NFPA Technical Committee on Fire Department Rescue Tools

NFPA 1936 (F2014 cycle)
Second Draft Meeting
Hilton Carillon Park
St. Petersburg, FL
March 4-6, 2014

Meeting Schedule

Day One: March 4\textsuperscript{th} Meeting to begin at 12:00 Noon, estimated finish at 5:30 PM.

Day Two: March 5\textsuperscript{th} Meeting to begin at 08:00 AM, Lunch Break at 12:00 Noon, estimated finish at 5:30 PM.

Day Three: March 6\textsuperscript{th} Meeting to begin at 08:00 AM, estimated finish at 1:00 PM.

Agenda

1). Call to order
2). Introduction and attendance
3). Recognize phone call-in Committee Members and interested party call-ins
4). Opening remarks by Chair, Glenn E. Mate
5). Review and approval of minutes from previous meeting
6). Power-point presentation by Chair, Glenn E. Mate
7). NFPA Staff Liaison presentation, Chris Farrell
8). Task Group reports
9). New Business
   A). Review public comments
   B). Discuss committee comments
10). Old Business
11). Other items, items from the floor
12). Next meeting
13). Adjourn
Call to Order
8:00 AM - The meeting is called to order by Chairman Glenn Mate

Introductions and Attendance
Attendance was taken and introductions were made.

Glenn Mate Chair
Lewis Austin
Paul Curtis
Thomas Gaylord*
Brad Havrilla
Christopher James
John Marstiller*
John McCarthy
Chris Mokracek
Patrick Moore
Alan Painter
William Swayne
Eric Marquess Alternate
Chris Farrell Staff Liaison

Tammy Horne Hale Products/ IDEX corp.
Bryan Wells Greensboro Fire Department
Michael Wixted NFPA Staff
* online/ phone

Opening Remarks by Chair, Glenn Mate

Review and Approval of Minutes from Previous Meeting
The minutes from the previous Committee meeting, held in Indianapolis, April 13-14 2008, were reviewed and approved.

NFPA Staff Liaison Presentation
NFPA Staff Liaison Chris Farrell presented NFPA guidelines for committee work and introduced the new procedures, terminology and policies that govern committee work. He also pointed out that the document is in the 2014 cycle for a 2015 revision.

Reports

A. Research Foundation report: Assessment of Powered Rescue Tool Capabilities with High-Strength Alloys and Composite Materials (rev. Dec. 2011) was reviewed by Casey Grant, NFPA.
B. Task Group Reports
   a. Research Foundation work getting into the standard – most likely it will be referenced in
      the appendix and a link provided to the full report.
   b. Review of 5.4 through 6.1.1.22 – The Task Group presented several comments and
      suggested language clarifications which were addressed and will appear in the First
      Draft document.
   c. Chapter four was reviewed. Some changes were suggested by the task group.

New Business

   A. Review Public Inputs – Two public inputs were received and addressed by the committee
   B. Discussion of Committee Inputs – Thirty-five First Revisions were made. The Committee
      discussed improved language in Section 4 as well as some clarification language in areas of
      the document that were affected by changes made in Sections 4 and 5. The approved
      changes will appear in the First Draft.

Old Business – None

Other Items – None

Next Meeting - The next meeting was suggested to be held in Tampa, FL, March 4-6, 2014.

Adjournment - The meeting adjourned at 12:30 PM on April 11, 2013.

Respectfully Submitted,

William G. Swayne
Secretary
Public Comment No. 2-NFPA 1936-2013 [ Sections 5.1.7, 5.1.8 ]

Sections 5.1.7, 5.1.8

5.1.7
All product labels shall meet the requirements of UL 969, Standard for Marking and Labeling Systems, for resistance to damage from temperatures between -29°C and 71°C (-20°F and 160°F) and outdoor use, and exposure to oil, fuel, water, and the hydraulic fluids used in the rescue tools.

5.1.8
Where, in addition to 5.1.7, where any required product labels are self-adhesive, the label material adhesion shall be evaluated for outdoor use applicable for the adhered surface.

Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Comment

The intent of this proposal is to clarify the requirements for all product labels regarding the evaluation for outdoor use. In addition, clause 5.1.8 is being revised to require that the adhesion evaluated per UL 969 shall be assessed on the substrate in which the adhesion label will be adhered (such as a rubber hydraulic hose).
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Sections 5.3.3.2, 5.3.3.3

5.3.3.2
Where the additional product label is configured as a hang tag as permitted by 5.3.3.1, the hang tag shall be attached to the assembly in a manner that it is not possible to remove the additional product label and use the assembly without being aware of the presence of the label. Have the following legibly printed on the label: “DO NOT DISPOSE OF THIS HANG TAG.”

5.3.3.3
Where the additional product label, if permanently attached, shall have the following legibly printed on the label: “DO NOT REMOVE THIS LABEL.” If label is a hang tag, it shall have the following legibly printed on the label: “DO NOT DISPOSE OF THIS HANG TAG.”

Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Comment

Clause 5.3.3.2 includes a requirement without a test method to validate. It is understood that the intent of the requirement is to design a hang tag construction such that the removal of such a tag is quite difficult and if removed, alerts the user that the hang tag is missing. With that said, Section 7 does not define a minimum strength requirement for such an evaluation, as well, Section 8 does not define an appropriate test method.

To better align the labeling requirements, it is being proposed that the hang tag requirements be aligned with the permanently attached label requirements in clause 5.3.3.3.

In addition, the last sentence of 5.3.3.3 belongs in clause 5.3.3.2 as it relates to hang tags.
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