Reference: 4.1.3.2
F.I.

Question:  Are agent storage containers permitted to be located within the hazard area?
Answer:  Yes.

Issue Edition:  1973
Reference:  1541
Date:  October - November 1974
Reference: 4.1.3.3, 4.1.4.7, and 5.5.1
F.I. 85-2

Question 1: Is it the intent of 5.5.1 that the total flooding quantity of Halon 1301 required to achieve design concentration be calculated on the basis of:
   a) the design temperature in the hazard area?
   Answer: Yes.
   b) the minimum anticipated temperature in the hazard area?
   Answer: Yes.
   c) the minimum anticipated temperature of the storage container?
   Answer: No.

Question 2: Does 4.1.4.7 define the phrase “severe weather conditions” in 4.1.3.3 to mean greater than 130°F or less than -20°F?
   Answer: No.

Issue Edition: 1985
Reference: 1-9.4.3, 1-9.5.8, 2-5.2
Date: December 1985
Reprinted to correct error: January 1989
Reference: 4.3.3.5, 5.5.2
F.I. 80-5

Background: Section 1.5.1 and Annex D address at substantial length the hazards to personnel from the extinguishing agent, its decomposition products produced by a fire, and the effects of agent discharge. However, nowhere does the standard seem to address good practice by assuring total personnel evacuation prior to discharge.

Question 1: Is it the intent of the Technical Committee to allow the installation of manual actuation stations within the hazard enclosure of total flooding systems? (Manual actuation stations being arranged to discharge agent immediately upon activation, thus requiring the occupant to be within the confines of the enclosure during all or portions of the system discharge.)

Answer: Yes.

Question 2: If the answer to Question 1 is “yes,” is it the intent of 5.5.2 to require additional agent quantities to compensate for loss, when the occupant exits the hazard enclosure?

Answer: No.

Question 3: If the answer to Question 1 is “no,” is it the intent of the Technical Committee to subject the location of the manual actuation stations to the approval/discretion of the authority having jurisdiction?

Answer: N/A.

Issue Edition: 1980
Reference: 1-8.3.5, 2-5.1
Date: February 1985
Reference: 4.3.4.1, 4.3.4.2
F.I. 87-1

Question 1:  Do the requirements of NFPA 12A, 4.3.4.1 and 4.3.4.2 mean that the detection system control equipment and the halon system actuation devices must be supplied by the same manufacturer?

Answer:  No.

Question 2:  Can one assume that if both the detection system control equipment and the halon system actuation devices are supplied by the same manufacturer that the requirements of NFPA 12A, 4.3.4.1 and 4.3.4.2 have been implicitly satisfied?

Answer:  No.

Question 3:  Do 4.3.4.1 and 4.3.4.2 of NFPA 12A require either evaluation by an organization acceptable to the Authority Having Jurisdiction or other means, such as an engineering evaluation satisfactory to the Authority Having Jurisdiction to show compatibility between control equipment and actuation devices, in all cases?

Answer:  Yes.

Question 4:  Was it the intent of the Committee in drafting 4.3.4.1 and 4.3.4.2 of NFPA 12A to permit the use of a detection system control panel made by one manufacturer and a halon system actuation device made by another manufacturer as long as the compatibility between them is verified in a means acceptable to the Authority Having Jurisdiction?

Answer:  Yes.