Final Minutes

August 2 (Noon) 3-5, 2010
NFPA Headquarters
1 Batterymarch Park
Quincy, MA 02169
(617) 770-3000

Members Present

Jim Pauley, Chair
Kerry M. Bell
James W. Carpenter
Shane M. Clary
Ronald R. Farr
Ralph D. Gerdes
J.C. Harrington
Roland J. Huggins
Joseph M. Jardin
Fred M. Leber
Danny L. McDaniel
James A. Milke
Michael D. Snyder

Also Present

Amy Beasley Cronin, Secretary
Linda Fuller, Recording Secretary
Maureen Brodoff, Vice President and Legal Counsel
Christian Dubay, Vice President and Chief Engineer

10-8-1	It was voted to issue NFPA 70, *National Electrical Code®*, with an issuance date of August 5, 2010 and an effective date of August 25, 2010, as acted on at the Association Meeting, with amendments and appeals and other action of the Council as indicated in Minutes Item 10-8-1-a, 10-8-1-b (D#10-3), 10-8-1-c (D#10-4), 10-8-1-d, 10-8-1-e (D#10-5), 10-8-1-f (D#10-6), 10-8-1-g, 10-8-1-h, 10-8-1-i, 10-8-1-i-1 (D#10-7), 10-8-1-j, 10-8-1-j-1 (D#10-8), 10-8-k/l (D#10-9)
10-8-1-a	Amendment No. 70-1 (CAM 70-1): Reject an Identifiable part of Comment 1-101. The rejection of the identifiable part results in the rejection of the last 5 words of the accepted text in the third paragraph of 110.14(A) in Comment 1-101 as follows: Connectors and terminals for conductors more finely stranded than Class B and Class C stranding as shown in Chapter 9, Table 10 shall be identified for the specific conductor class or classes ~~and the number of strands~~. Based on the recommendations of the Technical Correlating Committee and Panel, the Council voted to accept this amendment. Council Member Pauley recused himself during the deliberations and vote on this issue.
10-8-1-b	**D#10-3** *SUMMARY ACTION: The Standards Council voted to deny the appeal and reject the amendment to add a new identifiable part in Section 210.19(A)(5) as shown in Proposal 2-193.* At its meeting of August 5, 2010, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Paul

	Keleher of Paul Keleher Electrical Services requesting that the 2011 edition of NFPA 70®, *National Electrical Code*® be issued with an identifiable part of Proposal 2-193 (CAM 70-3). The acceptance of the identifiable part would result in a new subsection (5) to Section 210.10(A)(5), as follows: 210.19(A) Branch Circuits Not More than 600 Volts. … (5) Permissible Voltage Drop. The circuit conductors of a 15 or 20-ampere/120-volt branch circuit shall be sized such that voltage-drop measured at the rated ampacity of the circuit shall be 5% or less at any outlet. As background, the material was submitted to Panel 2 and rejected as Proposal 2-193 and was subsequently submitted and rejected as Comment 2-108. A Certified Amending Motion (CAM 70-3) seeking acceptance of an identifiable part of Proposal 2-193 was made at the 2010 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). The motion failed. The appeal requests that the Council overturn the action that was recommended by the full NFPA codes and standards development process. This recommendation represents the consensus judgment of the responsible panel and the NEC Technical Correlating Committee, a judgment that was also supported by a vote of the NFPA membership at the 2010 Tech Session. The appellant has had the opportunity to advocate his position at each stage of the full codes and standards process, and failed to persuade the consensus process to adopt his position. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA codes and standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process, only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results yielded by the NFPA codes and standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that the proposed new text of Section 210.19(A)(5) is not added. Council Chair James Pauley recused himself during the hearings, deliberations and vote on the issue.
10-8-1-c	**D#10-4** *SUMMARY ACTION: The Standards Council voted to deny the appeal to accept Comment 3-69. This action maintains the new text in Section 590.6 that requires new portable generators to have built-in GFCI protection in temporary wiring installations.* At its meeting of August 3-5, 2010, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Michael Flegel of Reliance Controls Corporation requesting that the 2011 edition of NFPA 70®, *National Electrical Code*® be issued with the acceptance of Comment 3-69 (CAM 70-6) that sought to reject Proposal 3-140. Specifically, through the acceptance of Comment 3-69, the appellant seeks to delete the new text in Section 590.6 requiring new portable generators to have built-in ground fault circuit interrupter (GFCI) protection. The effect of accepting Comment 3-69 would be to retain the 2008 edition language in Section 590.6 which requires GFCI protection for some temporary wiring installations,

	but does not require GFCI protection to be integral to the portable generator. As background, the new requirement was added by Panel 3 through accepted Proposal 3-140. Comment 3-69 which sought to reject the Proposal was rejected by the Panel. A Certified Amending Motion (CAM 70-5) seeking acceptance of Comment 3-69 was made at the 2010 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). The motion failed. The appeal requests that the Council overturn the action that was recommended by the full NFPA codes and standards development process. This recommendation represents the consensus judgment of the responsible panel and NEC Technical Correlating Committee, a judgment that was also supported by a vote of the NFPA membership at the 2010 Tech Session. The appellant has had the opportunity to advocate his position during the process, and failed to persuade the consensus process to adopt his position. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA codes and standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process, only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results yielded by the NFPA codes and standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that the new requirement in Section 590.6 that new portable generators must have built-in GFCI protection in temporary wiring installations is retained. Council Chair James Pauley, Council Member Kerry Bell and Council Member Shane Clary recused themselves during the hearings, deliberations and vote on the issue.
10-8-1-d	Amendment No. 70-2 (CAM 70-5): Reject Comment 3-22. This amendment failed to achieve the 2/3 affirmative vote of the Technical Correlating Committee and the Panel necessary to support the amendment. When this occurs, the recommended action is to return the text in question to the responsible Panel. No appeal was filed opposing this recommendation, so the Council voted to return the issue to the Panel and maintain the affected text as indicated in the previous edition of the document. See Minutes Item 10-8-1-e (D#10-5)
10-8-1-e	**D#10-5** *SUMMARY ACTION: The Standards Council voted to deny the appeal to extend the implementation date from January 1, 2011 to January 1, 2012 for the new text in Section 590.6(A)(3). This new text requires new portable generators to have built-in GFCI protection in temporary wiring installations.* At its meeting of August 3-5, 2010, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Chris Turner of Generac Power Systems requesting an extension of the implementation date for a new requirement in Section 590.6(A)(3) in the 2011 edition of NFPA 70®, *National Electrical Code®*. Specifically, the appellant requests an extension of the implementation date from January 1, 2011 to January 1, 2012 in Section 590.6 requiring new portable generators to have built-in GFCI protection. As background, the new requirement was added by Panel 3 as a result of accepted Proposal 3-140. Comment 3-69 which sought to reject the Proposal was rejected by the

	Panel. For the appeal related to that Comment, see agenda item 10-8-1-c (D#10-4). Neither the appellants nor others, however, submitted any comment seeking an extension of the implementation date. Under the NFPA standards development process, those who disagree with the actions of a panel during the Proposal stage of the process are required to register their objections through the filing of appropriate comments during a Comment phase. This gives the consensus bodies within the NFPA process the opportunity to consider any objections or new information, and the submitting of a Comment is generally a prerequisite to the making of an amending motion during the subsequent Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session) of the NFPA membership. In this case, however, neither the appellant nor others submitted any comment seeking an extension of the implementation date. Accordingly, an amending motion at the 2010 Tech Session was not in order. See NFPA *Regulations Governing Committee Projects* (*Regs.*) at Section 4.6.6, *Summary of Amending Motions at Association Technical Meetings*. Having failed to take all of the necessary steps to seek an extension of the implementation date within the NFPA codes and standards process, the appellant now brings this appeal requesting that the Council itself implement an extended implementation date. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA codes and standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process, only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. Moreover, in circumstances such as these, where the appellant has failed to take advantage of all the steps available to him within the process, the Council is especially reluctant to consider overturning the results that have been yielded by that process. The Council, having reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and having considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal, has found no basis on which to overturn the results recommended by the NFPA codes and standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. While the Council appreciates the able presentation made to it by the appellant's representatives, the Council does not believe that it is appropriate for it to act without the issue having been considered within the codes and standards development process. If the appellant or others wish to address this or other issues discussed during the appeals hearing, they can do so in the regular document revision process, or if the issues are believed to be of an emergency nature, a Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) can be submitted. Council Chair James Pauley, Council Member Kerry Bell and Council Member Shane Clary recused themselves during the hearings, deliberations and vote on the issue.
10-8-1-f	**D#10-6** *SUMMARY ACTION: The Council voted to deny the appeal to accept Comment 9-26 to add new text as a new Section 314.17(E) to require that outlet box covers be used to protect the inside of boxes during construction.* At its meeting of August 3-5, 2010, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Carlo Compagnone, Jr. of CompaCovers, Inc., requesting that the 2011 edition of NFPA 70®, *National Electrical Code*®, be issued with the acceptance of Comment 9-26. Specifically the appeal requests that new text be added as a new Section 314.17(E) to require that outlet covers be used to protect the inside of boxes during construction.

	As background, the material was submitted to Panel 9 and rejected as Proposal 9-52. The material was subsequently submitted and rejected as Comment 9-26. A Certified Amending Motion (CAM 70-12) seeking acceptance of Comment 9-26 was made at the 2010 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). The motion failed. The appeal requests that the Standards Council overturn the action that was recommended by the full NFPA codes and standards development process. This recommendation represents the consensus judgment of the responsible panel and the NEC Technical Correlating Committee, a judgment that was also supported by a vote of the NFPA membership at the 2010 Tech Session. The appellant has had the opportunity to advocate his position at each stage of the full codes and standards process, and failed to persuade the consensus process to adopt his position. On appeal, the Standards Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA codes and standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process, only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results yielded by the NFPA codes and standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that the proposed new Section 314.17(E) to require outlet covers be used to protect the inside of boxes during construction is not added.
10-8-1-g	Amendment No. 70-3 (CAM 70-16): Return a portion of a Report in the form of a Proposal 11-107a and related Comments 11-43a, 11-44, 11-45, 11-46 and 11-47. Based on the recommendations of the Technical Correlating Committee and Panel, the Council voted to accept this amendment. Council Member Pauley recused himself during the deliberations and vote on this issue.
10-8-1-h	Amendment No. 70-4 (CAM 70-17): Accept as Modified by Panel for Comment 13-96. Based on the recommendations of the Technical Correlating Committee and Panel, the Council voted to accept this amendment.
10-8-1-i	Amendment No. 70-5 (CAM 70-20): Reject Comment 15-101. This amendment failed to achieve the 2/3 affirmative vote of the Technical Correlating Committee and the Panel necessary to support the amendment. When this occurs, the recommended action is to return the text in question to the responsible Panel. An appeal was filed in response to the failed amendment. See Minutes Item 10-8-1-i-1 (D#10-7)
10-8-1-i-1	**D# 10-7** *SUMMARY ACTION: The Standards Council voted to deny the appeal to accept Comment 15-101. Comment 15-101 sought to add new text to Section 517.30(C)(3) to permit the use of listed MC cables in the emergency systems of hospitals.* At its meeting of August 3-5, 2010, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Dave Mercier of Southwire Company, requesting that the 2011 edition of NFPA 70, *National Electrical Code®*, be issued with the acceptance of Comment 15-101. Specifically, the appeal requests acceptance of a new requirement that permits listed metal clad (MC) cables to be used in the emergency systems of hospitals. As background, the material was first submitted in the Annual 2007 cycle as Proposal 15-54 which was rejected. It was subsequently submitted as Comment 15-39 which was

	held for further study. In accordance with Section 4.4.6.2.2 of the NFPA *Regulations Governing Committee Projects*, the held comment was reconsidered as Proposal 15-78 during the Annual 2010 revision cycle. Panel 15 rejected Proposal 15-78. The material was again submitted as Comment 15-101 which was accepted in principle, thereby permitting the use of listed metal clad (MC) cables in the emergency systems of hospitals. A Certified Amending Motion (CAM 70-20) seeking rejection of Comment 15-101 was made at the 2010 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). The amending motion was supported by the NFPA membership in attendance, but failed to pass the subsequent balloting of both Panel 15 and the NEC Technical Correlating Committee. This means under NFPA rules, that the default recommendation of the codes and standard development process is that no change from the existing edition should occur, and the portion of the Report modified by the Association recommended amendment is returned to previous edition text. The appeal requests that the Council overturn the action that was recommended by the codes and standards development process. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA codes and standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process, only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results yielded by the NFPA codes and standards development process. Indeed, since a majority of Panel 15 voted in favor of the amending motion, it appears that the Panel may no longer support its original position favoring the proposed use of MC cable. In these circumstances, it is more than appropriate to return to previous edition text. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that the proposed new text of Section 517.30(C)(3) to permit the use of listed MC cables in the emergency systems of hospitals is not added. Council Member Kerry Bell recused himself during the hearings, deliberations and vote on the issue.
10-8-1-j	Amendment No. 70-6 (CAM 70-22): Accept Comment 17-86. This amendment failed to achieve the 2/3 affirmative vote of the Technical Correlating Committee and the Panel necessary to support the amendment. When this occurs, the recommended action is to return the text in question to the responsible Panel. An appeal was filed in response to the failed amendment. See Minutes Item 10-8-1-j-1 (D#10-8)
10-8-1-j-1	**D#10-8** *SUMMARY ACTION: The Standards Council voted to deny the appeal and reject the amendment to modify Section 680.26(B)(2) as shown in Comment 17-86.* At its meeting of August 3-5, 2010, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Wayne Robinson, Lothian, MD, requesting that the 2011 edition of NFPA 70, *National Electrical Code*® be issued with the acceptance of Comment 17-86 (CAM 70-22). The accepted comment would revise Section 680.26(B)(2), which addresses bonding of the perimeter surfaces of a permanently installed pool. The text would require a copper equipotential bonding grid rather than a single wire copper conductor along the pool perimeter.

	As background, some of the material that is the subject of this appeal was originally brought to the Council as a Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA). This TIA had failed ballot and was not issued by the Council (see agenda item 09-8-1-g; D#09-13). In the current revision cycle, the material was submitted to Panel 17 and rejected as Proposal 17-179 and subsequently submitted and rejected as Comment 17-86. A Certified Amending Motion (CAM 70-22) seeking acceptance of Comment 17-86 was made at the 2010 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). The amending motion was supported by the NFPA membership, but failed to pass the subsequent balloting of the Panel by the requisite two-thirds affirmative vote and failed to pass the NEC Technical Correlating Committee (TCC) by the requisite three-quarters vote. When a recommended amendment is not approved by the Panel or the TCC, under NFPA rules, the default recommendation of the codes and standards process is that no change from the from the existing edition should occur, and the portion of the Report modified by the Association recommended amendment is returned to previous edition text. In this case, therefore, the default recommendation to Council is that Section 680.26(B)(2) is not modified as shown in Comment 17-86. The appeal requests that the Council overturn the action recommended by the NFPA codes and standards development process. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA codes and standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process, only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all of the arguments raised in this appeal. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results recommended by the NFPA codes and standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal and reject the amendment to modify 680.26(B)(2) as shown in Comment 17-86.
10-8-1-k/l	**D#10-9** *SUMMARY ACTION: The Standards Council voted to deny the appeals to delete Section 690.11 requiring arc-fault circuit interrupter protection for certain photovoltaic systems from the 2011 edition of NFPA 70, National Electrical Code®. The Council voted to also deny the appeal to add a delayed effective date for the new requirement of Section 690.11or to make a revision concerning the voltage level.* At its meeting of August 3-5, 2010, the Standards Council considered appeals from Matthias Haag and Thomas Schaupp of KACO New Energy, and Jurgen Krehnke of SMA Solar Technology America, LLC. The appeals concern the new text of Section 690.11 for the 2011 edition of NFPA 70, *National Electrical Code®*, which requires arc-fault circuit interrupter (AFCI) protection for certain photovoltaic (PV) systems. The appeals request that the Council either remove Section 690.11 or, in the alternative, that the Council add a delayed effective date and make a revision concerning the voltage level. As background, the requirement for AFCI protection for certain PV systems was submitted as Proposals 4-205 and 4-204 and was accepted and accepted in principle, respectively. Accepted Comment 4-83 made some revisions to conform the material to the Manual of Style. Comments 4-77, 4-80 and 4-81 sought to reject the new requirement and were both rejected. Comments 4-79 and 4-82 sought to introduce a

	delayed effective date, and both were rejected. No comments were submitted, however, that requested a delay in the effective date along the lines that the appellants appear to be requesting; namely, a delay of two years following the development of an appropriate UL listing standard. In any event, none of the rejected Comments were subsequently pursued through the filing of an appropriate Notice of Intent to Make a Motion (NITMAM) for the 2010 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). The submission of NITMAMs followed by the making of amending motions at the Tech Session is an important part of the NFPA codes and standards development process. The making and debating of such motions allows the committees to reconsider their actions through the reballotting of successful amending motions, and the debate of the NFPA membership provides an important addition to the record in the event of an appeal to the Standards Council. The appellants failed to do so, and now, having failed to take all of the necessary steps within the NFPA process to delete or revise the new provision or seek an extension of the implementation date, the appellant now brings these appeals. On appeal, the Standards Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA codes and standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process, only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. Moreover, in circumstances such as these, where the appellants have failed to take advantage of all the steps available within the process, the Council is especially reluctant to consider overturning the results that have been yielded by that process. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in these appeals. In the view of the Council, these appeals do not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results yielded by the NFPA codes and standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeals. The effect of this action is that the text of the 2011 edition of the NEC will include the new text of Section 690.11 that requires AFCI protection for certain PV systems without a delayed effective date. While the Council appreciates the able presentation made to it by the appellants, the Council does not believe that it is appropriate for it to act without the issue having been fully considered within the codes and standards development process. If the appellants or others wish to address the issues they have raised on this appeal, they can do so in the regular document revision process, or if the issues are believed to be of an emergency nature, a Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) can be submitted. Council Chair James Pauley recused himself during the hearings, deliberations and vote on the issue. Council Member Ralph Gerdes wished to be recorded as voting negatively.
10-8-1-m	It was voted to approve an editorial correction recommended by the NEC TCC, to make the following correction to Proposal 11-101 to read as follows: **(F) Cord-and-Plug-Connected Motors**. For a cord-and-plug-connected motor, a horsepower-rated attachment plug and receptacle, <u>flanged surface inlet and cord connector, or attachment plug and cord connector</u> having ratings no less than the motor ratings shall be permitted to serve as the

	disconnecting means. ~~A h~~H~~h~~orsepower-rated attachment plugs, flanged surface inlets, ~~and~~ receptacles, or cord connectors shall not be required for ~~a~~ cord-and-plug-connected appliances in accordance with 422.33, ~~a~~ room air conditioners in accordance with 440.63, or ~~a~~ portable motors rated 1/3 hp or less.
10-8-2	It was voted to issue NFPA 18, *Standard on Wetting Agents*, with an issuance date of August 5, 2010 and an effective date of August 25, 2010, as acted on at the Association Meeting, with action on one appeal and no amendments. See Minutes Item 10-8-2-a(D#10-21)
10-8-2-a	**D#10-21** *SUMMARY ACTION: The Standards Council voted to deny the appeal. The appeal sought to reject the identifiable part of Comment 18-4 and to accept Comment 18-17.* At its meeting of August 3-5, 2010, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Michael Greiner of Hazard Control Technologies, Inc. The appeal seeks to reject an identifiable part of Comment 18-4 and to accept Comment 18-17 for the 2011 edition of NFPA 18, *Standard on Wetting Agents.* When taken together, these actions would delete a new requirement establishing a 10 mg/L fish toxicity limit of the wetting agent in Sections 4.5.2.2 and 5.2.7.2 (CAM 18-1). As background, Proposal 18-15 sought to delete toxicity requirements from the standard to allow for the toxicity to be evaluated independently from the standard. The Proposal was rejected since it did not pass TC ballot. The committee reconsidered the issue during the Comment stage, however, and, in accepted Comment 18-4, the committee again addressed toxicity. Specifically, the identifiable part of Comment 18-4 which is the subject of this appeal added new section 4.5.2.2, which provides as follows: **4.5.2.2** The fish toxicity of the wetting agent shall not be less than 10 mg/L when tested in accordance with 4.5.2.2.1. Additionally, accepted Proposal 18-33 introduced aquatic toxicity in Section 5.2.7. Subsequent Comment 18-17 sought to delete the toxicity (LC_{50} value) of 10 mg/L in Section 5.2.7.2 and was rejected. In an effort to reject these actions, a Certified Amending Motion (CAM 18-1) seeking to reject an identifiable part of Comment 18-4 and to accept Comment 18-17 was made at the 2010 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). The motion failed. The appeal requests that the Council overturn the action that was recommended by the full NFPA codes and standards development process. This recommendation represents the consensus judgment of the responsible technical committee, a judgment that was also supported by a vote of the NFPA membership at the 2010 Tech Session. The appellant has had the opportunity to advocate his position at each stage of the full codes and standards process, and failed to persuade the consensus process to adopt his position. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA codes and standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process, only where a clear and substantial basis for

	doing so is demonstrated. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results yielded by the NFPA codes and standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that the proposed fish toxicity limit in Sections 4.5.2.2 and 5.2.7.2 remains as revised in the Committee Report.
10-8-3	It was voted to issue NFPA 25, *Standard for the Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance of Water-Based Fire Protection Systems*, with an issuance date of August 5, 2010 and an effective date of August 25, 2010, as acted on at the Association Meeting, with action on amendments and appeals as indicated in Minutes Items 10-8-3-a, 10-8-3-a-1(D#10-12), 10-8-3-b, 10-8-3-c, 10-8-3-c-1 (D#10-13), 10-8-3-d (D#10-15), 10-8-3-e (D#10-16),10-8-3-f (D#10-17)
10-8-3-a	Amendment No. 25-1(CAM 25-11): Accept Comment 25-41. This amendment failed to achieve the 2/3 affirmative vote of the Technical Committee necessary to support the amendment. When this occurs, the recommended action is to return the text in question to the responsible Technical Committee. An appeal was filed in response to the failed amendment. See Minutes Item 10-8-3-a-1 (D#10-12)
10-8-3-a-1	**D#10-12** *SUMMARY ACTION: The Standards Council voted to deny the appeal to accept Comment 25-41 which would have added a new requirement for owners to investigate and replace any missing hydraulic nameplates.* At its meeting of August 5, 2010, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Richard Ray of Cybor Fire Protection Company, requesting acceptance of Comment 25-41 in the 2011 edition of NFPA 25, *Standard for the Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance of Water-Based Fire Protection Systems*. Specifically, the appellant seeks to add a requirement for owners to investigate and replace any missing hydraulic nameplates. As background, Proposal 25-88 recommended adding the requirement for owners to investigate and replace any missing hydraulic nameplates to the body of the standard and to also add additional advisory annex material. This Proposal was Accepted in Part by the Technical Committee on Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance of Water-Based Systems (TC). The TC agreed to add the subject as advisory material, but rejected the part of the proposal to add the requirement to the body of the standard. Subsequently, Comment 25-41 recommended that the requirement for owners to investigate and replace any missing hydraulic nameplates be added to the body and was rejected. A Certified Amending Motion (CAM 25-11) seeking to accept Comment 25-41 was made at the 2010 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). The amending motion was supported by the NFPA membership, but failed to pass the subsequent balloting of the TC. When a recommended amendment is not approved by the TC, the default recommendation of the codes and standard development process is that no change from the existing edition should occur, and the portion of the Report modified by the Association recommended amendment is returned to previous edition text. The appeal requests that the Council take action other than that recommended by the NFPA codes and standards development process. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA codes and standards development process. In

	conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process, only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results yielded by the NFPA codes and standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that the portion of the Report modified by the Association recommended amendment is returned to previous edition text. This means neither the material proposed to be added in the annex by the Committee Meeting Action of Proposal 25-88 nor the text proposed in Comment 25-41 is added.
10-8-3-b	Amendment No. 25-2(CAM 25-15): Accept Comment 25-104. Based on the recommendation of the Technical Committee, the Council voted to accept this amendment.
10-8-3-c	Amendment No. 25-3(CAM 25-19): Accept Comment 25-101. This amendment failed to achieve the 2/3 affirmative vote of the Technical Committee necessary to support the amendment. When this occurs, the recommended action is to return the text in question to the responsible Technical Committee. An appeal was filed in response to the failed amendment. See Minutes Item 10-8-3-c-1 (D#10-13)
10-8-3-c-1	**D#10-13** *SUMMARY ACTION: The Standards Council voted to deny the appeal to accept Comment 25-101 to modify Chapter 14. Chapter 14 will be modified as recommended with the acceptance of Comment 25-104.* At its meeting of August 3-5, 2010, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Peter Larrimer of the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, requesting acceptance of Comment 25-101 on the 2011 edition of NFPA 25, *Standard for the Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance of Water-Based Fire Protection Systems*. The acceptance of Comment 25-101 would result in revisions to the existing Chapter 14. As background, Proposal 25-185 recommended revisions to Chapter 14, *Obstruction Investigation*, and was rejected by the Technical Committee on Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance of Water-Based Systems (TC). Subsequently, Comment 25-101 was submitted that sought the acceptance of Proposal 25-185. This Comment was rejected by the TC. At the same time, another comment, Comment 25-104, was submitted. This Comment 25-104 (along with related Proposals 25-187, 25-189 and 27-191) proposed a new and significantly revised Chapter 14, and it, too, was rejected by the TC. At the 2010 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session), Certified Amending Motions were made seeking to accept both Comment 25-101 (CAM 25-19) and Comment 25-104 (CAM 25-15). Both motions passed. Upon review of these two amendments, it was determined that the two amendments recommended text for Chapter 14 that were mutually inconsistent. The amendments, therefore, in the form they were drafted, could not both be incorporated into Chapter 14 of the proposed new edition of NFPA 25. Accordingly, a single ballot was submitted to the TC to determine if either of the successful amendments could achieve the two-thirds support of the TC necessary under NFPA rules to incorporate the amendment into the proposed new edition of NFPA 25. The result was that the amendment to accept Comment 25-101 (CAM 25-19) failed ballot while the amendment to accept Comment 25-104 (CAM 25-15) passed the ballot of the TC.

	In seeking to accept failed Comment 25-101, the appellant is requesting that the Council reject the results yielded by the NFPA codes and standards development process. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA codes and standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result reached through that process only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. The Council, having reviewed the entire record, has found no such basis here. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that Comment 25-101 is not accepted and the text of Chapter 14 will be as accepted in Comment 25-104. Council Member Kerry Bell recused himself during the hearings, deliberations and vote on the issue.
10-8-3-d	**D#10-15** *SUMMARY ACTION: The Standards Council voted to deny the appeal to accept Comment 25-11 which proposed to return the definition of "deficiency" back to previous edition text.* At its meeting of August 3-5, 2010, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Joshua Elvove of the US General Services Administration, requesting the acceptance of Comment 25-11 on the 2011 edition of NFPA 25, *Standard for the Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance of Water-Based Fire Protection Systems*. Specifically, the appellant seeks to return the definition of "deficiency" back to previous edition text. As background, Proposal 25-19 sought revisions to the definition of "deficiency" as set forth in Section 3.3.4. The Proposal was accepted in principle, with modifications by the Technical Committee on Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance of Water-Based Systems (TC). Subsequently, Comment 25-11 sought rejection of the committee action on Proposal 25-19, but the TC rejected this Comment. A Certified Amending Motion (CAM 25-4) seeking to accept Comment 25-11 was made at the 2010 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). The motion failed. The appeal requests that the Council overturn the action that was recommended by the NFPA codes and standards development process. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA codes and standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process, only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results yielded by the NFPA codes and standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that Comment 25-11 is rejected and the modified definition of "deficiency" will be retained in the new edition.
10-8-3-e	**D#10-16** *SUMMARY ACTION: The Standards Council voted to deny the appeal to accept Comment 25-24 which sought to delete Sections 4.1.5 and 4.1.6.* At its meeting of August 3-5, 2010, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Joshua Elvove of the US General Services Administration, requesting acceptance of Comment 25-24 in the 2011 edition of NFPA 25, *Standard for the Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance of Water-Based Fire Protection Systems*. Specifically the appellant sought

	to delete Sections 4.1.5 and 4.1.6 addressing owners' responsibilities. As background, Proposal 25-44 recommended deletion of Sections 4.1.5 and 4.1.6 and was rejected by the Technical Committee on Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance of Water-Based Systems Committee (TC). Subsequently, Comment 25-24 recommended acceptance of the Proposal and was rejected by the TC. A Certified Amending Motion (CAM 25-7) seeking to accept Comment 25-24 was made at the 2010 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). The motion failed. The appeal requests that the Council overturn the action that was recommended by the full NFPA codes and standards development process. This recommendation represents the consensus judgment of the responsible technical committee and technical correlating committee, a judgment that was also supported by a vote of the NFPA membership at the 2010 Tech Session. The appellant has had the opportunity to advocate his position at each stage of the full codes and standards process, and failed to persuade the consensus process to adopt his position. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA codes and standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process, only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results yielded by the NFPA codes and standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that the text of Sections 4.1.5 and 4.1.6 are not deleted. The Council noted that during the hearing, the appellant questioned whether Sections 4.1.5 and 4.1.6 were outside the committee and document scopes. These provisions have been in the document since its inception without the TC having felt the need for scope revisions. The Council defers to this reasonable judgment. Going forward, should the TC determine that any further scope clarification is needed, they may submit a revised scope request to the Council.
10-8-3-f	**D#10-17** *SUMMARY ACTION: The Standards Council voted to deny the appeal to reject Comments 25-68, 25-70, 25-71 and 25-72 which sought to return the operational no-flow tests for electric motor driven pumps back to weekly from monthly.* At its meeting of August 3-5, 2010, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Richard Ray of Cybor Fire Protection Company, seeking, in a Group Amending Motion, to reject Comments 25-68, 25-70, 25-71 and 25-72 on the 2011 edition of NFPA 25, Standard for the Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance of Water-Based Fire Protection Systems. Specifically, the appellant seeks to return the operational no-flow tests for electric motor driven pumps back to weekly from monthly. As background, Proposal 25-133 was submitted to the Technical Committee on Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance of Water-Based Systems (TC). The Proposal recommended changing operational no-flow tests for all fire pumps from weekly to monthly. The Proposal was rejected by the TC. Subsequently, Comments 25-68, 25-70,

	25-71, and 25-72 were submitted seeking seeking to readdress the test frequency issue in various ways. The TC actions on these Comments, which were a combination of accepts and accepts in principle and in part, had the effect of accepting monthly testing for electric motor driven pumps. A Group Certified Amending Motion (CAM 25-13) seeking to reject Comments 25-68, 25-70, 25-71 and 25-72 and return the test frequence for electric motor driven pumps back to weekly was made at the 2010 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). The motion failed. The appeal requests that the Council overturn the action that was recommended by the NFPA codes and standards development process. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA codes and standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process, only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results yielded by the NFPA codes and standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that the operational no-flow tests for electric motor driven pumps will remain at monthly. The Council wished to note that if members of the Technical Committee on Fire Pumps which is responsible for NFPA 20, the appellants, or others wish to address this or other issues going forward, they can do so in the regular document revision process or they can raise the issue as a Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA), if appropriate. Council Member J.C. Harrington recused himself during the hearings, deliberations and vote on the issue.
10-8-4	It was voted to issue NFPA 45, *Standard on Fire Protection for Laboratories Using Chemicals*, with an issuance date of August 5, 2010 and an effective date of August 25, 2010, as acted on at the Association Meeting, without amendments or appeals.
10-8-5	It was voted to issue NFPA 53, *Recommended Practice on materials, Equipment, and Systems Used in Oxygen-Enriched Atmospheres*, with an issuance date of August 5, 2010 and an effective date of August 25, 2010, as acted on at the Association Meeting, with one appeal and no amendments. See Minutes Item 10-8-5-a (D#10-11)
10-8-5-a	**D#10-11** *SUMMARY ACTION: The Standards Council voted to deny the appeal on NFPA 53 to return the entire Report to the Committee. The effect of this action is that the proposed new edition of NFPA 53 will be issued.* At its meeting of August 3-5, 2010, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Marcelo Hirschler, GBH International. The appeal requested that the 2011 edition of *Recommended Practice on Materials, Equipment, and Systems Used in Oxygen-Enriched Atmospheres* not be issued, and that the entire report be returned to the Committee. As background, at the 2010 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session), an amending motion to return the entire Report of the 2011 edition of NFPA 53 was made. The motion failed. The appeal requests that the Council overturn the action that was recommended by the

	codes and standards development process. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA codes and standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process, only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results yielded by the NFPA codes and standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that the proposed new edition of NFPA 53 is issued.
10-8-6	It was voted to issue NFPA 58, *Liquefied Petroleum Gas Code,* with an issuance date of August 5, 2010 and an effective date of August 25, 2010, as acted on at the Association Meeting, with amendments and appeals. See Minutes Items 10-8-6-a, 10-8-6-b, 10-8-6-b-1 (D#10-19), 10-8-6-c, and 10-8-23
10-8-6-a	Amendment No. 58-1(CAM 58-3): Accept Comment 58-30. Based on the recommendation of the Technical Committee, the Council voted to accept this amendment.
10-8-6-b	Amendment No. 58-2(CAM 58-5): Accept Comment 58-49. This amendment failed to achieve the 2/3 affirmative vote of the Technical Committee necessary to support the amendment. When this occurs, the recommended action is to return the text in question to the responsible Technical Committee. An appeal was filed in response to the failed amendment. See Minutes Item 10-8-6-b-1(D#10-19)
10-8-6-b-1	**D#10-19** *SUMMARY ACTION: The Standards Council voted to deny the appeal to accept Comment 58-49, but voted to return to the TC Action on Proposal 58-46 rather than to previous edition text.* At its meeting of August 3-5, 2010, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Manuel Gomez representing the U.S. Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board (CSB). The appeal seeks to accept Comment 58-49 for the 2011 edition of NFPA 58, *Liquefied Petroleum Gas Code*. Specifically, the appellant seeks to provide more detailed requirements for training. As background, Proposal 58-46 sought to provide more specific training requirements in Section 4.4. The Technical Committee on Liquefied Petroleum Gases (TC), through an accept in principle action, declined to add the proposed requirements to Section 4.4 but added new advisory material on training in the annex Section A.4.4. Comment 58-49 again sought to add more specific training requirements to Section 4.4. The TC rejected this Comment. A Certified Amending Motion (CAM 58-5) seeking to accept Comment 58-49 was made at the 2010 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). The amending motion was supported by the NFPA membership, but failed to pass the subsequent balloting of the TC. When a recommended amendment is not approved by the TC, the default recommendation under NFPA rules is that no change from the existing edition should occur, and the portion of the Technical Committee Report modified by the Association recommended amendment is returned to previous edition text. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA codes and standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. The appeal seeks the acceptance of Comment 58-49, which

	ultimately failed the ballot of the TC. The Council, after a review of the record, has concluded that the appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results of the process and accept Comment 58-49. To that extent, therefore, the appeal is denied. In this case, however, a question remains whether it is appropriate to adopt the default action and return to previous edition text. Such an action would have the effect of deleting from the new edition of NFPA 58, the Section A.4.4 Annex material on training added by the TC through its acceptance in principle of Proposal 58-46. While the appellant sought to have specific training material in the mandatory requirements of the standard, the CSB's representative made it clear that, as an alternative, the new advisory material in Section A.4.4 was preferable to having no additional text on training. Since the new advisory Annex material in Section A.4.4 has received the support of the TC and since no party supports returning to previous edition text, the Council has voted to return to the TC Action on Proposal 58-46 rather than to previous edition text. The Council noted that during the hearing, both the appellant and the TC Chair agreed that there was significant common ground that should be further explored and discussed. Both agreed that the TC and the appellant would work together to develop a Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) that could accommodate the appellant's interests and achieve acceptance within the TC.
10-8-6-c	Amendment No. 58-3(CAM 58-7): Accept a modified motion to accept Proposal 58-154. The modified motion accepts the text proposed by Proposal 58-154 except for the following sentence: This requirement shall apply to all new installations and to all existing installations within one year of adoption of this code. Amendment No. 58-3 (CAM 58-7), therefore, as successfully balloted by the Technical Committee, text to NFPA 58 will read as follows: **11.4.1.6** Containers for stationary engines shall be installed to meet the separation requirements of section 6.3, except as modified in section 11.14.1.7. ~~This requirement shall apply to all new installations and to all existing installations within one year of adoption of this code.~~ **11.14.1.7** Where containers for stationary engines have a fill valve with an integral manual shutoff valve, the minimum separation distances shall be one-half of the distances specified in section 6.3. Based on the recommendation of the Technical Committee, the Council voted to accept this amendment.
10-8-7	It was voted to issue NFPA 86, *Standard for Ovens and Furnaces*, with an issuance date of August 5, 2010 and an effective date of August 25, 2010, as acted on at the Association Meeting, with one appeal and no amendments. See Minutes Items 10-8-7-a (D#10-14), 10-8-26 and 10-8-27
10-8-7-a	**D#10-14** *SUMMARY ACTION: The Standards Council voted to deny the appeal to accept Comment 86-5 to use extracted definitions.*

	At its meeting of August 3-5, 2010, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Marcelo Hirschler, GBH International. The appeal requests that the 2011 edition of NFPA 86, *Standard for Ovens and Furnaces,* be issued with the acceptance of Comment 86-5. Specifically the Comment sought to use the extracted definitions for "flammable limits", "lower flammable limit (LFL)" and "upper flammable limit (UFL)" from NFPA 68, *Standard on Explosion Protection by Deflagration Venting.* As background, Proposal 86-14 modified the definitions and their use in NFPA 86. The definitions extracted from NFPA 68 were submitted and rejected as Comment 86-5. A Certified Amending Motion (CAM 86-1) seeking acceptance of Comment 86-5 was made at the 2010 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). The motion failed. The appeal requests that the Council overturn the action that was recommended by the NFPA codes and standards development process. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA codes and standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process, only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results yielded by the NFPA codes and standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that the definitions will remain as modified by the TC in the Committee Report.
10-8-8	It was voted to issue NFPA 96, *Standard for Ventilation Control and Fire Protection of Commercial Cooking Operations*, with an issuance date of August 5, 2010 and an effective date of August 25, 2010, as acted on at the Association Meeting, with no amendments or appeals.
10-8-9	It was voted to uphold the Association action of returning to Committee the proposed 2011 edition of NFPA 204, *Standard for Smoke and Heat Venting.* In making this decision, the Council approved the Committee's request to enter the Annual 2011 revision cycle, with a call for new public comments. See *Regulations Governing Committee Projects* (*Regs*.) at Section 4.7.3(c).
10-8-10	It was voted to issue NFPA 214, *Standard on Water-Cooling Towers*, with an issuance date of August 5, 2010 and an effective date of August 25, 2010, as acted on at the Association Meeting, with one appeal and no amendments. See Minutes Item 10-8-10-a (D#10-22)
10-8-10-a	**D#10-22** *SUMMARY ACTION: The Standards Council voted to deny the appeal to reject Comment 214-1.* At its meeting of August 3-5, 2010, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Marcelo Hirschler, GBH International. The appeal requests that the 2011 edition of NFPA 214, *Standard on Water-Cooling Towers,* be issued with the rejection of Comment 214-1. Specifically, the Comment sought to return the definition of "fire resistant partition" to the previous edition. As background, a modification of the definition of "fire resistant partition" was submitted and rejected as Proposal 214-3. The definition was modified and accepted as Comment 214-1. A Certified Amending Motion (CAM 214-1) seeking the rejection of

	Comment 214-1 was made at the 2010 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). The motion failed. The appeal requests that the Council overturn the action that was recommended by the NFPA codes and standards development process. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA codes and standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process, only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results yielded by the NFPA codes and standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that the definition of "fire resistant partition" will remain as modified by the TC in Comment 214-1.
10-8-11	It was voted to issue NFPA 303, *Fire Protection Standard for Marinas and Boatyards*, with an issuance date of August 5, 2010 and an effective date of August 25, 2010, as acted on at the Association Meeting, without amendments or appeals.
10-8-12	It was voted to issue NFPA 502, *Standard for Road Tunnels, Bridges, and Other Limited Access Highways,* with an issuance date of August 5, 2010 and an effective date of August 25, 2010, as acted on at the Association Meeting, with one amendment and no appeals. See Minutes Item 10-8-12-a
10-8-12-a	Amendment No. 502-1(CAM 502-8): Accept Comment 502-45. Based on the recommendation of the Technical Committee, the Council voted to accept this amendment.
10-8-13	It was voted to uphold the Association action of returning to Committee the proposed 2011 edition of NFPA 654, *Standard for the Prevention of Fire and Dust Explosions from the Manufacturing, Processing, and Handling of Combustible Particulate Solids.* In making this decision, the Council approved the Committee's request to enter the Annual 2012 revision cycle without a call for public comments. See *Regulations Governing Committee Projects* (*Regs*.) at Section 4.7.3(c). See Minutes Items 10-8-13-a-2 thru 10-8-13-e (D#10-18)
10-8-13-a-2 thru 10-8-13-e	**D#10-18** *SUMMARY ACTION: The Standards Council voted to deny the appeals to reject the Association action to return the entire report of the 2011 edition of NFPA 654, Standard for the Prevention of Fire and Dust Explosions from the Manufacturing, Processing, and Handling of Combustible Particulate Solids. This means that proposed 2011 edition of NFPA 654 will not be issued and the existing edition shall remain in effect. The entire document is returned to the Committee.* At its meeting of 3-5 August 2010, the Standard Council considered several appeals regarding the Association action to return the entire report of the 2011 edition of NFPA 654, *Standard for the Prevention of Fire and Dust Explosions from the Manufacturing, Processing, and Handling of Combustible Particulate Solids*. The Council considered an appeal from Walt Frank, Frank Risk Solutions, Inc., requesting that the Council reject the Association action to return the entire report of the 2011 edition of NFPA 654, and that instead, the Council issue the proposed 2011 edition as shown in the Committee Reports.

	The Council also considered other related appeals from John Cholin of JM Cholin Associates that requested the Council reject the Association action to return the entire report and issue the proposed 2011 edition, and a) accept the two motions that passed before the motion to return the entire report and b) accept two motions that were tabled before the motion to return the entire report. As background, at the 2010 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session), an amending motion to return the entire report of the 2011 edition of NFPA 654 was made, and was supported by the NFPA membership. Under NFPA rules, when the membership at the Tech Session votes to return a document to committee, the document should not be issued, but should go back for further processing in accordance with one of the available options set forth in the NFPA *Regulations Governing Committee Projects* (*Regs.*) at Section 4.4.7.3. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA codes and standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. In the case of an NFPA document that had been returned to Committee by the NFPA membership, it would be rare indeed for the Council to intervene. It is recognized that during this revision cycle, the Technical Committee on Handling and Conveying of Dusts, Vapors, and Gases (TC) did extensive and valuable work in an attempt to incorporate new equations and the new Section 6.1 during the revision of NFPA 654. Nevertheless the debate and vote of the membership at the Tech Session reflected the view that the document was not yet ready for issuance and that further work was needed. The record before the Council contains some support for that view, and the Council must, therefore, respect the outcome of the process. The Council notes that an informational ballot of the, while advisory only (see *Regs.* at Section 4.7.2[a]), failed to demonstrate TC support for the return to committee. However, after reviewing and considering all the information available to it, the Council voted to deny the various appeals to issue the document. The result of this action is that the entire document is returned to the Committee. This means that proposed 2011 edition of NFPA 654 shall not be issued and the existing edition shall remain in effect. See *Regs.* at Section 4.7.2(a). There remains the question of further processing of NFPA 654. After considering the recommendation of the TC, the Council is directing that NFPA 654 should be entered into the Annual 2012 cycle and processed according to the option described in the *Regs.* at Section 4.4.7.3(c). Specifically, under this option, the document will be processed through a full revision cycle without a call for new public proposals. This requires the TC to reconsider and act on all public proposals previously filed, generate any new TC proposals, and publish and prepare an amended Report on Proposals (ROP), followed by the processing of the new Report on Comments (ROC).
10-8-14	The 2010 Revision Cycle Consent Documents were letter balloted by the Council with an issuance date of June 1, 2010 and an effective date of June 21, 2010, as shown below: 30B *Code for the Manufacture and Storage of Aerosol Products* 33 *Standard for the Spray Application Using Flammable or Combustible Materials* 34 *Standard for Dipping and Coating Processes Using Flammable or*

	Combustible Liquids 40 *Standard for the Storage and Handling of Cellulose Nitrate Film* 73 *Electrical Inspection Code for Existing Dwellings* 87 *Recommended Practice for Fluid Heaters (New)* 88A *Standard for Parking Structures* 160 *Standard for the Use of Flame Effects Before an Audience* 307 *Standard for the Construction and Fire Protection of Marine Terminals, Piers, and Wharves* 312 *Standard for Fire Protection of Vessels During Construction, Conversion, Repair, and Lay-Up* 556 *Guide on Methods for Evaluating Fire Hazard to Occupants of Passenger Road Vehicles (New)* 780 *Standard for the Installation of Lightning Protection Systems* 1000 *Standard for Fire Service Professional Qualifications Accreditation and Certification Systems* 1071 *Standard for Emergency Vehicle Technician Professional Qualifications* 1126 *Standard for the Use of Pyrotechnics Before a Proximate Audience* 1145 *Guide for the Use of Class A Foams in Manual Structural Fire Fighting* The following documents received Certified Amending Motions but CAMS were not pursued by their submitters, therefore, they become consent documents. These documents have an issuance date of July 2, 2010 and effective date of July 22, 2010 276 *Standard Method of Fire Tests for Determining the Heat Release Rate of Roofing Assemblies with Combustible Above-Deck Roofing Components* 409 *Standard on Aircraft Hangars* 505 *Fire Safety Standard for Powered Industrial Trucks Including Type Designations, Areas of Use, Conversions, Maintenance, and Operations*
10-8-15 thru 10-8-20	D#10-10 ***SUMMARY ACTION:*** *The Standards Council voted to issue TIAs 1000, 995 and 994 on NFPA 13, NFPA 13R and NFPA 13D, respectively, which, for new installations, prohibit the use of antifreeze solutions within all NFPA 13D applications and within the dwelling unit portions of NFPA 13 and NFPA 13R sprinkler systems. In addition, the Council directed that the responsible technical committees conduct further activities as set forth in the decision.* At its meeting of August 3-5, 2010, the Standards Council considered six proposed Tentative Interim Amendments (TIAs), together with related appeals, regarding antifreeze in new residential fire sprinkler installations. Two TIAs were submitted on each of the following documents: NFPA 13, *Standard for the Installation of Sprinkler Systems,* NFPA 13D*, Standard for the Installation of Sprinkler Systems in One- and Two-Family Dwellings and Manufactured Homes,* and NFPA 13R, *Standard for the Installation of Sprinkler Systems in Residential Occupancies up to and Including Four Stories in Height*. Of the TIAs, one group of three (TIAs 1000, 995, and 994) sought collectively to prohibit the use of antifreeze solutions within all NFPA 13D applications and within the dwelling unit portions of NFPA 13 and NFPA 13R systems (the "No Antifreeze" TIAs). The other group of three (TIAs 996, 997, and 998) sought collectively to prohibit the use of antifreeze solutions in excess of 50% by volume within all NFPA 13D applications and within the dwelling unit portions of NFPA 13 and NFPA 13R systems (the "50%

	Antifreeze" TIAs). These latter TIAs permitted only the use of factory premixed antifreeze solutions. The six proposed TIAs were balloted through the responsible Technical Committees – the Technical Committee on Sprinkler System Installation Criteria for NFPA 13, and the Technical Committee on Residential Sprinklers for NFPA 13D and NFPA 13R – as well as the Technical Correlating Committee on Automatic Sprinkler Systems (the TCC). Balloting was completed in accordance with the NFPA *Regulations Governing Committee Projects,* but, as detailed further in this decision, the ballot results are of limited significance because of new technical data and information that has recently become available. The TIAs, ballot results, and several related appeals have nevertheless been forwarded to the Council for consideration. In this unusual and compelling situation, in which the status quo in the existing sprinkler documents is no longer tenable, and in which circumstances require emergency action, the Council has voted to issue three TIAs, the effect of which, pending further technical committee consideration, will be to prohibit the use of antifreeze within the dwelling unit portions of sprinkler systems **BACKGROUND** Antifreeze solutions have long been used in sprinkler systems to protect piping in unheated areas subject to freezing temperatures. Since at least 1940, NFPA standards have included guidance on the use of antifreeze solutions in sprinkler systems. The events that led to the development of the proposed TIAs to limit or prohibit the use of antifreeze solutions in residential sprinkler applications began when the NFPA became aware of a fire incident in Truckee, California, which took place in August of 2009. Emerging information concerning this incident raised concern surrounding the combustibility of antifreeze solutions in residential sprinkler systems. The incident reportedly involved a grease fire in a kitchen where a sprinkler system with a reportedly high - possibly in excess of 70% - concentration of antifreeze deployed. The fire resulted in a single fatality and serious injury to another person, and the possibility was raised that the antifreeze solution discharging from the sprinkler intensified the fire and resulting harm. In response to these reports, several activities were initiated within the NFPA and the NFPA- affiliated Fire Protection Research Foundation (the Research Foundation). These activities and especially the resulting reports of the Research Foundation will be described here only in brief, and the reader is urged to consult the Research Foundation reports available at www.nfpa.org/antifreeze for the presentation of the available research and analysis. With this caveat, it suffices to say, in outline, that the NFPA, in response to reports of the Truckee incident, commissioned the Research Foundation to conduct a literature review and develop a research plan on antifreeze solutions and residential fire sprinkler systems. A report on this project was published by the Research Foundation as "*Literature Review and Research Plan Antifreeze Solutions in Home Fire Sprinkler Systems," (*prepared for the Fire Protection Research Foundation by Code Consultants, Inc., May 28, 2010) (the First Research Foundation Report). Meetings of the NFPA Technical Correlating Committee on Sprinkler Systems (the TCC) were also convened to review available information. During this period, Underwriters Laboratories (UL) conducted a series of tests in an effort to begin exploring the effect of antifreeze

	solutions in certain residential sprinkler configurations (the Phase I tests). The Phase I tests were not conducted as part of the Research Foundation activities, but several of the tests were witnessed by researchers working on behalf of the Research Foundation and are summarized in the First Research Foundation Report. The results of these Phase I tests were also presented at a meeting of the TCC. The results of these limited Phase I tests could not provide answers to all questions concerning the safe use of antifreeze solutions in residential sprinkler systems. They did point to serious concerns with the use of higher concentrations of antifreeze and were inconclusive as to the safety of antifreeze in lower concentrations of 50% by volume or less. With the Phase I tests, the First Research Foundation Report and other available information, two sets of competing TIAs on antifreeze in residential sprinkler systems were developed and submitted by several parties. As summarized more fully above, the three No Antifreeze TIAs, prohibited the use of antifreeze solutions and the 50% Antifreeze TIAs prohibited the use of antifreeze solutions in excess of 50% by volume and required that only factory premixed solutions be used. The TIAs were submitted to the ballot of the responsible technical committees and the TCC. Five of the TIAs failed letter ballot of the technical committees. The No Antifreeze TIAs showed considerable support, including one TIA which failed by only a single vote. One of the TIAs, the 50% Antifreeze TIA on NFPA 13 did pass ballot. Unlike the balloting on the TIAs for NFPA 13D and NFPA 13R, however, the 50% Antifreeze TIA on NFPA 13 was balloted separately from the No Antifreeze option for NFPA 13, and it is not clear what effect the sequencing of the balloting on NFPA 13 may have had on the outcome. The confusing and inconclusive ballot results may have stemmed from the limited nature of the data then available to the technical committees. The Council, however, need not undertake to analyze these TIA results in any depth because events have largely superseded them. Specifically the First Research Foundation Report had concluded that "the existing research as well as the recent near-term [Phase I] testing conducted by UL indicate the urgent need for further research into the effectiveness of currently permitted antifreeze solutions." This conclusion led to the development of a Phase II test plan to investigate in greater depth the potential for large-scale ignition of antifreeze solutions discharged from residential sprinklers and the influence of antifreeze solutions on the effectiveness of residential sprinkler systems in controlling a fire condition and maintaining tenable conditions for egress. With great rapidity, the Research Foundation mounted a project to fund and conduct the Phase II testing, with UL and Code Consultants, Inc. under contract to do the testing and to develop a report. However, even under the aggressive testing schedule, the test results did not become available until after the close of balloting on the TIAs. Indeed, the Phase II tests were completed just prior to the commencement of the Standards Council's August meeting and have now been published as “Interim Report: Phase II Research Antifreeze Solutions in Home Fire Sprinkler Systems, (Prepared for the Fire Protection Research Foundation by Code Consultants, Inc., August 11, 2010) (www.nfpa.org/antifreeze) (the Second Research Foundation Report). At the Standards Council meeting, Steve Wolin, of Code Consultants, Inc., presented the Research Foundation reports, including the results of the Phase I and II tests. A hearing then proceeded to consider appeals and arguments as to what course of action the

	Council should pursue with respect to the TIAs. Rather than focus on the various arguments presented on the TIAs, the Council for purposes of this decision, focuses on some undisputed conclusions of the Phase II testing, namely that the existing provisions in NFPA 13, NFPA 13R and NFPA 13D, relating to antifreeze are no longer supportable as written. Specifically, current standards recommend the use of the antifreeze solutions, depending on the chemical being used and level of freeze protection being sought, to exceed 50% concentration, by volume, up to, in some cases, as much as 70%. See, e.g., NFPA 13, Table 7.6.2.2. The conclusions of the Research Foundation report, however, were clear this was no longer acceptable. Specifically, the new research from the Phase II testing clearly indicates that antifreeze solutions of propylene glycol exceeding 40% and glycerin exceeding 50% by volume are not appropriate for use in residential sprinkler systems, and the fire size increased (to some extent) for all the antifreeze solutions tested under certain sprinkler discharge and fire test conditions. Moreover, although these concentrations met UL 1626 fire control criteria and exhibited similar performance to that of water alone, consideration must also be given to adding appropriate safety factors for concentrations of these antifreeze solutions in the relevant standards. See Second Research Foundation Report at Executive Summary, pp. 1-2. Given these conclusions, the Council must now determine how to proceed. At the hearing to consider the TIAs, several alternatives were suggested and advocated to varying degrees, including: take no action and refer the matter back to the responsible technical committees to review the new technical data from the Phase II testing and consider further appropriate action; issue the 50% Antifreeze TIAs; issue the No Antifreeze TIAs; or issue modified TIAs taking into account the test results reported by the Research Foundation. In normal circumstances, the Council might well have delayed taking any action in order to give time to the responsible technical committees to review and take action based on the technical issues and new data presented by the Research Foundation reports. It is clear, however, from the discussion at the hearing, and from the complicated nature of the technical information that will need to be reviewed that consideration by the technical committees will require some time. Given the serious nature of the safety concerns related to the current concentrations of antifreeze permitted in existing NFPA standards, the Council believes that immediate action needs to be taken. As to the actions that have been proposed, issuing TIAs that would merely limit antifreeze solutions to 50% by volume is not an adequate step. The Phase II test results showed that a 50% by volume limitation for propylene glycol is not appropriate, and, depending on what safety factors may be needed, may not be appropriate for glycerin either. The 50% Antifreeze TIAs, moreover, would allow 50% solutions of other antifreeze compounds including diethylene glycol and ethylene glycol, which have not been tested and may well require different limits. Given the circumstances, the Council does not believe it would be appropriate for the Council to issue the 50% Antifreeze TIAs. Nor is it appropriate for the Council itself to craft and issue new TIAs that fully consider and address the technical issues raised by the Research Foundation data and other information now available. Crafting new TIAs is the province of the technical committees. In the interim, however, emergency action needs to be taken. This is not in

	dispute as the balloting on all the TIAs confirmed the emergency nature of addressing the existing antifreeze provisions concerning residential applications. Considering the entire record before it, the Council has concluded that the most prudent course of action at this time must be the most conservative approach to assuring safety in new residential sprinkler installations. That course of action is to prohibit the use of antifreeze in new residential sprinkler systems unless and until the responsible technical committees, after due consideration and any correlation by the TCC, reach consensus on a different approach. Accordingly, the Council has voted to issue the three TIAs 1000, 995 and 994 on NFPA 13, NFPA 13R and NFPA 13D, respectively, that prohibit the use of antifreeze solutions in new residential sprinkler applications. In reaching this decision, the Council wishes to make several points. First, the Council's action follows on previous action already taken by the NFPA. On July 6, 2010, the NFPA, separate from its standards development process, and acting in its role as a safety advocate, issued a Safety Alert responding to developing concerns about the use of antifreeze solutions in residential applications. The Safety Alert urged that, until further information was available, new residential sprinkler systems should be designed and installed so as not to require the use of antifreeze solutions. The TIAs now being issued merely extend this recommendation, pending any further consideration and action by the responsible technical committees. Second, it should be noted that for 13R and 13D residential systems, sprinklers are not required to be installed in unheated areas. At any rate, the use of antifreeze should be avoidable in most if not all residential installations through alternative design approaches including the use of insulation and other means. Third, the Council wishes to emphasize that in issuing the TIAs, it is not undertaking to make any final technical determination about the correct course of action that may eventually emerge. The technical issues concerning the content of NFPA codes and standards are generally for the responsible consensus based technical committees to determine, and the same should be true in this case. The Council's action is an emergency action only, and is not intended to prejudge the merits of any further revisions that the responsible technical committees may propose. As to the technical committees' further consideration of the technical issues, the record suggests that the Research Foundation reports and other information now available will require careful and considered review. This, of course, may take some time, but it is also possible that the technical committees may be able to act quickly to bring new recommendations to the Council. The Council urges the committees to address this matter with reasonable speed and provide clear technical substantiation for any further actions that are proposed. Should the committees do so prior to the Council's next scheduled meeting, the Council will make every effort to expedite its consideration of the matter through a special meeting or letter ballot. The Council wishes to address two additional important matters beyond the scope of the present TIAs. First, the TIAs that were presented to the Council all involve standards that address the design and installation of new sprinkler systems. The important question of what should be done to address antifreeze in existing residential sprinkler systems is,

	therefore, not addressed by these TIAs. Fortunately, the NFPA in its July 6, 2010 Safety Alert has addressed existing systems. Specifically, the Safety Alert stresses that fire sprinklers are extremely effective protection devices, significantly reducing deaths, injuries and property loss from fire. It urges that these systems should not be disconnected and it recommends that the following actions be taken: • If you have, or are responsible for, a residential occupancy with a fire sprinkler system, contact a sprinkler contractor to check and see if there is antifreeze solution in the system. • If there is antifreeze solution in the system, as an interim measure, drain the system and replace it with water only. Problems associated with freezing of sprinkler pipes can be mitigated by alternative measures such as insulation. NFPA hopes to provide further guidance based on additional testing before the winter freezing months. These recommendations and any updates that the NFPA may provide as a result of the Phase II testing (see www.nfpa.org/antifreeze for any updates as they may become available) provide important guidance on the handling of antifreeze in existing residential sprinkler systems. The responsible technical committees within the NFPA consensus codes and standards development process, however, should now review where and how relevant NFPA standards might be made to address antifreeze in existing systems. Relevant committees, including the Technical Committee on Sprinkler System Installation Criteria, the Technical Committee on Residential Sprinkler Systems, the Technical Correlating Committee on Automatic Sprinkler Systems, and the Technical Committee on Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance of Water-Based Systems, should consider this question in a coordinated manner and report back to the Council no later than its October 2010 meeting with any proposed actions or recommendations. Finally, the actions taken in this decision do not address antifreeze in non-residential commercial applications. As the Research Foundation reports suggests, commercial sprinklers and occupancies present quite different characteristics than residential sprinklers and occupancies and, as the First Research Foundation Report suggests, any analysis of antifreeze in sprinkler systems is highly dependent on the specific characteristics of the sprinkler design and setting. The current activities, driven by clear concerns identified in residential sprinkler systems, have been a necessary response to an emerging problem. Further research will likely be necessary to better understand and address the use of antifreeze in various non-residential commercial settings. The role of the relevant committees in considering further standards development activities in this area and in recommending needed research is clear, and the Council is, therefore, requesting that they begin to review and consider the use of antifreeze in non-residential contexts and report back to the Council by its October 2010 meeting with any proposed actions or recommendations. In conclusion, the Council wishes stress the importance of fire sprinklers in safeguarding lives and property. The home in particular is the place where most fire fatalities occur, and when home sprinklers are present, the risk of dying in a home fire decreases by 83%. It is hoped that the actions of the Standards Council, the valuable contributions of the NFPA and the Research Foundation, (including the project contractors, technical panel

	and sponsors), and the continuing activities of the sprinkler related NFPA technical committees will all combine to help ensure the continued effectiveness and wide use of these important safety devices. Council Member Roland Huggins recused himself during the hearings, deliberations and vote on the issue. Council Members Shane Clary and Ralph Gerdes wished to be recorded as voting negatively.
10-8-15-d	The Council heard a presentation by S. Wolin, Code Consultants on fire test data for sprinkler systems with various antifreeze concentrations. See related Minutes Item 10-8-15 thru 10-8-20 (D#10-10)
10-8-21	The Council voted to not issue a proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to 3.3.x Alcohol Blended Motor Fuel, 6.2.3, and Table B.1 of the 2008 edition of NFPA 30A, *Code for Motor Fuel Dispensing Facilities and Repair Garages,* (TIA No. 985). The proposed TIA failed to achieve the required support of the Technical Committee on technical merit and emergency nature. Three public comments were received and no appeals filed.
10-8-22	The Council voted to issue a proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to 8.3 of the 2009 edition of NFPA 54*, National Fuel Gas Code,* (TIA No. 984R). The proposed TIA achieved the necessary support of the Technical Committee on technical merit and emergency nature. Five public comments were received and no appeals filed.
10-8-23	The Council voted to issue a proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to 5.2.1.11, 6.6.6, A.6.6.6 and 14.3.1.4 of the proposed 2011 edition of NFPA 58*, Liquefied Petroleum Gas Code,* (TIA No. 986). The proposed TIA achieved the necessary support of the Technical Committee on technical merit and emergency nature. No public comments were received and no appeals filed.
10-8-24	The Council voted to issue a proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to 90.2(B)(5)(b) of the 2008 edition of NFPA 70*, National Electrical Code®,* (TIA No. 990). The proposed TIA achieved the necessary support of the Technical Correlating Committee on correlation issues and emergency nature and the Panel on technical merit and emergency nature. One public comment was received and no appeals were filed.
10-8-25	The Council voted not to issue a proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to 9.2.7.3 of the 2007 edition of NFPA 79*, Electrical Standard for Industrial Machinery,* (TIA No. 989). The proposed TIA failed to achieve the required support of the Technical Correlating Committee on correlating issues and emergency nature and the Technical Committee on technical merit and emergency nature. One public comment was received and no appeals filed.
10-8-26	The Council voted to issue a proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to 7.4.10.2 of the proposed 2011 edition of NFPA 86*, Standard on Ovens and Furnaces,* (TIA No. 987). The proposed TIA achieved the necessary support of the Technical Committee on technical merit and emergency nature. No public comments were received and no appeals filed.
10-8-27	The Council voted to issue a proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to 14.5.1.7.4 and A.14.5.1.7.4 of the proposed 2011 edition of NFPA 86*, Standard for Ovens and Furnaces,* (TIA No. 988). The proposed TIA achieved the necessary support of the Technical Committee on technical merit and emergency nature. No public comments were received and no appeals filed.
10-8-28	D#10-20 *SUMMARY ACTION: The Standards Council voted to uphold the appeal and issue TIA No. 982.*

	At its meeting of August 3-5, 2010, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Glenn Pecht of Senior Flexonics, requesting the issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) No. 982 on the 2010 edition of NFPA 850, *Recommended Practice for Fire Protection for Electric Generating Plants and High Voltage Direct Current Converter Stations*. The proposed TIA seeks to modify Section 11.4.1.1 as follows: **11.4.1.1*** ANSI/ASME B31.1, *Power Piping,* should be followed in the design of HTF piping systems. Piping and fittings should be properly designed to resist an exposure fire until protection can be achieved by water spray. ~~To reduce possible sources of leaks, use of rotating-ball-joint-type connections instead of flexible hose connections in areas such as the HTF loop connection of adjacent solar collector assemblies should be considered.~~ Careful consideration should be given to the design, application, construction, and installation of connections (e.g., rotating ball joint, flexible hose, etc.) employed in areas such as the HTF loop connections of adjacent solar collector assemblies so as to prevent possible sources of HTF leaks. Gaskets and seals should be compatible with HTF. Flanges and piping connections on HTF systems should have guards. As background, proposed TIA 982 was balloted through the Technical Committee on Electric Generating Plants (TC) in accordance with the *Regulations Governing Committee Projects*, to determine if it had the necessary three-fourths majority support on technical merit and emergency nature to establish a recommendation for issuance. The ballot passed the TC on technical merit, but failed to achieve the necessary support of the TC on emergency nature. No public comments on the proposed TIA were received. Where the ballot does not pass the TC on both technical merit and emergency nature, the recommendation to the Council is to not issue the TIA. The appeal requests that the Council overturn the action of the responsible TC, and instead issue the TIA. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal. On appeal, the Council generally defers to the responsible TC on technical issues, and here the TC supported the technical merit of the TIA. The TIA, however, failed the ballot on emergency nature by one vote. The question of emergency nature is one on which the Council gives less deference to the judgment of the TC since evaluation of emergency nature often involves issues of a non-technical nature that the Council itself has an obligation to evaluate to ensure fairness in the treatment of subjects addressed by TIAs. The Council has no difficulty here in concluding the TIA meets the test of emergency nature and accordingly has voted to uphold the appeal and issue TIA No. 982.
10-8-29	It was voted to approve the request of the Technical Correlating Committee on Automatic Sprinkler Systems to revise the scopes for the Technical Committee on Sprinkler Systems Installation (AUT-SSI) and the Technical Committee on Sprinkler System Discharge (AUT-SSD) by transferring the responsibilities for Chapter 22 and Chapter 23 as follows: AUT-SSD Scope: This Committee shall have primary responsibility for those portions of NFPA 13 that pertain to the classification of various fire hazards and the determination of associated discharge criteria for sprinkler systems employing automatic and open

	sprinklers, sprinkler system plans and calculations, and water supplies. AUT-SSI Scope: This Committee shall have the primary responsibility for those portions of NFPA 13 that pertain to the criteria for the use and installation of sprinkler systems components (with the exception of those components used for supporting of piping), position of sprinklers, types of systems, ~~plans and calculations, water supplies~~, and acceptance testing.
10-8-30	The Council considered the request of the Technical Committee (TC) on Fire Service Training to have NFPA establish a new document on fire service training on thermal imaging. At the March 2010 Standards Council Meeting the Council reviewed this request and directed that the TC on Fire Service Training and the TC on Electronic Safety work together to come to a joint decision on how best to address the issue of fire service training on thermal imagers. The Technical Committees are now reporting back to the Council that a Task Group (TG) has been formed that is composed of members from both TCs. It has been determined that the TG will produce a draft document and then release it to the Fire Service Training Committee who will assume primary responsibility of the document. After review of the recommendation from both TCs, the Council has voted to approve the development of this new document on fire service training on thermal imaging. After the task group has produced a draft document and released it to the Fire Service Training Committee, this TC must ballot the document (see *Regs*. 4.3.1.1) approving its release. The TC can then make a request to the Council to enter an appropriate revision cycle. The Council approved the scope of the document as follows: Document Scope: This standard shall contain minimum requirements for training fire service personnel in the selection, operation, care, use and maintenance of thermal imagers.
10-8-31	At the March, 2010 Standards Council Meeting, the Council considered the request of the International Association of Fire Chiefs to establish a new project on organization and deployment of fire investigation operations, code enforcement operations and public education operations to the public by career fire department. Action on this item was deferred from the August 2009 Meeting, administratively withdrawn from the October 2009 Agenda, and deferred to the March 2010 meeting while additional information was being sought. At the March 2010 meeting, the Council voted to publish a notice of receipt of the request soliciting opinions on the need for the document, information on resources available on the subject matter, those interested in participating if approved, and other organizations that may be actively involved with the subject matter. Sixty-one responses were received expressing support for the proposed project and volunteering to become members of the Committee when formed. After a review of all the information before it, the Council has voted to approve the development of this Technical Committee (TC) on Fire Prevention Organization and Deployment. Once the TC has developed and balloted a draft document (see *Regs*. 4.3.1.1), the TC can then make a request to the Council to enter an appropriate revision cycle. The Council approved the title and scope of the Committee as follows: Committee Title: Fire Prevention Organization and Deployment

	Committee Scope: This Committee shall have primary responsibility for documents on the organization, operation, deployment, and evaluation of code enforcement, public fire and life safety education, and fire investigation operations. See related Minutes Item 10-8-47-b
10-8-32	At its March 2010 meeting, the Council considered the request of D. Forsman, Chief, Champaign Fire Department, Champaign, Illinois, that NFPA consider the establishment of a new proposed technical committee and document on professional qualifications for emergency responders working on roadways. This request was administratively withdrawn from the October 2009 Agenda and deferred to the March 2010 meeting while additional information was being sought. After review of all the information before it, the Council voted to publish a notice of receipt of the request soliciting opinions on the need for the document, information on resources available on the subject matter, those interested in participating if approved, and other organizations that may be actively involved with the subject matter. Forty-four responses were received which expressed support for the proposed project; many responders also volunteered to become members of the Committee when formed. After a review of all the information before it, the Council has voted to establish a Technical Committee (TC) on Traffic Control Incident Management Professional Qualifications. Once the TC has been constituted they can review the Committee scope, and if necessary, may propose revisions to it. After the TC has developed and balloted a draft document (see *Regs*. 4.3.1.1), the TC can then make a request to the Council to enter an appropriate revision cycle. The Council approved the title and scope of the Committee and the document scope as follows: Committee Title: Traffic Control Incident Management Professional Qualifications Committee Scope: The Committee shall have jurisdiction over documents that address professional qualifications for emergency responders in relation to their operations on roadways. Document Scope: This standard identifies the minimum job performance requirements (JPRs) necessary to perform temporary traffic control duties at emergency incidents on, or near an active roadway. Standards Council Member Gerdes and Standards Council Member Jardin wished to be recorded as voting negatively.
10-8-33	The Council considered the request of the Technical Committee (TC) on Special Operations Protective Clothing and Equipment for a new document on Contaminated Water Operations Protective Clothing and Equipment. At the March 2009 Standards Council Meeting, the Council reviewed the request and determined that before a document could be developed that the TC needed to review its membership and make any membership recommendations necessary to assure that the TC has appropriate contaminated water expertise. The TC has now reported back to the Council showing that the TC has the expertise to write the new document, specifically with contaminated water expertise. After review of the material before them, the Council has determined that the TC on

	Special Operations Protective Clothing and Equipment has the appropriate expertise to develop the document on contaminated water and may proceed with the development of the document on Contaminated Water Operations Protective Clothing and Equipment. After the TC has developed and balloted a draft document (see *Regs*. 4.3.1.1), the TC can then make a request to the Council to enter an appropriate revision cycle.
10-8-34	At its March, 2010 meeting, the Council considered the request of the Technical Committee (TC) on Hazardous Materials Response Personnel, that NFPA consider the establishment of a new recommended practice on minimum requirements for the organization and management of hazardous materials/weapons of mass destruction (WMD) emergency response program. After review of all the information before it, the Council voted to publish a notice of receipt of the request soliciting opinions on the need for the document, information on resources available on the subject matter, those interested in participating if approved, and other organizations that may be actively involved with the subject matter. Five responses were received which consisted of support for the proposed project when formed. After a review of all the information before it, the Council has voted to approve the development of this Document. Once the TC has developed and balloted the draft document (see *Regs*. 4.3.1.1), the TC can then make a request to the Council to enter an appropriate revision cycle. The Council approved the document scope: Document Scope: This recommended practice establishes a common set of criteria for the organization, management, and deployment of personnel, resources, and programs for those public or private entities that are responsible for the hazardous materials/weapons of mass destruction emergency preparedness function.
10-8-35	At the March 2010 meeting, the Council considered the request of S. Pitts, Marine Corps Systems Command, that NFPA consider the establishment of a new proposed document on power air purifying respirator (PAPR). Action on this item was deferred from the August 2009 meeting. This request was administratively withdrawn from the October 2009 Agenda and deferred to the March 2010 meeting while clarifying information was being sought. After review of all the information before them, the Council voted to publish a notice of receipt of the request soliciting opinions on the need for the document, information on resources available on the subject matter, those interested in participating if approved, and other organizations that may be actively involved with the subject matter. Six responses were received which mostly consisted of support for the proposed project if formed. The Council has reviewed the public comments in favor of the development, and after a review of all the information before it, the Council has voted to approve the development of this Document and assign it to the Technical Committee (TC) on Respiratory Protection Equipment. Once the TC has developed and balloted the draft document (see *Regs*. 4.3.1.1), the TC can then make a request to the Council to enter an appropriate revision cycle. The Council approved the document scope, as follows: Document Scope: Specify minimum requirements for the design, performance, testing, NIOSH certification, and independent third-party certification for high air flow powered air purifying respirators (PAPRs) for

	emergency services operations at incidents involving chemical warfare agents, toxic industrial chemicals/toxic industrial materials, biological warfare agents, and radioactive particulates.
10-8-36	The Council reviewed the request of the NFPA Staff Liaison on the possibility of consolidating and combining the four combustible dust committees and five documents. After review of all the information before it, the Council believes that the reasons and the rationale for combining the committees and documents appear to be compelling and the Council has voted that a task group be formed. This task group will be appointed and chaired by Standards Council Member Jim Milke and shall consist of the chairs of the respective committees and may also include a few additional members from each committee. The task group shall meet to develop recommendations and a plan for a path forward on consolidation of the combustible dust committees and documents. The task group shall report back to the Council with those findings at the Council's October 2010 meeting.
10-8-37	The Council reviewed the request of the Chairs of the NEC Technical Correlating Committee (TCC) and the Technical Committee (TC) on Electrical Safety in the Workplace that the Council direct that the 2012 edition of NFPA 70E not become effective until 180 days from the date of issuance by the Standards Council. The Council voted to deny the request and notes that the effective date of this and all NFPA codes and standards should remain as 20 days after issuance from the Standards Council. The effective date of codes and standards is in the purview of the Council as noted in 4.8.2 of the *Regulations Governing Committee Projects* (*Regs.*) and the Council sees no reason to deviate. Delaying the effective date could inhibit users who wish to implement the codes and standards sooner. In any event, NFPA codes and standards are voluntary and users who adopt or use voluntary codes and standards can decide when and how to implement their use.
10-8-38	The Council has reviewed a request from NFPA Staff on behalf of the Chemical Safety Board (CSB) and Christian Dubay, NFPA Vice President of Codes and Standards and Chief Engineer regarding CSB's urgent safety recommendations regarding two explosion incidents. As background, the Chemical Safety Board (CSB) investigated two explosions in the past year in an industrial plant and at a nearly completed power plant. Though different industries, the practice of venting natural gas through piping and then releasing the gas into the atmosphere without proper control of the discharged flammable vapors has linked these two fatal incidents. At the conclusion of each of the investigations, the CSB issued urgent safety recommendations to various parties, including NFPA. NFPA has addressed one of these incidents, ConAgra, by issuing a TIA to NFPA 54 that addresses the issue of purging. In response to the second incident, Kleen Energy, two options were proposed to the Council to address this incident and they are: Option 1. Revise the Scope of the National Fuel Gas Code Technical Committee to permit it to address power plant piping systems, and request it to consider revisions to NFPA 54, *National Fuel Gas Code*, to address the safe conduct of fuel gas piping cleaning operations. Discussion. The CSB's recommendation focuses on the *National Fuel Gas Code* as the

	potential location for requirements to address the safe conduct of fuel gas pipe cleaning operations. NFPA 54, *National Fuel Gas Code*, however, has traditionally excluded electric utility power plants from coverage and has been limited to the installation of fuel gas piping systems with a maximum operating pressure of 125 psi. Moreover, the scope currently assigned by the Council to the Technical Committee limits the committee's authority to the development of standards for piping systems with a maximum operating pressure of 125 psi. In order for the Technical Committee to address the recommendations of the CSB, therefore, the Standards Council would have to revise the scope of the Technical Committee to enable it to do so. Questions that the Council would have to consider in addressing this option would include whether the *National Fuel Gas Code* is the best or most appropriate place to address piping operations, whether the Technical Committee has or could include the appropriate expertise to do so, and whether the Technical Committee itself believes that it is the appropriate body to undertake the activity. Option 2. Appoint a new technical committee to develop a separate standard specifically dedicated to addressing the safe practices associated with an array of gas process activities, including cleaning of gas piping, enriching the concentration within gas piping during commissioning (charging the line), and discharge of gas already in the system during gas purging or maintenance. Discussion. Because several NFPA documents contain requirements applicable to processing flammable gases in industrial systems (boilers, ovens, gas turbines and stationary combustion engines), the Chairs of those Technical Committees have come together in a joint task group to consider and coordinate discussion of possible issues in their respective committee documents that involve some aspect of flowing gas through piping at various stages of system operations. After review of all information before it, the Council voted to publish a notice seeking input from the affected Technical Committee membership and the public to seek comments on options on how to proceed. The Council requests comments on two options: 1) expanding the scope of NFPA 54; and 2) establishment of a new Technical Committee and Document on Gas Process Safety. The input received will then be reviewed by the Council at the October 2010 meeting.
10-8-39	It was voted to approve the request of the Technical Committee on Explosion Protection Systems for a one-time revision cycle change for NFPA 68*, Standard on Explosion Protection by Deflagration Venting* to move from F2011 to A2012; and NFPA 69, *Standard on Explosion Prevention Systems* to move from A2012 to A2013.
10-8-40	It was voted to approve the request of the Technical Committee on Fire Department Apparatus for a one-time revision cycle change for NFPA 1906, *Standard for Wildland Fire Apparatus* to move from F2010 to F2011. This document will not reopen for new proposals.
10-8-41	It was voted to approve the request of the Technical Committee on Fire Service Occupational Safety and Health for a one-time revision cycle change for the following documents: NFPA 1583, *Standard on Health-Related Fitness Programs for Fire Department Members* from A2012 to F2014; and NFPA 1584, *Standard on Health-Related Fitness Programs for Fire Department Members* to move from F2012 to F2014.

10-8-42	It was voted to approve the Technical Committee on Fire Service Training for a one-time revision cycle change for NFPA 1451, *Standard for a Fire Service Vehicle Operations Training Program* from F2011 to F2012.
10-8-43	It was voted to approve the request of the Technical Committee on Fire Tests for a one-time revision cycle change for the following documents: NFPA 259, *Standard Test Method for Developing Toxic Potency Data for Use in Fire Hazard Modeling* to move from A2012 to F2012; NFPA 270, *Standard Test Method for Measurement of Smoke Obscuration Using a Conical Radiant Source in a Single Closed Chamber* to move from A2012 to F2012; NFPA 289, *Standard Method of Fire Test for Individual Fuel Packages* to move from A2012 to F2012; NFPA 260, *Standard Methods of Tests and Classification System for Cigarette Ignition Resistance of Components of Upholstered Furniture* to move from A2013 to F2012; NFPA 261, *Standard Method of Test for Determining Resistance of Mock-Up Upholstered Furniture Material Assemblies to Ignition by Smoldering Cigarettes* to move from A2013 to F2012; NFPA 274, *Standard Test Method to Evaluate Fire Performance Characteristics of Pipe Insulation* to move from A2013 to F2012; NFPA 290, *Standard for Fire Testing of Passive Protection Materials for Use on LP-Gas Containers* to move from A2013 to F2012; and NFPA 705, *Recommended Practice for a Field Flame Test for Textiles and Films* to move from A2013 to F2012.
10-8-44	It was voted to approve the request of the Technical Committee Static Electricity for a one-time revision cycle change for NFPA 77, *Recommended Practice on Static Electricity* to move from A2011 to F2012.
10-8-45	It was voted to approve the request of the Technical Committee on Structural and Proximity Fire Fighting Protective Clothing for a one-time revision cycle change for NFPA 1851, *Standard on Selection, Care, and Maintenance of Protective Ensembles for Structural Fire Fighting and Proximity Fire Fighting* to move from A2012 to F2012. The Committee is also requesting that the proposal closing date be November 30, 2010.
10-8-46	The Council heard a Report of the Policy and Procedures Task Group.
10-8-47	The Council heard a report from the Committee Membership Task Group.
10-8-47-a	The Council considered the membership Task Group's recommendations on pending applications for committee membership and took appropriate action on each. Changes in committee membership approved by the Council can be found in Minutes Attachment 10-8-47-a.
10-8-47-b	It was voted to issue a proposed start-up roster (see Minutes Attachment 10-8-47-b) and scope for a new Technical Committee on Fire Prevention Organization and Deployment. The approved scope is as follows: Committee Scope: This Committee shall have primary responsibility for documents on the organization, operation, deployment, and evaluation of code enforcement, public fire and life safety education, and fire investigation operations. See related Minutes Item 10-8-31
10-8-47-c	It was voted to issue a proposed start-up roster (see Minutes Attachment 10-8-47-c) for the new Technical Committee on Fluid Heaters.
10-8-48	The Council heard a Report of the Recording Secretary on the status of the March 2-3, 2010 minutes, which were approved.
10-8-49	The Council reviewed the dates and places for upcoming meetings, as follows:

	Full Council October 19-20, 2010 (Task Group 8AM on Oct 19) February 28 (noon Task Group) March 1-2, 2011 August 8 (noon Task Group) August 9-11, 2011	San Antonio, TX San Juan, PR Quincy, MA
10-8-50	It was voted to approve the request of the Committee on Respiratory Protection Equipment for a one-time revision cycle change for NFPA 1981, *Standard on Open-Circuit Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus (SCBA) for Emergency Services* to move from F2011 to F2012.	
10-8-51	It was voted to approve the request of the Committee on Electronic Safety Equipment for a one-time revision cycle change for NFPA 1982, *Standard on Personal Alert Safety Systems (PASS)* to move from F2011 to F2012.	

Respectfully submitted,

Linda J. Fuller
Recording Secretary
NFPA Standards Council