, these new provisions set a precedence in the Code for requiring existing doors (of any type) to be “upgraded” without any technical justification.

The charging statement reads: “Classroom doors shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that the locking means is approved and all of the following conditions are met:” [Bolding added for emphasis.]
Strict interpretation of the charging statement would result in requiring existing classroom doors to be upgraded with new hardware that meets ALL of the conditions of 15.2.2.2.4, simply because they can be locked “…to prevent unwanted entry.”

Thank you for considering the appeal to return to the Second Draft Revision language. I look forward to our meeting in a few weeks.

Please let me know if additional information is needed. You can reach me by phone at (540) 316-9077 or by email at kpardoe@pardoeconsultingllc.com.

Respectfully,

Keith E. Pardoe

Keith E. Pardoe, FDAI, DAHC, CDC, CDT
Maynard, Mary

Subject: FW: Appeals to NFPA Standards Council re: CAMs 101-3, 101-5 and 101-6

From: Max Gandy [mailto:gandyml@ldschurch.org]
Sent: Thursday, June 15, 2017 11:45 AM
To: Maynard, Mary <mmaynard@NFPA.org>
Subject: RE: Appeals to NFPA Standards Council re: CAMs 101-3, 101-5 and 101-6

Mary 15 June 2017

I remember the discussions in committee and I favored one action.
They both bring up good points and the realism of actually having something happen.
I liken this to fire sprinklers in family housing, where it is the right thing to do but have had so-much pushback.
Maybe for this the limit of two actions would be not allowed in large assembly areas?
Concern is with an assembly space that has a large occupancy, would be a possible crowd crush situation.
Regards

Max

Max Gandy P.E.
CFPS, CPD, BEAP, LEED AP
Mechanical Engineer
THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS
Architecture Engineering & Construction
50 E North Temple St – 12th Floor | Salt Lake City, UT 84150-0012
Desk 801-240-4675, Cell 801-602-2391, Fax 801-240-1494
gandyml@ldschurch.org
Good Morning Ms. Fuller:

I would like to support the action taken by the Technical Committee for Educational and Daycare occupancies rejecting the action taken on the floor of the Technical Session at the recent Annual Meeting and Exposition in June 2017 in Boston, thereby reverting back to the language resulting from two draft meetings for the 2018 edition of NFPA 101 (allowing two locking devices amongst other changes). I am aware there are several appeals being made related to this topic. I also support the appeal by Keith Pardoe related to a similar locking issue in Business Occupancies (that committee supported the action on the floor and reverted back to limiting to one locking device).

I am a principal member of SAF-END and BLD-END Technical Committees and supported the language that the committee added in response to concerns that have arisen related to security in educational occupancies and day care occupancies. I participated in the security-life safety workshop sponsored by NFPA in December 2014 in College Park, MD. Additionally, I also was a member of the task group supported by NFPA and ASIS to gather stakeholders of multiple first responder organizations such as fire, police, FBI, and educational representatives to resolve this conflict (in addition to other important guidelines such as general campus design, identification, prevention, and response). A portion of the result of the NFPA/ASIS task group efforts was a statement (amongst others) that security and life safety authorities need to work together, inserting language in the already existent model codes that will create buildings that work both ways: Prevent unwanted intruders but also permit safe and timely egress if needed; with human and life safety as the first priority.

The provisions set up by the Technical Committee for Educational and Day Care Occupancies will weed out the dangerous hardware and locking means being promoted in the marketplace by those unfamiliar with traditional means of egress science found in the NFPA codes. The majority of the security/intruder devices being promoted are even more perilous, not allowing students the ability to open doors in the event of a fire so they can evacuate or preventing first responders from gaining entry. Additionally these devices could lock a victim in with an offender, again leaving first responders locked outside of the room unable to assist the victim. These devices are often too cumbersome or complicated for students to figure out how to use or are beyond their reach. (See attachment for some examples of these illegal locking devices).

If the model codes do not start providing guidance to educational administrators and AHJs on safe ways to deal with security concerns, these more dangerous devices will continue to be used, because the codes do not provide a better alternative. The Technical Committee recognized that hardware exists that could be used that allows two locking mechanisms with one releasing action (as existing code requires: an example being residential “hotel” locks.”) But frequently existing
doors cannot be retrofitted with new hardware and the entire door needs to be replaced. AHJs need to be more sensitive to the budgetary constraints that have become a fact of life in government and public institutions. The cost of replacing 100’s if not 1,000’s of doors is prohibitive in most cases. This carefully and thought-out language will provide an acceptable solution to what is growing into a problem in school districts throughout the country.

The Technical Committee spent much time developing this language: only permitting the second locking device to be used under certain conditions; making sure training and drills include using the procedure for unlocking the second device. The language itself uses the model for locking found in Chapter 7 that the lock cannot require special knowledge, keys, tools, or effort to unlock. The language provides for the lock to be at a level that can be reached by staff and students and door locking must be addressed in the building’s emergency action plan that is required in the operating features section of the involved chapters.

There have been too many incidents that have created substantial concern with families of students and staff that occupy educational building. Local AHJs need to be able to address these fears in a consistent and viable manner. I firmly believe the language created by SAF-END is that solution.

Very respectfully

Cathy Stashak, Section Chief
Office of the Illinois State Fire Marshal
Technical Services Division
312-814-2425
The Rhode Island State Fire Marshal wishes to oppose the use of “secondary” locking devices for existing educational establishments and existing business occupancies. Please support and honor the voting members, some of whom traveled a great distance, who voiced their concern and opposition back in June, 2017.

While the State Fire Marshal recognizes the need for better security measures as a defense against unwanted intruders, we also, must recognize the need for occupants to safely and quickly exit a classroom or area during an emergency. Multiple locking devices can and will be challenging for occupants to operate safely and quickly under numerous emergency conditions. Existing life safety features may need to be modified and/or corrected to suit the hazards of today. However, in attempting to make these modifications we should not condone conditions which will not allow for safe and quick egress.

The Life Safety Code identifies in Section 7.2.1.5 Locks, Latches and Alarm Devices and in section 7.2.1.6 Special Locking Arrangements a variety of additional approved locking mechanism that impedes entry against unwanted intruders. The use of a code compliant one motion locking mechanism installed in a suitable door will provide adequate locking capabilities against an unwanted intruder. A code compliant one motion locking mechanism will need no special knowledge to activate the egress components easily and quickly under emergency conditions.

Many class room assaults actually occur from within the classroom itself. The use of these secondary locking mechanism will delay egress for the room itself. This delay will further increase the danger to occupants. Also, secondary locking mechanism may create egress difficulties for people with disabilities and not allow them a means of egress to escape danger.

The Rhode Island State Fire Marshal wishes to conclude by opposing the use of a “secondary locking mechanism” for the use on existing educational and business use occupancies for the 2018 edition of the Life safety Code. Thank you for your time.

Respectfully Submitted
Vincent Quinterno, DSFM, CFI

On Behalf of
James Gumbley, CFI
Acting State Fire Marshal
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE FIRE MARSHALS

Standards Council
National Fire Protection Association
1 Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02169

July 17, 2017

RE: An appeal of actions taken at the NFPA Technical Meeting on June 7, 2017, in Boston, MA.

My name is James Narva; I serve as the Executive Director of the National Association of State Fire Marshals. We are located at P.O. box 671, Cheyenne, WY 82003.

I am writing about three actions:

1. Overturn the Association Action and Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision No. 30. Including any related portions of First Revision No. 2002 (CAM 101-3).
2. Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision No. 32 (CAM 101-5).
3. Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision No. 50 (CAM 101-6).

The National Association of State Fire Marshals stands in OPPOSITION to the appeals listed above.

On June 7th, 2017 Bert Polk offered testimony supporting CAM’s 101-3, 101-5, and 101-6 at the Technical Meeting in Boston. Bert is the retired State Fire Marshal from the State of South Carolina and was representing the National Association of State Fire Marshals at those proceedings. In each case, he testified the language in the above-listed appeals (if successful) would create inconsistencies with current prescriptive language, and would represent a significant departure from current emergency exiting situations in the code.

We offer this letter to assure the Standards Council her testimony was an accurate representation of the views of the National Association of State Fire Marshals.

On behalf of the National Association of State Fire Marshals, we urge you to reject the appeals listed above. If, in the course of your deliberations you wish to solicit additional information, please contact me at jnarva@narvaassociates.com or 207-737-1226.
August 15, 2017

Members of the Standards Council,

On behalf of myself and as a representative of the American Institute of Architects (AIA), I am filing formal opposition to the appeal by D. Geenen’s, Fire Door Solutions and K. Pardoe, Pardow Consulting, LLC requesting the Standards Council to:

• Overturn the Association Action and Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision No. 30 Including any Related Portions of First Revision No. 2002 (CAM 101-3/NFPA 15.2.2.2.4);
• Overturn the Association Action and Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision No. 32 (CAM 101-5/NFPA 17.2.2.2.6); and
• Overturn the Association Action and Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision No. 50 (CAM 101-6/39.2.2.2.2)

I request that the comments contained herein be entered into the record.

At the June 2017 NFPA Technical Meeting in Boston, I testified in support of the three (3) Certified Amending Motions (CAMs) listed. All of these CAMs sought to reject three (3) identifiable parts of NFPA 101 that, if not successful, would have ultimately permitted the use of up to two (2) actions to operate the hardware installed on classroom doors in existing Educational, Day-care and Business occupancies. As the Chair of NFPA 101 Technical Committee (TC) on Means of Egress, I presented the official position of the TC at the Technical Meeting stating:

It is the position of the TC on Means of Egress that increasing the number of latch/lock releasing operations is dangerous and could create a hazard to occupants. Technology exists that will meet the current code requirement for not more than one latch/lock releasing operation. The need for multiple operations is contrary to decades of experience resulting in fatalities in schools and other buildings. Single-action egress is an important aspect of life safety for all emergencies.

The TC on Means of Egress, and I as a design professional, and AIA as representing a broad spectrum of design professional throughout the United States believe that allowing such additional actions is dangerous and would add to, not decrease the hazard to occupants of classrooms. The untested and random means by which decisions would be made to use such devices are known perils that the Life Safety Code has long guarded against. While we all realize that there will always be dangers to building occupants from unplanned events, and while the use of barriers to prevent such events may seem worthy, simply allowing a type of device that is designed as impediments to egress, even for seconds, is extremely dangerous and may lead to additional unplanned and misunderstood disasters including fires. This is particularly concerning because these devices meet no standard of quality or performance.

As early as 1955, building and fire codes in the US have recognized the hazard that is created when devices are installed on doors that would delay or impede an occupant’s ready access to the means of escape from a building, or space in a building. With very few exceptions, these types of devices, e.g., hooks, bolts, slides and double keyed locks, have been prohibited on both new and existing installations in all occupancies, not just classrooms. In conjunction with the long-standing prohibition of additional devices on egress doors, the codes have also had a long-standing mandate that limited the action required to operate and open a door to a single action. This provision is found in 2015 edition of NFPA 101 in Section 7.2.1.5.10.2.
If the appeals are successful, and the Standards Council overturns the association actions on CAM 101-3, CAM 101-5 or CAM 101-6, the core goals that NFPA 101 is based upon, as stated in Chapter 4 NFPA 101, would be compromised.

4.1* Goals.

4.1.1* Fire. A goal of this Code is to provide an environment for the occupants that is reasonably safe from fire by the following means:

(1) Protection of occupants not intimate with the initial fire development
(2) Improvement of the survivability of occupants intimate with the initial fire development

4.1.2* Comparable Emergencies. An additional goal is to provide life safety during emergencies that can be mitigated using methods comparable to those used in case of fire.

4.1.3* Crowd Movement. An additional goal is to provide for reasonably safe emergency crowd movement and, where required, reasonably safe nonemergency crowd movement. (emphasis added)

The limitation to a single action first appeared in NFPA 101 in the 1988 edition, through Proposal 101-58 in the Fall-1987 TCR.

101 -58 - (5-2. 1.5.3*): Accept in Principle
SUBMITTER: Subcommittee on Means of Egress
RECOMMENDATION: Revise 5-2. 1.5.3* to read:
5-2. 1.5.3* A latch or other fastening device on a door shall be provided with a knob, handle, panic bar or other simple type of releasing device, having an obvious method of operation under all lighting conditions. Doors shall be openable with no more than one releasing operation. Egress doors from individual living units and guest rooms of residential occupancies may be provided with additional devices such as a night latch, dead bolt or security chain provided such device is operable from the inside without the use of a key or tool and are mounted at a height not to exceed 48 in. above the finished floor.

SUBSTANTIATION: The Committee has consistently interpreted that "the method of operation of which is obvious, even in darkness" is a performance criteria which normally prohibits more than one function to open a door. This interpretation was backed by research (Study of Human Engineering considerations in Emergency Exiting from Secure Spaces -U.S. Navy Civil Engineering Laboratory Report #7762-2, 1978) and is formalized in FI 73-13 issued April, 1975 and FI 76-97 issued August, 1979.

This revision will allow these F.I.s to be retired.
It will also provide for the common practice of putting a security chain or latch on doors to dwelling units or guest rooms.

COMMITTEE ACTION: Accept in Principle.
Revise 5-2. 1.5.3* to read:
5-2. 1.5.3* A latch or other fastening device on a door shall be provided with a knob, handle, panic bar or other simple type of releasing device, having an obvious method of operation under all lighting conditions. Doors shall be openable with no more than one releasing operation. Egress doors from individual living units and guest rooms of residential occupancies may be provided with not more than two additional devices such as a night latch, dead bolt or security chain provided such device is operable from the inside without the use of a key or tool and are mounted at a height not to exceed 48 in. above the finished floor. (emphasis added)

Exception: Existing security devices shall not exceed 60 in. (153 mm) in height above the finished floor.

COMMITTEE COMMENT: In reviewing the proposal, the Committee on Safety to Life questioned the number of additional devices this would allow. Considering typical existing installations, the Committee established a maximum of two additional devices. In addition, it was noted that the existing installations of a maximum of two additional devices below 60 in. rather than 48 in. should be allowed to be continued without modification.

By codifying the interpretations of the committee into the 1988 edition of NFPA 101, the intent of the Life Safety Code became clear – only 1 releasing operation is allowed on any egress door. A principle that has not changed since, and has been consistently applied. Due to this limitation on door hardware operation and other improvements in life safety features, the record of life loss in all facilities since this change took place in conjunction with an increased level of due diligence designers apply to a buildings egress system, and the consistent enforcement of codes and standards, has been dramatically reduced.
I adamantly disagree with Mr. Dave Geenens’ statement that “fire is not the biggest threat to human life.” Prior to the introduction of significant changes to the life safety features of codes and standards used throughout the United States, fire losses were dramatically higher than they are today. By removing one of the key proven and universally applied life safety features – that it doesn’t take an occupant more than a single action to operate an egress door – will expose building occupants in schools and in business occupancies with educational spaces to more risks, not remove risks that children and young adults would face in various emergency situations.

“Classroom safety” has become a buzzword for creative solutions to blunt ANY danger a child or young adult in a classroom setting may be exposed to. Removing carefully studied and understood principles of life safety is not the answer. NFPA has encouraged evaluation of this question by sponsoring a School Safety, Codes and Security Workshop on December 3 and 4 of 2014. In the report it suggests that “Developing new door-locking procedures and technologies, including remote and automatic controls” was a priority. NFPA 730 on Premises Security is a guide intended to assist persons in developing plans for addressing security intrusions.

In Section 4.1.1 of NFPA 730 2014 it states:

4.1.1 The primary goals of this guide should be as follows.

(1) To provide an environment for the occupants inside or near a building that is reasonably safe from security threats

(2) To provide reasonable safeguards for protection of property from security threats

The mechanism that NFPA 730 provides is the development of security objectives through a security plan. Included in a security plan are recommendations for:

(1) Restrict area perimeter – secure and monitor the perimeter of the facility.

(2) Secure site assets – secure and monitor restricted areas or potentially critical targets within the facility.

(3) Screen and control access – control access to the facility and to restricted areas within the facility by screening and/or inspecting individuals and vehicles as they enter, including the following:

a) Measures to deter the unauthorized introduction of dangerous substances and devices that could facilitate an attack or actions having serious negative consequences

b) Measures implementing a regularly updated identification system that checks the identification of facility personnel and other persons seeking access to the facility and that discourages abuse through established disciplinary measures

(4) Deter, detect or delay – deter, detect or delay an attack, creating sufficient time to implement countermeasures between detection of an attack and the point at which the attack becomes successful

NFPA 730 goes on to identify additional means for control of data, and facilities from internal attack. These guiding elements never include adding additional restrictions to the means of egress.

Several school shooting incidents have been evaluated and reports prepared regarding how the situations could have been better handled. In a statement to the Ohio Board of Building Standards at their meeting on June 5, 2015, Joseph Bergant, former Chardon City School Superintendent, indicated in response to the February 27, 2012 shooting that the doors to the classrooms were lockable only from the outside and were unlockable from the inside by simply turning the door handle. He also stated “…that he wished they would have changed the lock sets earlier to ones that would be locked all the time while still opening easily from the inside.” He went on to state that is would have been “…the cheapest and most effective option, because schools are open 24/7 and anyone can bring something into a school at any time.”

In addition, the State of Connecticut’s School Safety Infrastructure Council reported on June 27, 2014 what steps should be taken to address the issue of intruders and shooting incidents in schools. The pertinent portions to the issue in NFPA 101 and the number of actions to open a door during egress are as follows:

The following minimum standards shall be met:

6.15. Classroom door locks shall be easy to lock and allow for quick release in the event of an emergency.

6.16. Classroom doors with interior locks shall have the capability of being unlocked/ released from the interior with one motion.
6.17. All door locking systems must comply with life safety and State of Connecticut building and fire codes to allow emergency evacuation. [emphasis added]

Fundamentally, I do not believe that there is a consensus among the voters and users of NFPA 101 that a second action should be allowed on classroom doors. I do not believe that there has been a demonstrated need for such options amongst those in the security industry that believes that the use of such devices is appropriate. I do not believe that as a theoretical means of providing a higher level of security, that devices that require a second action are truly part of what should be considered appropriate in the Life Safety Code and Building Code published by NFPA.

The International Code Council (ICC) membership recently had to address this exact same topic. The membership adopted as part of its 2018 International Building Code (IBC), technical requirements for any such locking device in new Section 1010.4.4.4, which reads:

1010.1.4.4 Locking arrangements in educational occupancies. In Group E and Group B educational occupancies, egress doors from classrooms, offices and other occupied rooms shall be permitted to be provided with locking arrangements designed to keep intruders from entering the room where all of the following conditions are met:

1. The door shall be capable of being unlocked from outside the room with a key or other approved means.
2. The door shall be openable from within the room in accordance with Section 1010.1.9.
3. Modifications shall not be made to listed panic hardware, fire door hardware or door closers.

1010.1.4.4.1 Remote operation of locks. Remote operation of locks complying with Section 1010.1.4.4 shall be permitted.

1010.1.9.5 Unlatching. The unlatching of any door or leaf shall not require more than one operation. [emphasis added]

The American Institute of Architects stated policy on Codes and Standards includes a call for Comprehensive, Coordinated and Contemporary codes for use throughout the United States. With the decision by the NFPA vote to support the three CAMs that the ICC building code, the NFPA Life Safety Code and the NFPA Building Code will be coordinated on the fundamental question of operating devices on egress doors.

As an industry, we the designers, builders and owners have relied upon codes and standards working together to provide the appropriate installation of products that have been tested and proven to meet minimum criteria of performance in buildings. These expected minimum criteria have not been established for how secondary devices placed on classroom doors will perform in a crisis situation. Many of these devices have never been tested to meet any criteria. To simply allow their use is contrary to the goals, objectives and I believe intent, of the Life Safety Code.

The appellants are a product manufacturer and a representative of that same manufacturer. Their interests do not reflect the broad spectrum of the designers, code officials and representatives of the disability community that testified at the hearing in support of the action that was taken. I urge you to uphold the vote at the Technical Meeting on CAMs No. 101-3, 101-5 and 101-6.

Very truly yours,

David S. Collins, FAIA, NCARB

cc: Andrew Goldberg
John Peavy, PE
The American Institute of Architects
July 17, 2017

Standards Council  
National Fire Protection Association  
1 Batterymarch Park  
Quincy, MA 02169

RE: An appeal of actions taken at the NFPA Technical Meeting on June 7, 2017, in Boston, MA.  
My name is Curt Decker; I serve as the Executive Director of the National Disability Rights Network. We are located at 820 1st Street, Suite 740 in Washington, DC 20002.  
I am writing about three actions:

1. Overturn the Association Action and Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision No. 30. Including any related portions of First Revision No. 2002 (CAM 101-3).
2. Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision No. 32 (CAM 101-5).
3. Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision No. 50 (CAM 101-6).

The National Disability Rights Networks stands in OPPOSITION to the appeals listed above.

On June 7th, 2017 Chris Griffin offered testimony supporting CAM's 101-3, 101-5, and 101-6 at the Technical Meeting in Boston. Chris is the Executive Director of the Disability Law Center in Massachusetts and was representing the National Disability Rights Network at those proceedings. In each case, she testified the language the above-listed appeals (if successful) would reinstate was “discriminatory to those with physical or visual impairments, impedes egress and is in violation of Standards and laws regarding accessibility.”

We offer this letter to assure the Standards Council her testimony was an accurate representation of the views of the National Disability Rights Network. On behalf of the 57 federally mandated Protection and Advocacy Systems that serve every state and territory of the United States, we urge you to reject the
appeals listed above. If, in the course of your deliberations you wish to solicit additional information, please contact me at curt.decker@ndrn.org or 202-408-9514.

Respectfully Submitted,

[Signature]

Curtis Decker
Executive Director
July 16, 2017

Standards Council
National Fire Protection Association
1 Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA  02169

RE: Appeals file on CAMs 101-3, 101-5, and 101-6

On behalf of the Builders Hardware Manufacturers Association (BHMA), please consider these comments regarding the appeal by Mr. Geenens, Fire Door Solutions, and the appeal by Mr. Pardoe, Pardoe Consulting (the appeals), requesting the Standards Council to overturn the Association action on CAMs 101-3, 101-5, and 101-6. These motions passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting by a strong to overwhelming majority:

- Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision No. 30 Including any Related Portions of First Revision No. 2002 (CAM 101-3),
- Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision No. 32 (CAM 101-5), and
- Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision No. 50 (CAM 101-6).

BHMA asks the Standards Council to deny the appeals.

These three CAMs rejected an identifiable part of similar proposed revisions to the 2018 edition of NFPA 101. If the CAMs had not been successfully supported by the NFPA voting members, NFPA 101 would have allowed, on doors in the means of egress in existing educational occupancies, existing day care occupancies, and existing business occupancies, up to two motions to release a door for egress. Allowing up to two releasing motions would be a significant departure from the long-standing life safety requirement of NFPA 101 Section 7.2.1.5.10.2 requiring not more than one releasing operation.

BHMA is gravely concerned with implications to life safety should NFPA 101 allow up to two releasing motions to release a door for egress. For example, let’s consider these requirements in NFPA 101: 7.2.1.5.10* A latch or other fastening device on a door leaf shall be provided with a releasing device that has an obvious method of operation and that is readily operated under all lighting conditions.

Allowing up to two releasing motions to release a door for egress, would, from a simplistic perspective, allow additional locking / latching hardware to be installed on the door. Unfortunately, simply allowing additional hardware with one more releasing motion also allows for unintended consequences.

Unintended consequences – questions:

- Can it be assured that each and every occupant, in every conceivable and inconceivable emergency situation, and in absolute darkness, would know that two releasing motions are required, and be able to accomplish the two releasing operations in order to effect egress?
- Can it be assured that no hardware will be installed that would require two simultaneous releasing motions, which could prevent egress for some people.
- If hardware is installed where one releasing motion must occur prior to the second, will each occupant know the required sequence?
- Can it be assured that each blind person will know a second releasing motion is required?

For these reasons, and others, we urge the Standards Council to uphold the Association action on CAMs 101-3, 101-5, and 101-6.

Best regards,

John

John Woestman
Builders Hardware Manufacturers Association
355 Lexington Ave., 15th Floor
New York, NY  10017-6603
www.buildershardware.com
jwoestman@kellencompany.com
515-422-6027 (direct / mobile)
MEMORANDUM

(AMENDMENT)

TO: Technical Committee on Educational and Day-Care Occupancies

FROM: Kelly Carey, Project Administrator

DATE: July 5, 2017


Amendment 101-4: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 185

In accordance with the Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards, the final results show the Amendment HAS NOT achieved the 2/3 majority vote needed to recommend approval of the Association Action by the Technical Committee. The Committee has voted not to support Amendment 101-4. As a result, the recommendation to the Standards Council is previous edition text.

22 Members Eligible to Vote
3 Ballots Not Returned (Hansen, Merck, Wolf)

12 Agree (w/ comment, Mertens)
7 Disagree (Aaby, Dannaway, Dubrowski, Gandy, Longhitano, Stashak, Szachinowicz)
0 Abstentions

The number of votes needed to recommend approval of the Association Action is 13.

(22 eligible to vote - 3 not returned - 0 abstentions = 19 × 0.66 = 12.54)

Ballot comments are attached for your review.

The Regs at 1.6.2.(b) state: An appeal relating to an Association Technical Meeting Amendment that has been submitted shall be filed no later than 5 days after the notice of the amendment final ballot results are published in accordance with 4.2.6. The appeal date will be posted with the final ballot results of the Correlating Committee.
June 2017 Amendment 101-4 Ballot Form  
For the Technical Committee on Educational and Day-Care Occupancies  

Amendment 101-4: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 185  

Instructions:  

Vote Agree to support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session.  

Vote Disagree to withhold support on the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text. Note: where no previous edition text exists the text is simply deleted.  

☐ Agree   I support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session which reads as follows (changes shown legislatively to the Second Draft):  

15.2.2.4* Classroom Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.  
Classroom doors shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that the locking means is approved and all of the following conditions are met:  

(1) The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.  
(2) The unlocking and unlatching from the classroom side of the door can be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.  
(3) The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations.  
(4) Egress shall require not more than one releasing operation.  
(45) The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.  
(56) Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the classroom side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.  
(67) The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.  
(78) The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.  
(89) Modifications to fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.  
(910) The emergency action plan, required by 15.7.1, shall address the use of the locking and unlocking means from within and outside the room.  
(1011) Staff shall be drilled in the engagement and release of the locking means, from within and outside the room, as part of the emergency egress drills required by 15.7.2.  

☐ Disagree* I do not support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text which reads as follows (text shown clean):  

15.2.2.4* Classroom Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.  
Classroom doors shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that the locking means is approved and all of the following conditions are met:  

(1) The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.  
(2) The unlocking and unlatching from the classroom side of the door can be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.  
(3) The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations.  
(4) The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.  
(5) Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the classroom side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(6) The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.

(7) The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.

(8) Modifications to fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.

(9) The emergency action plan, required by 15.7.1, shall address the use of the locking and unlocking means from within and outside the room.

(10) Staff shall be drilled in the engagement and release of the locking means, from within and outside the room, as part of the emergency egress drills required by 15.7.2.

☐ Abstain*

*Please give reasons for voting “Disagree” or “Abstain”:

Conflicting with (3) and will create interpretation and enforcement confusion.

Signature: __________________________

Name - Please Print: MARK ARBY

Date: 6/17/17

Please return as soon as possible, but no later than Thursday, June 22, 2017 to:

Kelly Carey, Project Administrator
National Fire Protection Association
1 Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02169
EMAIL: kcarey@nfpa.org
FAX: 617-984-7110
Amendment 101-4: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 185

Instructions:

Vote Agree to support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session.

Vote Disagree to withhold support on the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text. Note: where no previous edition text exists the text is simply deleted.

☐ Agree I support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session which reads as follows (changes shown legislatively to the Second Draft):

15.2.2.4* Classroom Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.

Classroom doors shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that the locking means is approved and all of the following conditions are met:

(1) The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
(2) The unlocking and unlatching from the classroom side of the door can be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(3) The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations.
(4) Egress shall require not more than one releasing operation.
(45) The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
(56) Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the classroom side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(67) The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.
(78) The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.
(89) Modifications to fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.
(910) The emergency action plan, required by 15.7.1, shall address the use of the locking and unlocking means from within and outside the room.
(4011) Staff shall be drilled in the engagement and release of the locking means, from within and outside the room, as part of the emergency egress drills required by 15.7.2.

X Disagree* I do not support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text which reads as follows (text shown clean):

15.2.2.4* Classroom Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.

Classroom doors shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that the locking means is approved and all of the following conditions are met:

(1) The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
(2) The unlocking and unlatching from the classroom side of the door can be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(3) The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations.
(4) The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
(5) Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the classroom side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(6) The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.
(7) The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.
(8) Modifications to fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.
(9) The emergency action plan, required by 15.7.1, shall address the use of the locking and unlocking means from within and outside the room.
(10) Staff shall be drilled in the engagement and release of the locking means, from within and outside the room, as part of the emergency egress drills required by 15.7.2.

☐ Abstain*

*Please give reasons for voting "Disagree" or "Abstain":

This requirement is reasonable for existing occupancies given the requirements for staff training.

Signature: 

Name - Please Print: Samuel Dannaway

Date: 6/20/17

Please return as soon as possible, but no later than Thursday, June 22, 2017 to:

Kelly Carey, Project Administrator
National Fire Protection Association
1 Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02169
EMAIL: kcarey@nfpa.org
FAX: 617-984-7110
Amendment 101-4: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 185

Instructions:

Vote Agree to support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session.

Vote Disagree to withhold support on the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text. Note: where no previous edition text exists the text is simply deleted.

☐ Agree

I support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session which reads as follows (changes shown legislatively to the Second Draft):

15.2.2.2.4* Classroom Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.
Classroom doors shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that the locking means is approved and all of the following conditions are met:
(1) The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
(2) The unlocking and unlatching from the classroom side of the door can be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(3) The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations.
(4) Egress shall require not more than one releasing operation.
(5) The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
(6) Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the classroom side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(7) The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.
(8) The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.
(9) Modifications to fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.
(10) The emergency action plan, required by 15.7.1, shall address the use of the locking and unlocking means from within and outside the room.
(11) Staff shall be drilled in the engagement and release of the locking means, from within and outside the room, as part of the emergency egress drills required by 15.7.2.

☒ Disagree

I do not support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text which reads as follows (text shown clean):

15.2.2.2.4* Classroom Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.
Classroom doors shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that the locking means is approved and all of the following conditions are met:
(1) The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
(2) The unlocking and unlatching from the classroom side of the door can be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(3) The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations.
(4) The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
(5) Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the classroom side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(6) The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.
(7) The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.
(8) Modifications to fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.
(9) The emergency action plan, required by 15.7.1, shall address the use of the locking and unlocking means from within and outside the room.
(10) Staff shall be drilled in the engagement and release of the locking means, from within and outside the room, as part of the emergency egress drills required by 15.7.2.

☐ Abstain*

*Please give reasons for voting “Disagree” or “Abstain”:

| I believe that the second releasing operation was a critical component of the solution |
| package for existing Educational occupancies. |

Signature: 

Name - Please Print: Victor L. Dubrowski

Date: June 12, 2017

Please return as soon as possible, but no later than Thursday, June 22, 2017 to:

Kelly Carey, Project Administrator
National Fire Protection Association
1 Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02169
EMAIL: kcarey@nfpa.org
FAX: 617-984-7110

June 2017 Amendment 101-4 Ballot Form

For the Technical Committee on Educational and Day-Care Occupancies

Amendment 101-4: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 185

Instructions:

**Vote Agree** to support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session.

**Vote Disagree** to withhold support on the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text. Note: where no previous edition text exists the text is simply deleted.

---

**Agree**

I support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session which reads as follows *(changes shown legislatively to the Second Draft)*:

15.2.2.4* Classroom Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.

Classroom doors shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that the locking means is approved and all of the following conditions are met:

1. The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
2. The unlocking and unlatching from the classroom side of the door can be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
3. The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations.
4. Egress shall require not more than one releasing operation.
5. The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
6. Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the classroom side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
7. The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.
8. The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.
9. Modifications to fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.
10. The emergency action plan, required by 15.7.1, shall address the use of the locking and unlocking means from within and outside the room.
11. Staff shall be drilled in the engagement and release of the locking means, from within and outside the room, as part of the emergency egress drills required by 15.7.2.

---

**Disagree**

I do not support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text which reads as follows *(text shown clean)*:

15.2.2.4* Classroom Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.

Classroom doors shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that the locking means is approved and all of the following conditions are met:

1. The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
2. The unlocking and unlatching from the classroom side of the door can be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
3. The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations.
4. The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
5. Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the classroom side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
6. The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.

7. The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.

8. Modifications to fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.

9. The emergency action plan, required by 15.7.1, shall address the use of the locking and unlocking means from within and outside the room.

10. Staff shall be drilled in the engagement and release of the locking means, from within and outside the room, as part of the emergency egress drills required by 15.7.2.

☐ Abstain*

*Please give reasons for voting “Disagree” or “Abstain”:

Second look--The agree wording is confusing. The original wording in the disagree is the most realistic approach for the schools to do something to an existing facility.

________________________________________________________________________

Signature: [Signature]

Name - Please Print: Max E. Gandy

Date: 26 June 2017

Please return as soon as possible, but no later than Thursday, June 22, 2017 to:

Kelly Carey, Project Administrator
National Fire Protection Association
1 Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02169
EMAIL: kcarey@nfpa.org
FAX: 617-984-7110
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*June 2017 Amendment 101-4 Ballot Form*

For the Technical Committee on Educational and Day-Care Occupancies

Amendment 101-4: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 185

Instructions:

**Vote Agree** to support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session.

**Vote Disagree** to withhold support on the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text. Note: where no previous edition text exists the text is simply deleted.

**Agree**

I support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session which reads as follows *(changes shown legislatively to the Second Draft)*:

15.2.2.2.A* Classroom Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.

Classroom doors shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that the locking means is approved and all of the following conditions are met:

1. The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
2. The unlocking and unlatching from the classroom side of the door can be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
3. The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations.
4. Egress shall require not more than one releasing operation.
5. The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
6. Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the classroom side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
7. The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.
8. The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.
9. Modifications to fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.
10. The emergency action plan, required by 15.7.1, shall address the use of the locking and unlocking means from within and outside the room.
11. Staff shall be drilled in the engagement and release of the locking means, from within and outside the room, as part of the emergency egress drills required by 15.7.2.

**Disagree**

I do not support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text which reads as follows *(text shown clean)*:

1
15.2.2.2.4* Classroom Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.
Classroom doors shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that the locking means is approved and all of the following conditions are met:
(1) The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
(2) The unlocking and unlatching from the classroom side of the door can be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(3) The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations.
(4) The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
(5) Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the classroom side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(6) The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.
(7) The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.
(8) Modifications to fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.
(9) The emergency action plan, required by 15.7.1, shall address the use of the locking and unlocking means from within and outside the room.
(10) Staff shall be drilled in the engagement and release of the locking means, from within and outside the room, as part of the emergency egress drills required by 15.7.2.

Abstain*

*Please give reasons for voting “Disagree” or “Abstain”:

In existing facilities with limited funding, a simple slide bolt may be their only option, and it certainly is not too complicated for trained staff.

Signature: [Signature]
Name - Please Print: Alfred J. Longhitano
Date: 6/27/2017

Please return as soon as possible, but no later than Thursday, June 22, 2017 to:

Kelly Carey, Project Administrator
National Fire Protection Association
1 Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02169
EMAIL: kcarey@nfpa.org
FAX: 617-984-7110
Amendment 101-4: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 185

Instructions:

**Vote Agree** to support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session.

**Vote Disagree** to withhold support on the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text. Note: where no previous edition text exists the text is simply deleted.

☐ **Agree**

I support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session which reads as follows *(changes shown legislatively to the Second Draft)*:

15.2.2.2.4* Classroom Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.
Classroom doors shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that the locking means is approved and all of the following conditions are met:
(1) The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
(2) The unlocking and unlatching from the classroom side of the door can be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(3) The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations.
(4) Egress shall require not more than one releasing operation.
(5) The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
(6) Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the classroom side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(7) The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.
(8) The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.
(9) Modifications to fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.
(10) The emergency action plan, required by 15.7.1, shall address the use of the locking and unlocking means from within and outside the room.
(11) Staff shall be drilled in the engagement and release of the locking means, from within and outside the room, as part of the emergency egress drills required by 15.7.2.

☒ **Disagree**

I do not support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text which reads as follows *(text shown clean)*:

15.2.2.2.4* Classroom Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.
Classroom doors shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that the locking means is approved and all of the following conditions are met:
(1) The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
(2) The unlocking and unlatching from the classroom side of the door can be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(3) The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations.
(4) The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
(5) Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the classroom side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(6) The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.
(7) The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.
(8) Modifications to fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.
(9) The emergency action plan, required by 15.7.1, shall address the use of the locking and unlocking means from within and outside the room.
(10) Staff shall be drilled in the engagement and release of the locking means, from within and outside the room, as part of the emergency egress drills required by 15.7.2.

*Please give reasons for voting “Disagree” or “Abstain”:

The multiple provisions of the proposed 15.2.2.4 will weed out the dangerous hardware and locking means being promoted in the marketplace by those unfamiliar with traditional means of egress science found in the model codes. The majority of the security/intruder devices being promoted are even more dangerous, not allowing students the ability to open doors in the event of a fire so they can evacuate or preventing first responders from gaining entry. These devices are also to cumbersome or complicated for students to figure out how to use or beyond their reach. If the codes do not start providing guidance on safe ways to deal with security concerns, these more dangerous devices will continue to be used, because the codes do not provide a better alternative. The Committee recognizes that hardware does exist, and could be used that allows two locking mechanisms with one releasing actions (as existing code requires), such as residential “hotel” locking systems, but the proposed language addresses the inevitable existing conditions that cannot utilize the “hotel locks.” The AHJs need to be more sensitive to the budgetary constraints that have become a fact of life in government and public institutions. Schools often cannot afford the expense of retrofitting “hotel” locks and in some instances existing doors cannot accommodate a new locking system so the entire door needs to be replaced. The language calls for drills and training which historically educational occupancies are active in performing. The language calls for the locking device to be at a level that can be reached by students without the need for a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort. This language provides the opportunity for a secondary lock that will be consistent with the means of egress design required for the primary lock. This conflict between security and life safety has come to a head in recent years and it can no longer be ignored. There have been too many incidents that have created substantial concern with families of students and the staff that occupy educational buildings and fire authorities need to be able to address these fears in a consistent and viable manner. The efforts of the NFPA working with security organizations (ASIS), and multiple first responder organizations such as fire, police, FBI, and educational representatives to resolve this conflict resulted in a statement that security and life safety authorities need to work together, inserting language in the already existent model codes that will create buildings that work both ways: Prevent unwanted intruders but also permit safe and timely egress if needed-with human and life safety as the first priority.

Signature: [Signature]

Name - Please Print: Catherine L. Stashak

Date: June 13, 2017

Please return as soon as possible, but no later than Thursday, June 22, 2017 to:
Amendment 101-4: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 185

Instructions:

**Vote Agree** to support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session.

**Vote Disagree** to withhold support on the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text. Note: where no previous edition text exists the text is simply deleted.

☐ **Agree**

I support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session which reads as follows *(changes shown legislatively to the Second Draft)*:

15.2.2.2.4* Classroom Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.

Classroom doors shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that the locking means is approved and all of the following conditions are met:

1. The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
2. The unlocking and unlatching from the classroom side of the door can be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
3. The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations.
4. Egress shall require not more than one releasing operation.
5. The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
6. Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the classroom side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
7. The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.
8. The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.
9. Modifications to fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.
10. The emergency action plan, required by 15.7.1, shall address the use of the locking and unlocking means from within and outside the room.
11. Staff shall be drilled in the engagement and release of the locking means, from within and outside the room, as part of the emergency egress drills required by 15.7.2.

X **Disagree**

I do not support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text which reads as follows *(text shown clean)*:

15.2.2.2.4* Classroom Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.

Classroom doors shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that the locking means is approved and all of the following conditions are met:

1. The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
2. The unlocking and unlatching from the classroom side of the door can be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
3. The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations.
4. The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
5. Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the classroom side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(6) The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.

(7) The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.

(8) Modifications to fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.

(9) The emergency action plan, required by 15.7.1, shall address the use of the locking and unlocking means from within and outside the room.

(10) Staff shall be drilled in the engagement and release of the locking means, from within and outside the room, as part of the emergency egress drills required by 15.7.2.

☐ Abstain*

*Please give reasons for voting “Disagree” or “Abstain”:

I am advocating for a return to the text originally promulgated by the well informed and balanced SAF-END Technical Committee (pre Tech Session modification floor vote). The Technical Committee put a tremendous amount of time, effort, vetting, and deliberation toward arriving at a sound, reasonable, actionable, practical, defensible, affordable, and implementable solution. It well balances (emphasis added) the need for fire safety, life safety and security in an existing (emphasis added) educational facility. In a new facility, there is no question/argument that the owner/operator have the ability to fully comply with the “one releasing mechanism” requirement. Case closed! But in an existing facility, the answer is not as cut and dry. The Life Safety Code has had a long history of allowing differentiation between new and existing facilities based upon many well justifiable and supportable reasons. I can personally attest to many such debates over applications of new vs. existing code provisions as a first-hand participant in the NFPA TC process since 1993. That is exactly the case in this matter, and the SAF-END TC got this one right. The old aphorism of “never allow the perfect to get in the way of good” applies here. Forcing existing educational occupancy building owners/operators to comply with the Tech Session’s version of the code language will at best dissuade them from making any enhancements to the classroom doors/hardware, and at worst, they will opt to utilize the many cheaper, unproven, untested, and potentially downright dangerous aftermarket door locking/jamming/blocking devices that have hit the marketplace. Not making any enhancements will in no way improve the security of the building occupants during an unwanted intruder/active shooter scenario. Utilizing the many cheaper, unproven, untested, and potentially downright dangerous aftermarket door locking/jamming/blocking devices that have hit the marketplace will jeopardize the safety of the building’s occupants during a fire scenario. There are over 100,000 K-12 schools in the USA. Competing interests and scarcity of resources are the norm in the vast majority of said facilities. Don’t place the owners/operators of these facilities in this Hobson’s choice predicament. Reason and reasonableness must be allowed to prevail and the differentiation of provisions between new and existing occupancy applications must be allowed to stand in this matter.

By way of background and frame of reference for my commentary, I am at present the Chief Operating Officer (COO) and former Chief Facilities Officer (CFO) for the 42rd largest public school district in the USA. I have been a Principal Member of the SAF-END TC since 1997 in the User Category. I am also a registered professional fire protection engineer (PE) by licensure and a fire protection engineer by training/education via attaining both a Bachelor’s and Master’s Degree in Fire Protection Engineering from the University of Maryland.
Signature: [Signature]

Name - Please Print: [Signature]

Date: June 16, 2017

Please return as soon as possible, but no later than Thursday, June 22, 2017 to:

Kelly Carey, Project Administrator
National Fire Protection Association
1 Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02169
EMAIL: kcarey@nfpa.org
FAX: 617-984-7110
CERTIFIED AMENDING MOTION 101-4

MR. WOESTMAN: Thanks, Ms. Moderator.

John Woestman, BHMA. Move 101-4, please.

MS. MANLEY: Thank you.

There is a motion on the floor to accept an identifiable part of Public Comment Number 185. Is there a second?

PARTICIPANT: Second.

MS. MANLEY: Thank you. We do have a second.

Please proceed with the discussion on the motion.

MR. WOESTMAN: I'll be brief.

For the same reasons you approved the last motion which remove language that would allow up to two releasing motions now reinsert language that limits it to one releasing motion, please.

Thank you.
MS. MANLEY: All right. Mr. Koffel, would you like to offer the committee's position?

MR. KOFFEL: Yes. I think we've already heard the committee's position on the issue, but just so that I'm sure everyone understands the motion and, again, John, correct me if I'm wrong, if you are looking at the motion's report, in 101-4 it shows paren 3 remaining, saying not more than two operations, and then paren 4 saying there's only a single operation.

It is my understanding the intent of this motion is that this action is cumulative with the action that was just taken.

So, again, if you are looking at the motion's report, item three would disappear and what is shown as item four would be the new item three.

MS. MANLEY: All right. Thank you, gentlemen.

With that we're going to open up debate on the motion. Please provide your name, affiliation and whether you are speaking in support or against the motion.

Microphone 3, please.

MR. COLLINS: Dave Collins, Chair of TC Means of Egress. We didn't take any position on
this one officially, so I'm speaking for myself.

I believe this brings us back to the start

-- standard that the --

MS. MANLEY: Are you for or against?

MR. COLLINS: I am for. I'm standing in

the for motion.

MS. MANLEY: I understand that. Thank

you. I want to hear it as well. All right?

MR. COLLINS: I'm for it, Bonnie.

MS. MANLEY: Thank you.

MR. COLLINS: I believe this will bring us

back to the historic position that NFPA has held

that one operation for means of egress is the only

operation we're willing to allow, even if it's for

an existing building.

There's no -- this is an economic issue,

which is what it comes down to. Are you going to

spend enough money to put the right devices in that

are tested and proven to be reliable for this

application? Or are you going to allow jury-rigged

operations that I've seen all over this country that

are being used for this kind of application?

I urge you to keep the standard strict and
direct. Thank you.

MS. MANLEY: All right.
Microphone 5, please.

MS. GRIFFIN: Christie Griffin again from the Disability Law Center, speaking in support of the motion. I won't bore you with my remarks again, but they stand for this motion as for the previous one in that we believe that allowing more than one releasing operation would violate the Americans with Disabilities Act.

MS. MANLEY: Thank you.

Microphone 5, please.

MR. POPE: Yes. Thank you. Robert Pope, National Association of State Fire Marshals. The commonalities of these motions allows for brevity, so I will stand by my prior remarks.

MS. MANLEY: So you actually were in support, correct?

MR. POPE: Yes, ma'am.

MS. MANLEY: All right. I just wanted to make sure.

All right. Is there any further discussion on Motion 101-4 to accept -- are you standing at 9? Sorry. Go ahead.

MR. QUINTERNO: Yes, ma'am. Vincent Quinterno, voting on behalf of the Rhode Island State Fire Marshal for the motion.
Again, my comments before stand. And also
I want to understand that this isn't necessary for
the occupants inside the school, because if this
gets passed it could affect almost every other
occupancy that's out there. So the lives of the
firefighters could also be affected as well too,
getting out of a building filled with smoke, so
thank you.

**MS. MANLEY:** All right. Is there any
further discussion on Motion 101-4 to accept an
identifiable part of Public Comment Number 185?
Okay.

Seeing none, Mr. Chair?

**MR. KOFFEL:** No.

**MS. MANLEY:** No. All right. Before we
vote, let me restate the motion.
The motion on the floor is to accept an
identifiable part of Public Comment Number 18. To
vote, please touch the vote button. If you
recommend the text in favor of the motion and
recommend the text on screen 1, touch yes. If you
wish to vote against the motion and recommend the
text on screen 2, vote no. Please record our vote
now.
The voting is going to close in five
seconds. All right. Voting is now -- the balloting
is now closed. Thank you.

The results of the vote are 233 for the
motion recommending the text on screen 1 and 41
against the motion recommending the text on screen
2. The motion has passed.

Let's now proceed with the discussion on
Certified Amending Motion 101-5.

Microphone 5, please.

CERTIFIED AMENDING MOTION 101-5

MR. WOESTMAN: Thanks, Ms. Moderator.

John Woestman, BHMA, please move 101-5.

MS. MANLEY: All right.

PARTICIPANT: Second.

MS. MANLEY: Hold on. Hold on. I
understand.

There's a motion on the floor to reject an
identifiable part of the second correlating revision
number 32. There is a second. Correct? So we did
have a second. Please proceed with the discussion
on the motion.

Microphone 5.

MR. WOESTMAN: Thank you. John Woestman,
BHMA, in support of the motion.

A little explanation. The previous two
MEMORANDUM

(AMENDMENT)

TO: Correlating Committee on Safety to Life

FROM: Kelly Carey, Project Administrator

DATE: August 1, 2017


In accordance with the Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards, the final results show the Amendment HAS achieved the ¾ majority vote needed to recommend approval of the Association Action by the Correlating Committee. As a result, the recommendation to the Standards Council is to support the Technical Committee recommendation to previous edition text.

11 Members Eligible to Vote
0 Ballots Not Returned
9 Agree (w/comment: Kalie, Rosenbaum)
2 Disagree (Hugo, Koffel)
0 Abstain

The number of votes needed to recommend approval of the Association Action is 9.

\[
11 \times 0.75 = 8.25
\]

Ballot comments are attached for your review.

The transcripts from the Annual 2017 NFPA Tech Session are now available at: www.nfpa.org/techsession.

The Regs at 1.6.2.(b) state: An appeal relating to an Association Technical Meeting Amendment that has been submitted shall be filed no later than 5 days after the notice of the amendment final ballot results are published in accordance with 4.2.6.

Appeal Closing Date for this Amendment is August 6, 2017.
Amendment 101-4: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 185

The Amendment DID NOT achieve the necessary 2/3 majority vote of the Technical Committee on Educational and Day-Care Occupancies. As a result, the recommendation of the TC is previous edition text.

15.2.2.2.4* Classroom Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.
Classroom doors shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that the locking means is approved and all of the following conditions are met:
(1) The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
(2) The unlocking and unlatching from the classroom side of the door can be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(3) The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations. [TEXT DELETED BY ACTION OF NFPA MEMBERSHIP ON CAM 101-3; NOT SUBJECT TO TC/CC BALLOT PER NFPA REGS.]
(4) Egress shall require not more than one releasing operation. [TEXT ADDED BY ACTION OF NFPA MEMBERSHIP ON CAM 101-4; FAILED TC BALLOT; RESULT RECOMMENDS PREVIOUS EDITION TEXT; NO PREVIOUS EDITION TEXT EXISTS, THEREFORE TEXT IS DELETED.]
(4) The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
(3) Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the classroom side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(4) The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.
(5) The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.
(6) Modifications to fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.
(7) The emergency action plan, required by 15.7.1, shall address the use of the locking and unlocking means from within and outside the room.
(8) Staff shall be drilled in the engagement and release of the locking means, from within and outside the room, as part of the emergency egress drills required by 15.7.2.

Instructions:

Vote Agree if you foresee no correlation issues with the Technical Committee recommendation.

Vote Disagree if you see one or more correlation issues with the Technical Committee recommendation.

☐ Agree

☐ Disagree*

☐ Abstain*

*Please give reasons for voting “Disagree” or “Abstain”:

Although latch and lock engagement can be debate, this
change would appear to limit release to one operation (7.2.1.5, 10.2) as permission to use two operations has been removed, but the regulations are confusing and difficult to follow.

Signature: [Signature]

Name - Please Print: J. Edmund Kelley Jr.

Date: 7/12/17

Please return as soon as possible, but no later than July 12, 2017 to:

Kelly Carey, Project Administrator
National Fire Protection Association
1 Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02169
EMAIL: kcarey@nfpa.org
FAX: 617-984-7110
**NFPA 101, Life Safety Code**

**June 2017 Amendment 101-4 Ballot Form**

For the Correlating Committee on Safety to Life

**Amendment 101-4: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 185**

The Amendment DID NOT achieve the necessary 2/3 majority vote of the Technical Committee on Educational and Day-Care Occupancies. As a result, the recommendation of the TC is previous edition text.

15.2.2.4* Classroom Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.

Classroom doors shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that the locking means is approved and all of the following conditions are met:

1. The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
2. The unlocking and unlatching from the classroom side of the door can be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
3. The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations. [TEXT DELETED BY ACTION OF NFPA MEMBERSHIP ON CAM 101-3; NOT SUBJECT TO TC/CC BALLOT PER NFPA REGS.]
4. The releasing mechanism shall require not more than one releasing operation. [TEXT ADDED BY ACTION OF NFPA MEMBERSHIP ON CAM 101-4; FAILED TC BALLOT; RESULT RECOMMENDS PREVIOUS EDITION TEXT; NO PREVIOUS EDITION TEXT EXISTS, THEREFORE TEXT IS DELETED.]
5. The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
6. Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the classroom side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
7. The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.
8. The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.
9. Modifications to fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.
10. The emergency action plan, required by 15.7.1, shall address the use of the locking and unlocking means from within and outside the room.
11. Staff shall be drilled in the engagement and release of the locking means, from within and outside the room, as part of the emergency egress drills required by 15.7.2.

**Instructions:**

**Vote Agree** if you foresee no correlation issues with the Technical Committee recommendation.

**Vote Disagree** if you see one or more correlation issues with the Technical Committee recommendation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>I foresee NO correlation issues being created.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree*</td>
<td>I foresee one or more correlation issues being created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstain*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please give reasons for voting “Disagree” or “Abstain”:

Agree with Comments of Kofel
Signature: 

Name - Please Print: "Eric Rosendal"

Date: 7/24/2017

Please return as soon as possible, but no later than July 12, 2017 to:

Kelly Carey, Project Administrator
National Fire Protection Association
1 Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02169
EMAIL: kcarey@nfpa.org
FAX: 617-984-7110
Amendment 101-4: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 185

The Amendment DID NOT achieve the necessary 2/3 majority vote of the Technical Committee on Educational and Day-Care Occupancies. As a result, the recommendation of the TC is previous edition text.

15.2.2.4* Classroom Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry. Classroom doors shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that the locking means is approved and all of the following conditions are met:

1. The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.

2. The unlocking and unlatching from the classroom side of the door can be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.

3. The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations. [TEXT DELETED BY ACTION OF NFPA MEMBERSHIP ON CAM 101-3; NOT SUBJECT TO TC/CC BALLOT PER NFPA REGS.]

4. Egress shall require not more than one releasing operation. [TEXT ADDED BY ACTION OF NFPA MEMBERSHIP ON CAM 101-4; FAILED TC BALLOT; RESULT RECOMMENDS PREVIOUS EDITION TEXT; NO PREVIOUS EDITION TEXT EXISTS, THEREFORE TEXT IS DELETED.]

5. The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.

6. Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the classroom side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.

7. The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.

8. The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.

9. Modifications to fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.

10. The emergency action plan, required by 15.7.1, shall address the use of the locking and unlocking means from within and outside the room.

11. Staff shall be drilled in the engagement and release of the locking means, from within and outside the room, as part of the emergency egress drills required by 15.7.2.

Instructions:

Vote Agree if you foresee no correlation issues with the Technical Committee recommendation.

Vote Disagree* if you see one or more correlation issues with the Technical Committee recommendation.

□ Agree

I foresee NO correlation issues being created.

X Disagree*

I foresee one or more correlation issues being created.

□ Abstain*

*Please give reasons for voting “Disagree” or “Abstain”:

The CAM text of 101-3 (removes the two releasing operations) did not appear to be clear to the TC while voting on 101-4.
TCC needs to consider the actions in 101-5 for 101-4 also. If 101-4 is successful inserting the one releasing text, then 101-5 needs the same text inserted.

Signature: __________
Name - Please Print: Jeffrey M. Hugo, CBO
Date: __________

Please return as soon as possible, but no later than July 12, 2017 to:

Kelly Carcy, Project Administrator
National Fire Protection Association
1 Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02169
EMAIL: kcarey@nfpa.org
FAX: 617-984-7110
Amendment 101-4: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 185

The Amendment DID NOT achieve the necessary 2/3 majority vote of the Technical Committee on Educational and Day-Care Occupancies. As a result, the recommendation of the TC is previous edition text.

15.2.2.2.4* Classroom Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.
Classroom doors shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that the locking means is approved and all of the following conditions are met:
(1) The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
(2) The unlocking and unlatching from the classroom side of the door can be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(3) The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations. [TEXT DELETED BY ACTION OF NFPA MEMBERSHIP ON CAM 101-3; NOT SUBJECT TO TCCC BALLOT PER NFPA REGS.]
(4) Egress shall require not more than one releasing operation. [TEXT ADDED BY ACTION OF NFPA MEMBERSHIP ON CAM 101-4; FAILED TC BALLOT; RESULT RECOMMENDS PREVIOUS EDITION TEXT; NO PREVIOUS EDITION TEXT EXISTS, THEREFORE TEXT IS DELETED.]
(4) The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
(3) Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the classroom side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(4) The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.
(5) The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.
(6) Modifications to fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.
(7) The emergency action plan, required by 15.7.1, shall address the use of the locking and unlocking means from within and outside the room.
(8) Staff shall be drilled in the engagement and release of the locking means, from within and outside the room, as part of the emergency egress drills required by 15.7.2.

Instructions:
Vote Agree if you foresee no correlation issues with the Technical Committee recommendation.
Vote Disagree if you see one or more correlation issues with the Technical Committee recommendation.

☐ Agree

☐ Disagree* I foresee one or more correlation issues being created.

☐ Abstain*  

*Please give reasons for voting “Disagree” or “Abstain”:

In reviewing the Committee ballots, the Committee is not suggesting a return to the 2015 text; but rather
the Committee did not support the amendment. The correlation issue is that a similar section will appear in Chapter 14 but will not appear in Chapter 15.

Signature: 

Name - Please Print: William E Koffel

Date: 12 July 2017

Please return as soon as possible, but no later than July 12, 2017 to:

Kelly Carey, Project Administrator
National Fire Protection Association
1 Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02169
EMAIL: kcarey@nfpa.org
FAX: 617-984-7110
MEMORANDUM

TO: Technical Committee on Educational and Day-Care Occupancies

FROM: Kelly Carey, Project Administrator

DATE: June 9, 2017


At the NFPA Technical Meeting (Tech Session), held June 7, 2017, NFPA 101 was recommended for issuance with the following:

Amendment 101-3: Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision No. 30 including any related portions of First Revision No. 2002

Amendment 101-5: Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision No. 32

Pursuant to section 4.6 and Table 1 of the Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards (Regs), the following are not subject to Committee ballot:

☐ An Amendment to Reject a Second Revision and related portions of a First Revision.

☐ Or

☐ An Amendment to Reject a Second Revision where no First Revision or related part of a First Revision exists.

As a result, NFPA 101 shall be forwarded to the Standards Council for action in accordance with section 4.5.3.7 and 4.7 of the Regs.

The transcripts from the Annual 2017 NFPA Technical Meeting (Tech Session) will be available within two weeks after the Tech Session at: www.nfpa.org/techsession.

Note:

In accordance with 1.6.2(a) of the Regs, anyone who is dissatisfied with the results of the floor motions from the June 2017 NFPA Technical Meeting may appeal the results. Appeals shall be filed no later than twenty days after the NFPA Technical Meeting at which Association action on the issuance of the Standard was recommended. The final date to file any such appeal is June 27, 2017.
Let's now proceed with the discussion on
Certified Amending Motion 101-5.

Microphone 5, please.

CERTIFIED AMENDING MOTION 101-5

MR. WOESTMAN: Thanks, Ms. Moderator.

John Woestman, BHMA, please move 101-5.

MS. MANLEY: All right.

PARTICIPANT: Second.

MS. MANLEY: Hold on. Hold on. I
understand.

There's a motion on the floor to reject an
identifiable part of the second correlating revision
number 32. There is a second. Correct? So we did
have a second. Please proceed with the discussion
on the motion.

Microphone 5.

MR. WOESTMAN: Thank you. John Woestman,
BHMA, in support of the motion.

A little explanation. The previous two
CAMS were a pair. And the next two are a pair, but this one isn't. And that's because I screwed up.

(Laughter)

MR. WOESTMAN: CAMs or NITMAMs or CAMs are based on public comments. And I missed the work of the Correlating Committee when they put some -- or proposed some language in the day care chapter so I didn't submit a public comment. So we don't have the other half of this topic to do -- to insert language because I failed in putting the public comment together.

So what we can do here is approve this motion, delete the language that allows up to two motions, and then by default the existing requirements in Chapter 7 would apply, which requires no more than one motion to open a door in the means of egress.

Thank you.

MS. MANLEY: All right. Mr. Koffel, would you like to offer the committee's position?

MR. KOFFEL: Yes. This is the same issue, only we're in an existing day care. As John pointed out, we do not have the companion CAM to vote on. He is correct that there is language in Chapter 7 that would address this for an occupant load more than
three people in the room.

I would encourage him, not that the
council needs more work, but I would encourage him
to appeal, to try to get the list to look the same
in all the chapters since, you know, there certainly
are people who read through the code and you see one
-- something in Chapter 15 and you see it different
in Chapter 17, you might wonder why the text is
different.

So I think this would be an appropriate
action for an appeal if this motion passes. And I
don't know -- again, I think we've heard the
committee's perspective, but no comment from the
Technical Committee.

Thank you.

**MS. MANLEY:** All right. Thank you,
gentlemen.

With that we're going to open up debate on
the motion. Please provide your name, affiliation,
and whether you're speaking for or against the
motion.

Microphone 5, please.

**MR. HIRSCHLER:** Marcelo Hirschler, GBH

International for NFPA and in support of the motion.

The only thing I wanted to put for the
record is that both the Technical Correlating Committee and Standards Council should look at correlating this chapter with the others, and I hope that this can be done.

Thank you.

**MS. MANLEY:** All right. Let's go with microphone 5 again, please.

**MS. GRIFFIN:** Hi, Christine Griffin again from the Disability Law Center, in support of the motion.

Again, for the same reasons we think allowing the language that would say not more than two releasing operations would violate the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Thank you.

**MS. MANLEY:** All right.

Microphone 7, please.

**MR. POPE:** Robert Pope, National Association of State Fire Marshals, in support of the motion.

**MS. MANLEY:** Thank you, sir.

All right. Is there any further discussion on 101-5 to reject an identifiable part of second correlating revision number 32?

Number 3. There we go.
MR. COLLINS: Dave Collins. Just for the record, I'm in support of the motion.

MS. MANLEY: Who do you represent, Dave?

MR. COLLINS: I'm representing myself.

MS. MANLEY: Thank you, sir.

Any further discussion on Motion 101-5, to reject an identifiable part of second correlating revision number 32?

All right. Seeing none, Mr. Chair?

Anything?

MR. KOFFEL: No.

MS. MANLEY: Great. Before we vote, let me restate the motion.

The motion on the floor is to reject an identifiable part of second correlating revision number 32. To vote, touch the vote button. If you wish to vote in favor of the motion and recommend the text on screen 1, touch yes. If you wish to vote against the motion and recommend the text on screen 2, touch no. Please record your vote now.

All right. The balloting is going to close in about five seconds. All right. The balloting is closed. Thank you.

The results of the vote are 249 for the motion, recommending the text on screen 1 and 27
against the motion, recommending the text on screen

2. This motion has passed.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Technical Committee on Mercantile and Business Occupancies

FROM: Kelly Carey, Project Administrator

DATE: June 9, 2017


At the NFPA Technical Meeting (Tech Session), held June 7, 2017, NFPA 101 was recommended for issuance with the following:

Amendment 101-6: Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision No. 50
Amendment 101-14: Reject Second Correlating Revision No. 60

Pursuant to section 4.6 and Table 1 of the Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards (Regs), the following are not subject to Committee ballot:

- An Amendment to Reject a Second Revision and related portions of a First Revision.
- Or
- An Amendment to Reject a Second Revision where no First Revision or related part of a First Revision exists.

As a result, NFPA 101 shall be forwarded to the Standards Council for action in accordance with section 4.5.3.7 and 4.7 of the Regs.

The transcripts from the Annual 2017 NFPA Technical Meeting (Tech Session) will be available within two weeks after the Tech Session at: www.nfpa.org/techsession.

Note:
In accordance with 1.6.2(a) of the Regs, anyone who is dissatisfied with the results of the floor motions from the June 2017 NFPA Technical Meeting may appeal the results. Appeals shall be filed no later than twenty days after the NFPA Technical Meeting at which Association action on the issuance of the Standard was recommended. The final date to file any such appeal is June 27, 2017.
We're going to proceed with the discussion on Certified Amending Motion 101-6.

Microphone 5, please.

CERTIFIED AMENDING MOTION 101-6

MR. WOESTMAN: John Woestman, BHMA, move 101-6.

MS. MANLEY: Thank you.

There's a motion on the floor to reject an identifiable part of second correlating revision number 50. Is there a second?

PARTICIPANT: Second.

MS. MANLEY: Thank you. We do have a second. Please proceed with the discussion on the motion.

MR. WOESTMAN: John Woestman, BHMA, in support of this motion.

For all the same reasons that you just heard, this was intended to address colleges and universities. However -- in classrooms in colleges and universities. However, if you look at the context of the language, if you need another reason to support this motion is the language doesn't scope this to just colleges and universities and
classrooms. It leaves it wide open for business and mercantile occupancies. So any door.

The language says any door could be -- in an existing building could be modified to be -- to allow up to two releasing motions. So for all the reasons earlier and for the unfortunate hoops in the broader scope, this language really should be supported -- the CAM should be supported and revert back to one motion.

Thank you.

MS. MANLEY: All right. Mr. Koffel, would you like to offer the committee's position?

MR. KOFFEL: Again, similar issue, only we're now in existing business occupancies. I would ask the chair to recognize the Chair of Business and Mercantile, Amy Murdock.

MS. MANLEY: Microphone 2, please.

MS. MURDOCK: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you, Bill.

Just to clarify, 39 is existing business occupancies, not mercantile. So that was incorrect.

In the wake of the unfortunate mass shooting events our committee had to take action to balance security and fire. Along with many other Technical Committees, our committee was very sincere
in our discussions and remained focus on the
technical needs and safety for all.

    Door locking provisions in business
occupancies, yes, especially those for educational
purposes such as our colleges and universities, is a
very important and relevant issue.

    The committee was interested in the
subject of door locking in locations such as
classroom doors and so, therefore, we did seek the
guidance of the education and day care Technical
Committee. We also had careful consideration within
our own business occupancy and office building
members within our staff on the committee. We also
did ask for input from universities, specifically
because it is a differential from education.

    The workshop on safety -- on School Safety
Codes and security's final report documented the
need to lock classroom doors against the unwanted
entry. The multiple provisions proposed as a part
of 392222 cover the concerns for accomplishing door
locking in business occupancies such as buildings in
the college and university campuses in a safe manner
for those who are older than what you would see in
education and day care.

    The detailed criteria would weed out the
dangerous hardware and locking means promoted in the marketplace right now by those who are unfamiliar with traditional egress needs. While the provisions are written to apply to doors in business occupancies, the annex text did clarify that the intent of this section is really for security measures that are needed to prevent unwanted entry. And examples that we use were those included in colleges, universities, classroom doors and office spaces open to the public; laboratories, instructional rooms and spaces.

For existing doors, it is permitted that the releasing mechanism can open the door with not more than two releasing operations.

The proposed language supports a safe installation and necessary guidance for situations that are already occurring in our existing buildings, in our existing universities. The language is written so that it's done to protect the occupants to allow for operable, safe and quick egress during emergencies.

The committee recognizes that the hardware does exist and can be used that allows the two locking mechanism devices appropriately.

The proposed language addressed the
inevitable existing conditions that cannot use a single operating mechanism.

We had 27 eligible voters, four not returned, 18 affirmative, two were affirmative with comments, three were negative with comments.

MS. MANLEY: All right. Thank you very much. With that we're going to open up debate on the motion. Please provide your name, affiliation, and whether you are speaking in support or against the motion.

Microphone 5, please.

MS. GRIFFIN: Hi, Christine Griffin again, speaking for the Disability Law Center and the National Disability Rights Network in support of the motion for the reasons already stated.

MS. MANLEY: Thank you.

Microphone 3, please.

MR. COLLINS: Dave Collins, speaking for myself in support of the motion.

MS. MANLEY: Thank you.

MR. COLLINS: I think it's important to recognize the significant improvements that have been made by all of these changes to the various criteria associated with locking doors. And I think they've done an outstanding job. The only one that
I personally disagree with is two operations. No matter what that means, as far as the type of device installed, it is a delay. And a delay in any activity involving getting out of a space, whether it's under a means of duress, whether you're being held against your will, whether you're there on another emergency, we've recognized for years and required that a single means of operation is necessary in order to provide safety.

I urge your support of this committee.

This action.

**MS. MANLEY:** Thank you.

Let's go back to number 9, please.

**MR. QUINTERNO:** Hi, Vincent Quinterno on behalf of the Rhode Island State Fire Marshal's office. Again, where in -- we're for the motion.

**MS. MANLEY:** Thank you.

**MR. QUINTERNO:** And as I stated earlier, it's not just about the occupants, it's about the firefighters that have to go into these dangerous situations and recognize a second means of egress or second latching, locking mechanism to get safely out of a building could danger, endanger their life.

Thank you.

**MS. MANLEY:** Thank you.
I'd like to go back to number 7, please.

MR. POPE: Robert Pope, National Association of State Fire Marshals, in favor of the motion.

I would just add at this point that B occupancy is a B occupancy. And they exceed far beyond the footprint of educational facilities. Starting down that path seems to begin to change the means of egress across the very, very broad spectrum of structures and facilities. And something to this point unknown to us, both as responders and occupants.

Thank you.

MS. MANLEY: All right. Microphone 5, please.

MR. WOESTMAN: John Woestman, BHMA, in support of the motion.

Ms. Murdock, thank you very much for the clarification, I was wrong. And thank you as far as this only applies to business. Thanks.

And just remember, as I said earlier, the committee did a lot of good work. This whole list of things is good work. It's important work. And we were very careful in working with staff on these many motions to only, only focus on the one versus
two to bring that issue before the membership for
consideration. We did not want to risk all the
other good work. And that's not on the table for
debate here or vote.

So remember, we're only voting on this
motion which would retain no more than one motion
allowed for door hardware in the means of egress.

Thank you.

MS. MANLEY: All right. Five, are you
looking to speak? Please do.

MR. MERTENS: Matthew Mertens, North Shore
Fire Department, speaking in favor of the motion.
And also I'm a member of the Educational Day Care
Committee that helped work on this original proposal
that you saw today.

And one of the things that I think needs
to be identified is one of the biggest struggles
that we came up with wrangling with this was age
appropriateness and where the threats were coming
from. They're coming from within the classrooms.
And we felt that in the younger schools, the younger
kids, not so much. You get into the college level -
- one of the hardest things for me, with a wife as a
teacher and kids in schools, is that these doorjamb
tools and other adjuncts that are on the market are
being used against the teachers. They're being
assaulted in their classrooms and nobody can get in
to rescue them.

There are impacts to all of these angles
no matter which way you look at this. And it is a
very complicated problem that we all face. And we
are all looking to find the best solution.

But as you get into the older schools and
the businesses and you're dealing with adults, the
ability to overpower other people and prevent help
from arriving is something that's very real and
caught me by surprise when we had witnesses that
were testifying to that and that people need to be
aware.

Thank you.

**MS. MANLEY:** All right. Any further
discussion on Motion 101-6 to reject an identifiable
part of second correlating revision number 50?

Seeing none, Mr. Koffel? Anything?

**MR. KOFFEL:** No.

**MS. MANLEY:** No. All right. Before we
vote, let me restate the motion.

The motion on the floor is to reject an
identifiable part of second correlating revision
number 50. To vote, touch the vote button.
If you wish to vote in favor of the motion and recommend the text on screen 1, touch yes. If you wish to vote against the motion and recommend the text on screen 2 vote no. Please record your vote now.

All right. We're going to close voting. About five seconds. All right. Voting is now closed. Thank you.

The results of the vote are, 245 for the motion, recommending the text on screen 1 and 26 against the motion, recommending the text on screen 2. The motion has passed.
July 17, 2017

Standards Council c/o Ms. Linda Fuller
NFPA
1 Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02169-7471

RE: CAM 101-6
CODE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS: LIFE SAFETY CODE

Standards Council:

The limitation of door releasing operations remains a significant concern for multiple Occupancy Chapters in the Life Safety Code. The purpose of this letter is to assist the Standards Council in their review of the appeal request letters from K. Pardoe, Pardoe Consulting, LLC, and D. Geenens, Fire Door Solutions, both requesting the NFPA Standards Council overturn the Association action to Reject an Identifiable Part of Second Correlating Revision No. 50 (CAM 101-6). This Motion passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting on June 7, 2017.

This letter simply supports the execution of the code development process in my opinion as Chair of the Technical Committee Mercantile and Business Occupancies (MER Technical Committee). This letter neither represents my personal/professional opinion nor the personal/professional opinion of the MER Technical Committee membership.

To date, the code development and approval process relating to the one or two releasing operations for door hardware provisions (Section 39.2.2.2.2) was conducted fairly, justly, and as required by the Standards process. All those wanting to participate had the opportunity during all stages of the code development process. No person was denied the right to be heard regarding this door hardware matter. NFPA staff have properly handled the code development process.

I participated during the entire day of the NFPA Technical Meeting on June 7, 2017. As Chair of the MER Technical Committee, I was requested by Mr. William Koffel to testify on behalf of the MER Technical Committee. My testimony was an accurate summary of the MER Technical Committee proceedings. The testimony that occurred after my statement and prior to the floor vote was properly handled by NFPA staff. All those present at the Technical Session had the opportunity to testify. The floor vote was properly conducted.

The appeal documents received appear to support the MER Technical Committee’s reason for allowing the two releasing operations for door hardware. My testimony at the Technical Session on June 7, 2017, as Chair of the MER Technical Committee, summarized the Committee’s position on this matter. The appeal letter received from K. Pardoe, Pardoe Consulting, LLC refers to a code correlating matter between Chapter 7 and the Occupancy Chapters that should be reviewed by the Correlating Committee to ensure that conflict is not presented by the Motion(s) in question.

In summary, the code development process relating to the code provisions outlined in Section 39.2.2.2.2 was properly executed by the MER Technical Committee and NFPA Staff. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Amy J. Murdock, PE
Chair Technical Committee Mercantile and Business Occupancies
Maynard, Mary

From: Amy Murdock <amym@codeconsultants.com>
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2017 9:53 PM
To: Maynard, Mary; Fuller, Linda
Cc: Solomon, Robert; Bigda, Kristin
Subject: RE: Appeals to NFPA Standards Council re: CAMs 101-3, 101-5 and 101-6

Team,

On a somewhat related matter, I believe it appropriate to advise that, in my personal/professional opinion, some form of accountability for statements made during testimony should occur. In my opinion as Chair of the MER Technical Committee, and as a Professional Engineer registered in multiple states, two statements made during testimony regarding this door releasing hardware matter were presented verbally as “factual” statements:

1. The two releasing operations for door hardware “would violate the American with Disabilities Act.” (CAM 101-3)
2. The two releasing operations for door hardware would affect “the fire fighters that have to go into these dangerous situations and recognize a second means of egress or second latching, locking mechanism to get safely out of a building could danger, endanger their life”. (CAM 101-6)

These “factual” statements made during the testimony process were unsupported by evidence and should have been considered opinions by the voting membership; not sure if that was clearly identified or if it is simply understood that every comment mentioned in the testimony was an “opinion” other than testimony by Mr. Koffel and/or the Technical Committee Chairs (since we are to abstain from providing personal/professional opinions).

The MER Technical Committee strives to analyze code revisions, changes or additions with the utmost respect for professionalism and any “factual” statements made are required to be substantiated. For example, the statement made regarding ADA compliance should have been properly substantiated with a specific reference to the 2010 ADA Standards; that was not done. The statement made regarding endangering fire fighters should have been properly substantiated with examples; that was not done. Consideration for opinion versus factual statements should be reviewed.

My apologies if this is outlined in a formal document that explains the regulation process, I simply don’t have access to that at the moment. And to be honest, I wouldn’t have time over the next two days to research with my schedule; I am heading on a family vacation Thursday this week. I wanted to send this concern to you now while fresh in my mind during my review of the transcripts and the appeal documents received.

Let me know if you have any time Tuesday or Wednesday this week to discuss; or some time next week Tuesday through Friday. Or, if preferred, simply reply to my email.

Thanks!

Regards,
Amy

Amy J. Murdock
Principal

CODE CONSULTANTS, INC.
314.991.2633

From: Maynard, Mary [mailto:mmaynard@NFPA.org]
Sent: Tuesday, June 13, 2017 1:46 PM
To: Maynard, Mary <mmaynard@NFPA.org>
Subject: Appeals to NFPA Standards Council re: CAMs 101-3, 101-5 and 101-6
MEMORANDUM (AMENDMENT)

TO: Technical Committee on Mercantile and Business Occupancies

FROM: Kelly Carey, Project Administrator

DATE: July 5, 2017


Amendment 101-7: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 192

In accordance with the Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards, the final results show the Amendment HAS achieved the 2/3 majority vote needed to recommend approval of the Association Action by the Technical Committee. The Committee has voted to support Amendment 101-7. As a result, the recommendation to the Standards Council is to Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 192.

26 Members Eligible to Vote
3 Ballots Not Returned (Burris, Jacobs, Tidwell)

20 Agree (w/ comment, Dodge)
3 Disagree (Aaby, Derr, Murdock)
0 Abstentions

The number of votes needed to recommend approval of the Association Action is 16.

(26 eligible to vote - 3 not returned - 0 abstentions = 23 × 0.66 = 15.18)

Ballot comments are attached for your review.

The Regs at 1.6.2.(b) state: An appeal relating to an Association Technical Meeting Amendment that has been submitted shall be filed no later than 5 days after the notice of the amendment final ballot results are published in accordance with 4.2.6. The appeal date will be posted with the final ballot results of the Correlating Committee.
Amendment 101-7: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 192

Instructions:
Vote **Agree** to support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session.
Vote **Disagree** to withhold support on the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text. Note: where no previous edition text exists the text is simply deleted.

☐ **Agree**  
I support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session which reads as follows *changes shown legislatively to the Second Draft*:

39.2.2.2* Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.
Where approved, doors, other than those complying with 39.2.11.2, shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that all of the following conditions are met:
(1) The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
(2) The unlocking and unlatching operation from the egress side of the door shall be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(3) The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations.
(4) Egress shall require not more than one releasing operation.
(42) The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
(56) Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the egress side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(67) The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.
(78) The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.
(89) Modifications to required fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.

☒ **Disagree**  
I do not support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text which reads as follows *text shown clean*:

39.2.2.2* Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.
Where approved, doors, other than those complying with 39.2.11.2, shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that all of the following conditions are met:
(1) The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
(2) The unlocking and unlatching operation from the egress side of the door shall be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(3) The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations.
(4) The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
(5) Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the egress side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(6) The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.
(7) The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.
(8) Modifications to required fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.

☐ Abstain*

*Please give reasons for voting "Disagree" or "Abstain":

Conflicts with (3) and will create interpretation and enforcement confusion.

Signature: __________________________

Name - Please Print: Mark Abby

Date: 8/17/2017

Please return as soon as possible, but no later than Thursday, June 22, 2017 to:

Kelly Carey, Project Administrator
National Fire Protection Association
1 Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02169
EMAIL: kcarey@nfpa.org
FAX: 617-984-7110
Amendment 101-7: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 192

Instructions:
Vote Agree to support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session.
Vote Disagree to withhold support on the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text. Note: where no previous edition text exists the text is simply deleted.

☐ Agree I support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session which reads as follows (changes shown legislatively to the Second Draft):

39.2.2.2* Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.
Where approved, doors, other than those complying with 39.2.11.2, shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that all of the following conditions are met:
(1) The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
(2) The unlocking and unlatching operation from the egress side of the door shall be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(3) The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations.
(4) Egress shall require not more than one releasing operation.
(45) The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
(56) Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the egress side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(67) The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.
(78) The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.
(89) Modifications to required fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.

☒ Disagree* I do not support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text which reads as follows (text shown clean):

39.2.2.2* Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.
Where approved, doors, other than those complying with 39.2.11.2, shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that all of the following conditions are met:
(1) The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
(2) The unlocking and unlatching operation from the egress side of the door shall be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(3) The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations.
(4) The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
(5) Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the egress side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(6) The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.
(7) The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.
(8) Modifications to required fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.

☐ Abstain*

*Please give reasons for voting “Disagree” or “Abstain”:

I disagree with the proposed amendment as supported by membership vote at the Technical Session because the proposed requirement to allow a maximum of two locking methods was to address a concern of aftermarket devices that are dangerous, including devices attached to door closers out of the reach of potential occupants and the need to address security concerns in existing occupancies. The two locking methods is based on a recommendation from a workshop on school safety by a diverse group of stakeholders. Even though the workshop was associated with schools, the risk associated with workplace violence in business occupancies is similar to the issues discussed for schools.

Signature: [Signature]

Name - Please Print: Kevin L. Derr, PE

Date: June 19, 2017

Please return as soon as possible, but no later than Thursday, June 22, 2017 to:

Kelly Carey, Project Administrator
National Fire Protection Association
1 Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02169
EMAIL: kcarey@nfpa.org
FAX: 617-984-7110
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Amendment 101-7: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 192

Instructions:
Vote Agree to support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session.
Vote Disagree to withhold support on the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text. Note: where no previous edition text exists the text is simply deleted.

☑ Agree

I support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session which reads as follows (changes shown legislatively to the Second Draft):

39.2.2.2.2* Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.
Where approved, doors, other than those complying with 39.2.11.2, shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that all of the following conditions are met:
(1) The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
(2) The unlocking and unlatching operation from the egress side of the door shall be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(3) The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations.
(4) Egress shall require not more than one releasing operation.
(45) The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
(56) Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the egress side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(67) The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.
(78) The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.
(89) Modifications to required fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.

☐ Disagree*

I do not support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text which reads as follows (text shown clean):

39.2.2.2.2* Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.
Where approved, doors, other than those complying with 39.2.11.2, shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that all of the following conditions are met:
(1) The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
(2) The unlocking and unlatching operation from the egress side of the door shall be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(3) The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations.
(4) The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
(5) Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the egress side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
employees, but also by outsiders, adding to the occupant load with no corresponding exit ways.

When I write and lecture about product safety (my area of expertise) I advocate planning for unintentional misuses of a product. Likewise, I think that we should anticipate that the empty space in an office will be filled at some time in the life expectancy of that building and we should plan for that. It seems to me that buildings should be designed to be used under reasonably foreseeable conditions of use. It further seems to me that it is entirely foreseeable that office workers in some buildings will be asked to work in a space, open or not, that is 10 feet by 10 feet rather than a space that is 10 feet by 15 feet. That is what the existing Code requires which also states that the occupant load may be determined as the “maximum probable population of the space” (38.1.7)

Signature: [Signature]

Name - Please Print: [Name]

Date: [Date]
Please return as soon as possible, but no later than [Date] to:

Kelly Carey, Project Administrator
National Fire Protection Association
1 Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02169
EMAIL: kcarey@nfpa.org
FAX: 617-984-7110
Amendment 101-7: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 192

Instructions:

Vote Agree to support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session.

Vote Disagree to withhold support on the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text. Note: where no previous edition text exists the text is simply deleted.

Agree

I support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session which reads as follows (changes shown legislatively to the Second Draft):

39.2.2.2.2+ Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.
Where approved, doors, other than those complying with 39.2.11.2, shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that all of the following conditions are met:
(1) The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
(2) The unlocking and unlatching operation from the egress side of the door shall be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(3) The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations.
(4) Egress shall require not more than one releasing operation.
(45) The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
(56) Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the egress side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(67) The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.
(78) The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.
(82) Modifications to required fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.

Disagree*

I do not support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text which reads as follows (text shown clean):

39.2.2.2.2+ Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.
Where approved, doors, other than those complying with 39.2.11.2, shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that all of the following conditions are met:
(1) The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
(2) The unlocking and unlatching operation from the egress side of the door shall be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(3) The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations.
(4) The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
(5) Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the egress side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
(6) The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.

(7) The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.

(8) Modifications to required fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.

☐ Abstain*

*Please give reasons for voting “Disagree” or “Abstain”:

**DISAGREE:** In my professional opinion, two releasing operations in a business occupancy should be maintained. Considering the reason for this locking arrangement provision in the first place, we are discussing BOTH fire and security. In the situation of BOTH fire and security, two releasing operations can easily be engaged or disengaged quickly within a business occupancy by occupants. The releasing mechanisms would have to fully comply with the code in regards to location, reach ranges, and ability to easily identify that these mechanisms are in place. All eight (8) provisions in this section properly protect for BOTH fire and security. The FACT is that building owners/users are buying and installing their own secondary methods for locking a door. Those such devices pose a MUCH GREATER hazard than the inclusion of a second locking device in accordance with the provisions 1-8 outlined herein. The Technical Committee originally approved the two (2) releasing mechanisms and I continue to strongly support two (2) releasing mechanisms. In the testimony at the hearings, someone mentioned that the ADA standards would not allow two releasing mechanisms. That is INACCURATE! Nothing in the 2010 Standards requires one (1) releasing mechanism. 2010 Standards Section 404.2.7 covers the topic but does not include provisions regarding the number of releasing mechanisms. The DOJ commentary states that any locking or latching mechanism that requires simultaneous finger and hand movements is to be avoided. Two releasing operations is an option without simultaneous finger and hand movement: panic hardware bar and a deadbolt. In the testimony at the hearings, someone mentioned that two releasing mechanisms will kill/harm fire fighters. I disagree with that statement with the same example: panic hardware bar and a deadbolt; both are easy to unlock for egress.

______________________________

Signature: Amy J. Murdock

Name - Please Print: Amy J. Murdock

Date: 06-16-2017

Please return as soon as possible, but no later than Thursday, June 22, 2017 to:

Kelly Carey, Project Administrator
National Fire Protection Association
1 Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02169
EMAIL: kcarey@nfpa.org
FAX: 617-984-7110
Let's now proceed with the discussion on Certified Amending Motion 101-7. Our plan is to take a break after 101-7. Perhaps that's a little bit of incentive.

Anyway, microphone 5, please.

CERTIFIED AMENDING MOTION 101-7

MR. WOESTMAN: John Woestman, BHMA, move 101-7, please.

MS. MANLEY: Thank you.

There is a motion on the floor to accept an identifiable part of Public Comment Number 192. Is there a second?

PARTICIPANT: Second.
MS. MANLEY: Thank you. We do have a second.

Please proceed with the discussion on the motion.

Microphone 5.

MR. WOESTMAN: John Woestman, BHMA, in support of this motion. This wraps up the package of these five to -- this wraps up the package of five. Please vote in support.

Thank you.

(Laughter)

MS. MANLEY: Thank you.

Mr. Koffel, would you like to present the committee's position?

MR. KOFFEL: Again, I just want to clarify, if you are looking at the motions report you will see a paren 3 there which was deleted in the previous motion. The intent of the submitter is that paren 3 will be deleted and he is adding new text shown as paren 4, which would be the new paren 3.

MS. MANLEY: All right.

With that we're going to open up debate on the motion. Please provide your name, affiliation, and whether you're speaking in support or against
the motion.

Microphone 5, please.

**MS. GRIFFIN:** Christine Griffin, Disability Law Center and National Disability Rights Network, in support of the motion.

**MS. MANLEY:** All right.

Microphone 7, please.

**MR. POPE:** Robert Pope, National Association of State Fire Marshals, supporting the motion.

**MS. MANLEY:** Microphone 1, please.

**MR. WHITE:** Jim White, I'm not for or against, but I just want to point out that screen 1 does not show what's in the -- in our tablets.

**MS. MANLEY:** Do you guys want to -- thank you. Okay.

**PARTICIPANT:** Not quoting on that.

**MR. BELL:** That is correct, Madam Chair.

That is the text that we took action on 101-6.

**MS. MANLEY:** All right. Do you want to take a break now?

(Laughter)

**MS. MANLEY:** I'm not asking you.

**MR. BELL:** I think it's clear.

**MS. MANLEY:** Tablet -- I think the
tablet’s clear, yes? All right. Thank you. I think with that -- if we can proceed. What's on the tablet, is that okay? I'm seeing general nods in the affirmative. I saw the important nod.

Is there any further discussion on 101-7, to accept an identifiable part of Public Comment Number 192?

Seeing none, Mr. Chair, anything?

MR. KOFFEL: No.

MS. MANLEY: No. All right. Before we vote, let me restate the motion.

The motion on the floor is to accept an identifiable part of the Public Comment Number 192. To vote, touch the vote button. If you wish to vote in favor of the motion and recommend the text that you see identified as screen 1, touch yes. If you wish to vote against the motion and recommend the text on screen 2, go ahead and vote -- touch no.

Please record your vote now.

All right. Balloting is going to close in five seconds. Okay. Let's go ahead and close the ballot.

And the results of the vote are 247 for the motion, recommending the text on screen 1 or what's on your tablet, and 22 against the motion,
1 recommending the text on screen 2 on your tablet.
2
3 The motion has passed.  
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
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22
23
24
25
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MEMORANDUM

(AMENDMENT)

TO: Correlating Committee on Safety to Life

FROM: Kelly Carey, Project Administrator

DATE: August 1, 2017


In accordance with the Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards, the final results show the Amendment HAS achieved the ¾ majority vote needed to recommend approval of the Association Action by the Correlating Committee. As a result, the recommendation to the Standards Council is to support the Amendment recommended by the membership vote at the Tech Session.

11 Members Eligible to Vote
0 Ballots Not Returned
9 Agree
2 Disagree (Koffel, Rosenbaum)
0 Abstain

The number of votes needed to recommend approval of the Association Action is 9.

(11 eligible to vote – 0 not returned – 0 abstentions = 11 x 0.75 = 8.25)

Ballot comments are attached for your review.

The transcripts from the Annual 2017 NFPA Tech Session are now available at:
www.nfpa.org/techsession.

The Regs at 1.6.2.(b) state: An appeal relating to an Association Technical Meeting Amendment that has been submitted shall be filed no later than 5 days after the notice of the amendment final ballot results are published in accordance with 4.2.6.

Appeal Closing Date for this Amendment is August 6, 2017.
Amendment 101-7: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 192

The Amendment did achieve the necessary 2/3 majority vote of the Technical Committee on Mercantile and Business Occupancies. As a result, the recommendation of the TC is to Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 192.

39.2.2.2.2 Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.
Where approved, doors, other than those complying with 39.2.11.2, shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that all of the following conditions are met:
1. The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
2. The unlocking and unlatching operation from the egress side of the door shall be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
3. The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations. [TEXT DELETED BY ACTION OF THE NFPA MEMBERSHIP ON CAM 101-6; NOT SUBJECT TO TC/CC BALLOT PER NFPA REGS.]
4. Egress shall require not more than one releasing operation. [TEXT ADDED BY ACTION OF THE NFPA MEMBERSHIP ON CAM 101-7; PASSED TC BALLOT.]
5. The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
6. Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the egress side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
7. The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.
8. The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.
9. Modifications to required fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.

Instructions:
Vote Agree if you foresee no correlation issues with the Technical Committee recommendation.
Vote Disagree if you see one or more correlation issues with the Technical Committee recommendation.

☐ Agree  I foresee NO correlation issues being created.
☒ Disagree* I foresee one or more correlation issues being created.
☐ Abstain*

*Please give reasons for voting “Disagree” or “Abstain”:

Same comments at 101-4. The Committee did not vote to return to previous text and if that is what happens in Chapter 39, Chapter 38 will have a section that is not in Chapter 39 to address room locking.
Signature: ____________________________

Name - Please Print: William E Koffel

Date: 12 July 2017

Please return as soon as possible, but no later than **July 12, 2017** to:

Kelly Carey, Project Administrator  
National Fire Protection Association  
1 Batterymarch Park  
Quincy, MA 02169  
EMAIL: kcarey@nfpa.org  
FAX: 617-984-7110
Amendment 101-7: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 192

The Amendment did achieve the necessary 2/3 majority vote of the Technical Committee on Mercantile and Business Occupancies. As a result, the recommendation of the TC is to Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 192.

39.2.2.2.2* Door Locking to Prevent Unwanted Entry.

Where approved, doors, other than those complying with 39.2.11.2, shall be permitted to be locked to prevent unwanted entry provided that all of the following conditions are met:

1. The locking means shall be capable of being engaged without opening the door.
2. The unlocking and unlatching operation from the egress side of the door shall be accomplished without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
3. The releasing mechanism shall open the door leaf with not more than two releasing operations. [TEXT DELETED BY ACTION OF THE NFPA MEMBERSHIP ON CAM 101-6; NOT SUBJECT TO TC/CC BALLOT PER NFPA REGS.]
4. Egress shall require not more than one releasing operation. [TEXT ADDED BY ACTION OF THE NFPA MEMBERSHIP ON CAM 101-7; PASSED TC BALLOT.]
5. The releasing mechanism for unlocking and unlatching shall be located at a height not less than 34 in. (865 mm) and not exceeding 48 in. (1220 mm) above the finished floor.
6. Locks, if remotely engaged, shall be unlockable from the egress side of the door without the use of a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort.
7. The door shall be capable of being unlocked and opened from outside the room with the necessary key or other credential.
8. The locking means shall not modify the door closer, panic hardware, or fire exit hardware.
9. Modifications to required fire door assemblies, including door hardware, shall be in accordance with NFPA 80.

Instructions:

Vote Agree if you foresee no correlation issues with the Technical Committee recommendation.

Vote Disagree if you see one or more correlation issues with the Technical Committee recommendation.

☐ Agree I foresee NO correlation issues being created.

☐ Disagree* I foresee one or more correlation issues being created.

☐ Abstain*

*Please give reasons for voting "Disagree" or "Abstain":

Agree w Comment by Koffel
Signature: [Signature]
Name - Please Print: [Name]
Date: [Date]

Please return as soon as possible, but no later than July 12, 2017 to:

Kelly Carey, Project Administrator
National Fire Protection Association
1 Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02169
EMAIL: kcary@nfpa.org
FAX: 617-984-7110
MEMORANDUM

(AMENDMENT)

TO: Technical Committee on Mercantile and Business Occupancies

FROM: Kelly Carey, Project Administrator

DATE: July 5, 2017


Amendment 101-10: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 161

In accordance with the Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards, the final results show the Amendment HAS achieved the 2/3 majority vote needed to recommend approval of the Association Action by the Technical Committee. The Committee has voted to support Amendment 101-10. As a result, the recommendation to the Standards Council is to Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 161.

26 Members Eligible to Vote
3 Ballots Not Returned (Burris, Jacobs, Tidwell)
17 Agree
6 Disagree (Bellamy, Dawe, Dodge, Freels, Gauvin, Stocker)
0 Abstentions

The number of votes needed to recommend approval of the Association Action is 16.

(26 eligible to vote - 3 not returned - 0 abstentions = 23 × 0.66 = 15.18)

Ballot comments are attached for your review.

The Regs at 1.6.2.(b) state: An appeal relating to an Association Technical Meeting Amendment that has been submitted shall be filed no later than 5 days after the notice of the amendment final ballot results are published in accordance with 4.2.6. The appeal date will be posted with the final ballot results of the Correlating Committee.
Supplemental Agenda-August 15-17, 2017 Standards Council Agenda

June 2017 Amendment 101-10 Ballot Form
For the Technical Committee on Mercantile and Business Occupancies

Amendment 101-10: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 161

Instructions:
Vote Agree to support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session.
Vote Disagree to withhold support on the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text. Note: where no previous edition text exists the text is simply deleted.

☐ Agree
I support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session which reads as follows (changes shown legislatively to the Second Draft):

38.1.7 Occupant Load.
38.1.7.1
The occupant load, in number of persons for whom means of egress and other provisions are required, shall be determined on the basis of the occupant load factors that are characteristic of the use of the space or shall be determined as the maximum probable population of the space under consideration, whichever is greater.
38.1.7.2
The occupant load for business use shall be 150 ft² (13 m²)/person.

☒ Disagree*
I do not support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text which reads as follows (text shown clean):

38.1.7 Occupant Load.
The occupant load, in number of persons for whom means of egress and other provisions are required, shall be determined on the basis of the occupant load factors that are characteristic of the use of the space or shall be determined as the maximum probable population of the space under consideration, whichever is greater.

☐ Abstain*

*Please give reasons for voting "Disagree" or "Abstain":

I agree with the Committee Statement for rejection to PC#161 - The variation of results from the cited 2012 report did not provide sufficient examples supporting the 150 sq ft per person. The cited reports lacked sufficient data to address populations outside the US and didn't get high enough participation rates to provide an accurate analysis on occupant load trends. The reports contained many statements that support multiple different occupant load factors but not one number was supported by all of the data. Business use is becoming more concentrated. Examples of this are clinical offices which are employing more occupants in the same space and are utilizing the space differently. The submitter didn't provide adequate technical justification for the proposed 450 sq ft threshold. In addition, the newly proposed occupant load factors were proposed as a gross factor, rather than net. The Code today uses a net value when determining the occupant load of conference room type spaces. In addition, the measurement of occupant load factor for these spaces is
already provided through factors currently in Table 7.3.1.2. When a tenant of an office space changes, the enforcement of the Code provisions will be increasingly complicated by allowing an increased occupant load factor (lower total occupant load.) The effect of this change can mean that a space that was evaluated using the lower occupant load factor (resulting in a higher permitted occupant load) will now have to be evaluated using a greater occupant load factor (less people) in the same space. The proposed change can be challenging to accommodate different tenants with different office use and occupant arrangement. Fire officials may not have the opportunity to address the new use of the space recognizing a greater occupant load that's present. Tenants are increasing their occupant load without providing appropriate accommodations.

________________________________________
Signature:

Name - Please Print: Timothy D. Bertram

Date: 8/21/17

Please return as soon as possible, but no later than Thursday, June 22, 2017 to:

Kelly Carey, Project Administrator
National Fire Protection Association
1 Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02169
EMAIL: kcarey@nfpa.org
FAX: 617-984-7110
Amendment 101-10: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 161

Instructions:

Vote Agree to support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session.

Vote Disagree to withhold support on the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text. Note: where no previous edition text exists the text is simply deleted.

☐ Agree

I support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session which reads as follows (changes shown legislatively to the Second Draft):

38.1.7 Occupant Load.

38.1.7.1

The occupant load, in number of persons for whom means of egress and other provisions are required, shall be determined on the basis of the occupant load factors that are characteristic of the use of the space or shall be determined as the maximum probable population of the space under consideration, whichever is greater.

38.1.7.2

The occupant load for business use shall be 150 ft² (13.5 m²)/person.

X - Disagree*

I do not support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text which reads as follows (text shown clean):

38.1.7 Occupant Load.

The occupant load, in number of persons for whom means of egress and other provisions are required, shall be determined on the basis of the occupant load factors that are characteristic of the use of the space or shall be determined as the maximum probable population of the space under consideration, whichever is greater.

☐ Abstain*

*Please give reasons for voting “Disagree” or “Abstain”:

I disagree for several reasons;

1. The Mercantile and Business TC has already voted this specific proposal down multiple times.
2. The report used is out of date, and unfortunately the data being used was extrapolated from an exceedingly low sample pool.
3. The WPI report identifies a much lower occupant load factor, which should be considered.
4. The method used for requesting the data is prone to inaccuracies.
5. The referenced report does not reflect or consider highly populated areas such as Japan, India, China or Mexico.

Signature:  

Name - Please Print: Nick Dawe

Date: 6-20-17  
Please return as soon as possible, but no later than June 22, 2017 to:

Kelly Carey, Project Administrator  
National Fire Protection Association  
1 Batterymarch Park  
Quincy, MA 02169  
EMAIL: kcarey@nfpa.org  
FAX: 617-984-7110
**NFPA 101, Life Safety Code**  
*June 2017 Amendment 101-10 Ballot Form*  
*For the Technical Committee on Mercantile and Business Occupancies*

**Amendment 101-10: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 161**

**Instructions:**

- **Vote Agree** to support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session.
- **Vote Disagree** to withhold support on the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text. Note: where no previous edition text exists the text is simply deleted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>I support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session which reads as follows <em>(changes shown legislatively to the Second Draft)</em>:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**38.1.7 Occupant Load.**

**38.1.7.1**  
The occupant load, in number of persons for whom means of egress and other provisions are required, shall be determined on the basis of the occupant load factors that are characteristic of the use of the space or shall be determined as the maximum probable population of the space under consideration, whichever is greater.

**38.1.7.2**  
The occupant load for business use shall be 150 ft² (13.7 m²)/person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree*</th>
<th>I do not support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text which reads as follows <em>(text shown clean)</em>:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**38.1.7 Occupant Load.**  
The occupant load, in number of persons for whom means of egress and other provisions are required, shall be determined on the basis of the occupant load factors that are characteristic of the use of the space or shall be determined as the maximum probable population of the space under consideration, whichever is greater.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abstain*</th>
<th>*Please give reasons for voting “Disagree” or “Abstain”:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

Quite frankly, I do not think that either side made a particularly convincing argument. The side that proposed the change never did answer the question as to whether or not they had done the occupancy load calculations under their proposed design as opposed to the calculations under the existing code in an effort to see which had the denser occupancy. It seems to me that those who propose the change simply want to provide fewer exits for the same amount of square feet of space under the mistaken assumption that the space will forever be used as the architect intended. This is a flawed assumption. In addition, he is assuming that only in-house personnel use the space and
they simply wander around to various cubbies. It seems to me that the empty space will, at times, get filled with people many of whom may be visitors. The argument was made that the occupancy was an enforcement issue, but when a tenant hires ten or twenty new people and gives them space in the office, he or she is not going to call the AHJ to ask permission. In addition, 449 (just under the proposed 450) square feet is a huge space and I cannot be convinced that it will be used only for a table and a couple of chairs and a few people. It is a conference room and we can anticipate that it will be used not only by employees, but also by outsiders, adding to the occupant load with no corresponding exit ways.

When I write and lecture about product safety (my area of expertise) I advocate planning for unintentional misuses of a product. Likewise, I think that we should anticipate that the empty space in an office will be filled at some time in the life expectancy of that building and we should plan for that. It seems to me that buildings should be designed to be used under reasonably foreseeable conditions of use. It further seems to me that it is entirely foreseeable that office workers in some buildings will be asked to work in a space, open or not, that is 10 feet by 10 feet rather than a space that is 10 feet by 15 feet. That is what the existing Code requires which also states that the occupant load may be determined as the “maximum probable population of the space” (38.1.7)

__________________________
Signature: [Signature]

Name - Please Print: [Name]

Date: 6-26-17

Please return as soon as possible, but no later than Thursday, June 22, 2017 to:

Kelly Carey, Project Administrator
National Fire Protection Association
1 Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02169
EMAIL: kcarey@nfpa.org
FAX: 617-984-7110
Supplemental Agenda-August 15-17, 2017 Standards Council Agenda

June 2017 Amendment 101-10 Ballot Form
For the Technical Committee on Mercantile and Business Occupancies

Amendment 101-10: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 161.

Instructions:

Vote Agree to support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session.

Vote Disagree to withhold support on the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text. Note: where no previous edition text exists the text is simply deleted.

☐ Agree

I support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session which reads as follows (changes shown legislatively to the Second Draft):

38.1.7 Occupant Load.

38.1.7.1 The occupant load, in number of persons for whom means of egress and other provisions are required, shall be determined on the basis of the occupant load factors that are characteristic of the use of the space or shall be determined as the maximum probable population of the space under consideration, whichever is greater.

38.1.7.2 The occupant load for business use shall be 150 ft² (13m²)/person.

☐ Disagree

I do not support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text which reads as follows (text shown clean):

38.1.7 Occupant Load.

The occupant load, in number of persons for whom means of egress and other provisions are required, shall be determined on the basis of the occupant load factors that are characteristic of the use of the space or shall be determined as the maximum probable population of the space under consideration, whichever is greater.

☐ Abstain

*Please give reasons for voting “Disagree” or “Abstain”:

Insufficient technical justification has been provided to support this less conservative proposal. Additionally, this change would put the LSC out of sync with the predominant Building Code.

Signature: Douglas R. Freels

Name - Please Print: Douglas R. Freels

Date: 8-20-17
Amendment 101-10: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 161

Instructions:

Vote Agree to support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session.

Vote Disagree to withhold support on the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text. Note: where no previous edition text exists the text is simply deleted.

☐ Agree

I support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session which reads as follows (changes shown legislatively to the Second Draft):

38.1.7 Occupant Load.

The occupant load, in number of persons for whom means of egress and other provisions are required, shall be determined on the basis of the occupant load factors that are characteristic of the use of the space or shall be determined as the maximum probable population of the space under consideration, whichever is greater.

38.1.7.2

The occupant load for business use shall be 150 ft² (13 m²)/person.

☒ Disagree*

I do not support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text which reads as follows (text shown clean):

38.1.7 Occupant Load.

The occupant load, in number of persons for whom means of egress and other provisions are required, shall be determined on the basis of the occupant load factors that are characteristic of the use of the space or shall be determined as the maximum probable population of the space under consideration, whichever is greater.

☐ Abstain*

*Please give reasons for voting “Disagree” or “Abstain”:

See committee statement for Public Comment No. 161-NFPA 101-2016

______________________________________________________

______________________________________________________

______________________________________________________

______________________________________________________

Signature: Daniel J Gauvin

Name - Please Print: Daniel J Gauvin

Date: 06/09/2017
June 2017 Amendment 101-10 Ballot Form  
For the Technical Committee on Mercantile and Business Occupancies

Amendment 101-10: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 161

Instructions:

**Vote Agree** to support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session.

**Vote Disagree** to withhold support on the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text. Note: where no previous edition text exists the text is simply deleted.

☐ Agree  
I support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session which reads as follows *(changes shown legislatively to the Second Draft)*:

38.1.7 Occupant Load.
38.1.7.1 The occupant load, in number of persons for whom means of egress and other provisions are required, shall be determined on the basis of the occupant load factors that are characteristic of the use of the space or shall be determined as the maximum probable population of the space under consideration, whichever is greater.
38.1.7.2 The occupant load for business use shall be 150 ft² (13 m²)/person.

☒ Disagree*  
I do not support the Amendment recommended by the membership by vote at Tech Session and therefore recommend previous edition text which reads as follows *(text shown clean)*:

38.1.7 Occupant Load.
The occupant load, in number of persons for whom means of egress and other provisions are required, shall be determined on the basis of the occupant load factors that are characteristic of the use of the space or shall be determined as the maximum probable population of the space under consideration, whichever is greater.

☐ Abstain*

*Please give reasons for voting “Disagree” or “Abstain”:

**There doesn't appear to be enough statistical data to support the number.**

Signature: [Signature]
Name - Please Print: Warren Stocker
Date: 6/28/17
MEMORANDUM

(AMENDMENT)

TO: Correlating Committee on Safety to Life

FROM: Kelly Carey, Project Administrator

DATE: July 13, 2017


Amendment 101-10: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 161

In accordance with the Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards, the final results show the Amendment HAS achieved the 3/4 majority vote needed to recommend approval of the Association Action by the Correlating Committee. As a result, the recommendation to the Standards Council is to Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 161.

11 Members Eligible to Vote
2 Ballots Not Returned *(Reiswig, Reynolds)*
9 Agree *(w/comment, Koffel)*
0 Disagree
0 Abstentions

The number of votes needed to recommend approval of the Association Action is 7.

(11 eligible to vote - 2 not returned - 0 abstentions = 9 × 0.75 = 6.75)

Ballot comments are attached for your review.

The *Regs* at 1.6.2.(b) state: An appeal relating to an Association Technical Meeting Amendment that has been submitted shall be filed no later than 5 days after the notice of the amendment final ballot results are published in accordance with 4.2.6.

**Appeal Closing** Date for this Amendment is **July 18, 2017**.
June 2017 Amendment 101-10 Ballot Form
For the Correlating Committee on Safety to Life

**Amendment 101-10: Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 161**

The Amendment did achieve the necessary 2/3 majority vote of the Technical Committee on Mercantile and Business Occupancies. As a result, the recommendation of the TC is to Accept an Identifiable Part of Public Comment No. 161

38.1.7 Occupant Load.

**38.1.7.1**
The occupant load, in number of persons for whom means of egress and other provisions are required, shall be determined on the basis of the occupant load factors that are characteristic of the use of the space or shall be determined as the maximum probable population of the space under consideration, whichever is greater.

**38.1.7.2**
The occupant load for business use shall be 150 ft² (13m²)/person.

**Instructions:**

- **Vote Agree** if you foresee no correlation issues with the Technical Committee recommendation.
- **Vote Disagree** if you see one or more correlation issues with the Technical Committee recommendation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>I foresee NO correlation issues being created.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree*</td>
<td>I foresee one or more correlation issues being created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abstain*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please give reasons for voting “Disagree” or “Abstain”:
There is a correlation issue of the text in the Follow-Up Motion is not accepted.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Signature: __________________________

Name - Please Print: William E Koffel

Date: 12 July 2017

Please return as soon as possible, but no later than **July 12, 2017** to:

Kelly Carey, Project Administrator
National Fire Protection Association
1 Batterymarch Park
All right. Let's proceed with the discussion on Certified Amending Motion 101-10.

Microphone 5, please.

CERTIFIED AMENDING MOTION 101-10

MR. FRABLE: Dave Frable, US General Services Administration. I'm speaking in support of the Motion 101 --

MS. MANLEY: No, you've got to move it first.

MR. FRABLE: Oh, I would like to move Motion 101-10.
MS. MANLEY: All right. Thank you.

There is a motion on the floor to accept
an identifiable part of Public Comment Number 161.
Is there a second?

PARTICIPANT: Second.

MS. MANLEY: We have lots of seconds. Do
we -- please proceed with the discussion on the
motion. Microphone 5.

MR. FRABLE: David Frable, US General
Services Administration. I am speaking in support
of Motion 101-10 to accept an identifiable part.

The intent of this motion is to revise the
occupancy load for business use from 100 square foot
per person to 150 square foot per person.

The rationale for this revision is based
on at least ten past research studies. One common
similarity of each of these studies conducted after
1935 was that all subsequent studies have concluded
that 100 square foot per person occupant load factor
for business use is conservative. This has led to
requiring office buildings in general to have
additional egress capacity and possibly additional
exits to accommodate an overestimated building
population.

It should also be pointed out that the
existing occupant load factor of 100 square foot per person first appeared in the 1934 Building Exit Code and was based on a 1922 recommendation from the Buildings Exit Code Committee.

To provide a more updated look at this issue and to determine if the current occupant load factor based on 1930 designs were still appropriate for contemporary business use designs today, a project in 2012 was undertaken by NFPA Fire Protection Research Foundation to study the appropriateness of the 100 square foot per person occupant load factor.

Two studies were conducted, one by students from WPI in Boston, and another study by students from Gilbert Group at the University of Canterbury in Spain.

Like the previous conducted studies on this subject matter, both studies concluded 100 square foot per person for business use is conservative.

The WPI study indicated that it would be reasonable to increase the occupant load factor to 150 square foot per person in business occupancies.

The Gilbert Group study indicated that the mean average occupant load factor for general
buildings use was 181 square foot per person.

We believe the increase from 100 square foot to 150 square foot per person for business use is reasonable based on the recent changes in -- based on the past studies and also based on office building designs, as well as changes in the workplace, such as workspace in sharing, workspace configuration, flexible schedules, telecommuting, et cetera.

Lastly, it should be pointed out that the ICC membership also heard a similar code change proposal and they approved the occupant load factor of 150 square foot per person which would be up here in the 2018 edition of the IBC.

We encourage the membership to vote in support of this motion.

Thank you.

**MS. MANLEY:** Thank you.

Mr. Koffel, would you like to offer the committee's position?

**MR. KOFFEL:** The Correlating Committee took no action on this, so in a moment I will defer to the Technical Committee chair. But just in the interest of potentially avoiding certain testimony, we have four motions that we will potentially hear
on occupant load factors and business occupancies.

We recognize that the factor itself really should be located in a table in Chapter 7. If any of these motions pass, it's my understanding that there is a followup motion already prepared to move these to Chapter 7, which would be the appropriate location.

So I don't think we need to hear testimony on that aspect. We're prepared to correlate it properly.

So with that, Amy Murdock is our chair at mic 2.

**MS. MANLEY:** Go ahead, mic 2, please.

**MS. MURDOCK:** Thank you very much.

For the first draft a committee input was issued that included the occupant load factor of 150 square feet per person. This allowed the committee to review available research and new information provided by the public relating to the business occupant load factor of 100 square feet per person.

The committee, however, did not make any revision based on the committee input. The variation of results from the reports cited at the committee meetings did not provide a sufficient amount of examples in the committee's mind supporting the 150 square feet per person factor.

The committee believed that the reports
lack sufficient data to address populations outside
of the U.S., and did not obtain a high enough
participation rate to provide an accurate analysis
on occupant load trends.

The reports contained many statements that
supported multiple different occupant load factors,
but not one factor was supported by all the data.

The business uses are becoming more
concentrated and examples of this are in clinical
offices which are employing more occupants -- I'm
sorry, employing more occupants in the same space
and are utilizing the space differently.

Further, the committee believes that when
a tenant of an office space changed, the enforcement
of the code provisions would be increasingly
complicated by allowing an increased occupant load
factor for a total lower occupant load.

The effect of this change can mean that
the space that was evaluated using a lower occupant
load factor resulting in a higher permanent occupant
load would not have to be evaluated using a greater
occupant load factor, which means less people in the
same space.

The proposed change can be challenging to
accommodate different tenants with different office
use and occupant arrangements.

**MS. MANLEY:** Thank you.

With that we're going to open up debate on the motion. Please provide your name, affiliation, and whether you're speaking in support or against the motion.

All right. Microphone 3, please.

**MR. GRILL:** Ray Grill, Fire Protection Engineer with Arup, speaking on behalf of myself.

**MS. MANLEY:** In?

**MR. GRILL:** I'm in support of the motion.

**MR. MANLEY:** Thank you.

**MR. GRILL:** I'd just like to make a few points. So I've had to deal with this issue of occupant load determination in office buildings and I deal with it every day. The problem that we have -- you know, the committee accepted the concentrated use factor of 50 square feet per person in the last cycle. The 150 was also proposed at that time, but it was rejected. So now we have situations where office space is being reviewed in a very detailed way. Existing buildings can't accommodate a rebuild of an office space without introduction of horizontal exits, without adding additional plumbing fixtures. These spaces are being scrutinized.
The initial intent of applying the 100 square foot gross factor to the entire floor has been lost. So every AHJ I've worked with in the last five years looks at every individual conference room within a tenant space as an assembly occupancy of 1 to 15. They look at collaboration spaces as an assembly use where it's the same people that are in the work station that are using those spaces.

So it's just driving the occupant loads in these buildings beyond what it was originally intended.

Now, I urge the membership to support this motion. I can't recall a change that has been substantiated by more research. Someone said -- I think chair may have mentioned that the factors in the studies didn't come up with a specific number. The 150 per square foot per person is conservative. It's lower -- it's a higher density than any of the studies have shown.

So none of the studies, other -- there was one instance where there was a combination of findings of 181 square feet in a concentrated use factor of 127 square feet. So the 150 square feet is still a conservative number based on all the research that's been done over a multitude of years.
So I urge the membership to support this motion.

Thank you.

MS. MANLEY: All right.

Microphone 5, please.

MR. FRABLE: David Frable, US General Services Administration. Regarding some of the --

MS. MANLEY: Just repeat again.

MR. FRABLE: I'm in support of the motion.

MS. MANLEY: Thank you. That's obvious.

MR. FRABLE: Regarding some of the comments by the chair, the issue with regard to no studies outside the United States, with all due respect to the committee, if they read some of the reports, there was studies done in 1977 from -- based on research from Canadian buildings, summed up by Jake Pauls himself, in which he had an occupant load factor concluded that was much more than 100 square foot per person.

I mentioned before, there's a 2013 study from Canterbury, Spain in which they looked at 23 office buildings.

Regarding the ranges, once again, some of the studies looked at private sector buildings and federal buildings in which there was a range. And
they did state that federal buildings were more
dense. But that range was at over 200 square foot
per person versus 250 for a private sector building.

So it's interesting that they're bringing
up the ranges in the reports.

The other issue is complexity. The 100
square foot square foot is the same complexity as
the 150 square foot occupant load factor. The
complexity of the situation is not going to change.

In addition, with the new requirement for
concentrated use, that's even making it more
confusing on the AHJ that has to review these
spaces.

So I urge you to support this motion.

Thank you.

**MS. MANLEY:** All right. Is there any
further discussion on Motion 101-10 to accept an
identifiable part of Public Comment Number 161?

Mr. Chair, anything?

**MR. KOFFEL:** No.

**MS. MANLEY:** Awesome. We will -- before
we vote, let me restate the motion.

The motion on the floor is to accept an
identifiable part of Public Comment Number 161. To
vote, touch the vote button.
If you wish to vote in favor of the motion and recommend the text on screen 1, vote yes. If you wish to vote against the motion and recommend the text on screen 2, touch no. Please record your vote now.

We're going to close the voting in five seconds. Balloting is now closed.

All right. Thank you. The results of the vote are 135 for the motion, recommending the text on screen 1 and 105 against the motion, recommending the text on screen 2. This motion has passed.