MEMORANDUM

To: NFPA Technical Committee on Fire and Emergency Service Organization and Deployment-Career

From: Jenny Depew, Administrator, Technical Projects

Date: January 21, 2014

Subject: NFPA 1710 First Draft TC FINAL Ballot Results (A2015)

According to the final ballot results, all ballot items received the necessary affirmative votes to pass ballot.

28 Members Eligible to Vote
4 Not Returned (P. Brooks, A. Brunacini, R. Crawford, F. De Clercq)

14 Affirmative on All
3 Negatives on one or more first revision: (R. Brown, D. Greensweig, C. Spain)
0 Abstentions on one or more first revision

The attached report shows the number of affirmative, negative, and abstaining votes as well as the explanation of the vote for each first revision. Cathy Spain, Richard Brown, and Daniel Greensweig have addressed several revisions with the following voting comment: “See statement sent to NFPA from NLC and ICMA.” The comments exceeded the 4,000 character limit, therefore they were submitted to NFPA in a Word Document and have been attached to this report.

There are two criteria necessary for each first revision to pass ballot: (1) simple majority and (2) affirmative $\frac{2}{3}$ vote. The mock examples below show how the calculations are determined.

(1) Example for Simple Majority: Assuming there are 20 vote eligible committee members, 11 affirmative votes are required to pass ballot. (Sample calculation: 20 members eligible to vote ÷ 2 = 10 + 1 = 11)

(2) Example for Affirmative $\frac{2}{3}$: Assuming there are 20 vote eligible committee members and 1 member did not return their ballot and 2 members abstained, the number of affirmative votes required would be 12. (Sample calculation: 20 members eligible to vote – 1 not returned – 2 abstentions = 17 x 0.66 = 11.22 = 12)

As always please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Jenny Depew, Administrator, Technical Projects
    National Fire Protection Association

FROM: Dan Greensweig, 1710 Technical Committee Member
      Richard Brown, 1710 Technical Committee Member
      Cathy Spain, 1710 Technical Committee Member
      Tom Wieczorek, 1710 Technical Committee Alternate

RE: Reasons for Negative Votes on Ballots Cast by NLC and ICMA
    Representatives Regarding NFPA Standard 1710

DATE: January 8, 2014

Introduction

The purpose of this memorandum is to document the reasons for our negative votes on the following revisions on the 1710 ballot: FR 3, 6, 4, 11, 12, 13, 10.

As representatives of the National League of Cities (NLC) and the International City/County Management Association (ICMA), we have determined that the 1710 Standard does not serve the interests of cities and counties. The traditional standard of response coverage that is contained in the 1710 Standard focuses on the level and speed of response in fighting fires and providing emergency medical services. The 1710 Standard embraces a one-size-fits-all approach that is inconsistent with a modern approach to improving public safety. We support an integrated risk management planning process that employs a community risk assessment, promotes prevention, and focuses on outcomes for determining deployment methodologies.

Need for Local Discretion

Many local communities are affected by resource constraints, including those that affect fire safety, education and training, and firefighting personnel. Budget limitations combined with the fire services’ expanding responsibilities in homeland security, emergency medical services, hazardous materials incidents response, search and rescue, and other emergency demands translate to more duties and fewer dollars to support them.

Local government residents have shown an unwillingness to support additional taxation and have demanded reductions in costs. The legacy costs of pensions and health care of current and former public safety employees create another level of fiscal stress.
Communities need the flexibility to make judgments about risks, how to manage those risks, and how to allocate resources that balance prevention and intervention. The Standard should focus on creating guidelines that communities can use to manage risks that are appropriate for their unique, individual needs, rather than attempting to impose criteria that in many places will be neither attainable nor desired.

We commend the work of the new NFPA 1730 Technical Committee dealing with the deployment of prevention programs and the work of Vision 20/20 in bringing greater focus to community risk reduction, planning, and management. We endorse the data-driven analysis that is the basis for community risk assessment and risk-reduction decision making. This is especially important since a majority of professional fire departments are so small and remote that they will never meet the arbitrary factors imposed by 1710 and thus need real, actionable guidance.

Need for Integrated and Outcomes-based Standards

We believe that decisions about resource deployment for fire suppression and other emergency medical and special operations must be integrated with decisions about prevention programs. Local decision makers need the flexibility to establish staffing and response times based on local circumstances and take into account the relevant science. The deployment of resources must be based on both anticipated and actual risks in the community that are based on various profiles: geographic, demographic, fire loss, building stock, and economic. We urge NFPA to consider whether its technical committee structure supports local community efforts to identify, prioritize, mitigate and prevent community risks and we suggest that having separate technical committees dealing with suppression and other operations and prevention deployment present a significant roadblock to an integrated approach to community risk management.

A related concern is the focus in the 1710 Standard on inputs rather than outcomes. We believe that the best way to optimize time, money and other resources is to have an outcome-oriented approach where communities are encouraged to embrace innovative and creative problem solving to achieve results. A rigid standard that addresses reacting to fires and medical emergencies is not incentivizing efficiency, effectiveness, and creativity in the fire service.

Need for Balance on the 1710 Technical Committee

We have tried to bring about changes in the 1710 Standard that would make it more acceptable. We were able to insert language in the Standard’s annex about community risk assessment. We applaud these inclusions, but note that the approach taken in the 1730 Standard where the community risk assessment is in the Standard and not relegated to the annex is more consistent with the results we are trying to achieve. During the current revision cycle, we worked with other members of the Technical Committee to include new equivalency language in the annex. This language was not given full consideration.
There is a reason why we were not able to provide practical guidance to cities and counties on equivalency in the annex of the 1710 Standard and why there exist other fundamental flaws in the 1710 Standard. The 1710 Technical Committee does not have the balance of interests mandated by NFPA for its committees. As a result, the 1710 Standard is not a consensus document. This imbalance undermines the standard-setting process and calls into question the validity of the 1710 Standard. We have observed that the 1710 Standard has not achieved widespread adoption. We do not believe it will until the 1710 Technical Committee fully and equitably represents the full range of community interests affected by this Standard.

We strongly support greater reliance on more science in the standard-setting process through the National Institute of Standards and Technology’s studies of residential (2010) and high-rise (2013) fires. However, we are concerned about the significant involvement in the studies by organizations that may have preconceived expectations about what the outcomes of those studies will be. We believe that research suggesting new methods of resource deployment and tactics is not supported or considered by the Technical Committee if it recommends fewer suppression resources. For example, new research is suggesting that fire departments should fight fires defensively more frequently. This research was not considered by the Technical Committee.

Considerable research has been conducted by Underwriters Laboratories (UL) on the effects of new building techniques that would negate much of the methodology that has been incorporated into the 1710 Standard using traditional firefighting techniques. The UL research, compiled and presented for departmental use via the internet and other venues, clearly indicates that traditional search and rescue/firefighting techniques may lead to increased dangers for first responders and residents. The processes studied to date rely on historical deployment methodology and fail to take these significant safety issues into account. Further, 11 years of research has taken place in the United Kingdom on new models for deployment that have led to significant increases in safety for responders and residents but that have also reduced financial demands on communities via staffing. The studies and research have led to far different responses for incidents based on risks and historical deployment with a concentration on metric-driven outcomes.

Call for Action

We appreciate the opportunity to raise these concerns. We acknowledge the support we have received from the Committee leadership to express our views and from the staff in helping us to understand the NFPA standard-setting process and answering our questions. However, we urge the NFPA Standards Council to take actions that address our concerns so that the validity of the standard-setting process itself will be preserved and the 1710 Standard will support local efforts to reduce citizen and firefighter deaths and fire losses through more modern means that are demonstrably more successful.
We believe there is significant room for improvement in preventing and fighting fires. The members of NLC and ICMA are on the forefront of efforts to continue providing adequate public safety in the context of increasingly limited resources and both organizations want to work with other fire service constituencies to develop and promote
solutions. Unfortunately, the 1710 Standard as currently designed, and with the revisions being proposed, is not a solution we believe will accomplish those goals and we cannot endorse it.
Change individuals to member throughout standard.

Submitter Information Verification

Submitter Full Name: [ Not Specified ]
Organization: [ Not Specified ]
Street Address:
City:
State:
Zip:
Submittal Date: Tue Oct 08 18:36:40 EDT 2013

Committee Statement

Committee Statement: The term member is the term used and needs to be consistent in the standard.

Response Message:

Ballot Results

☑ This item has passed ballot

28 Eligible Voters
4 Not Returned
23 Affirmative All
  1 Affirmative with Comments
0 Negative with Comments
0 Abstention

Not Returned
Brooks, Paul D.
Brunacini, Alan V.
Crawford, Robert John
De Clercq, Frank

Affirmative All
Bingham, William L.
Brown, Richard M.
Brown, Michael R.
Bruegman, Randy R.
Bryson, William W.
Caussin, John J.
Grant, Michael
Greensweig, Daniel J.
Hanify, Thomas
Affirmative with Comment

Turno, Donald H. J.

I agree with this change. However since I could not find another place I want to comment that I do not see where the Committee addressed other staff members who could be out performing work, are trained and can respond to assist during any emergency incident. Examples are FF who maybe delivering supplies, mail or painting hydrants. Although not assigned a station they should be able to be counted in the total on duty available members and may be on scene as soon or even before the companies.
A.1.4

Nothing in this standard is intended to prohibit the use of systems, methods, or approaches of equivalent or superior performance to those prescribed by this standard. The equivalency statement contained in this standard allows jurisdictions to use other “systems, methods, or approaches” to meet requirements of the standard if they can validate and document in writing that such are equal or superior to the requirements contained in the standard. This equivalency statement is not intended to allow any jurisdiction or fire department to reduce the requirements in the standard and still claim compliance. Moreover, it specifically requires any jurisdiction relying on “equivalent” systems, methods, or approaches to validate, demonstrate, and document in writing that the standard is equal or superior to the requirements contained in this standard.

The authority having jurisdiction (AHJ) determines what systems, methods, or approaches are equivalent or superior in performance. An AHJ should approach the assessment by reviewing the overall public fire protection and EMS system performance.
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Ballot Results

☑ This item has passed ballot

28 Eligible Voters
4 Not Returned
21 Affirmative All
0 Affirmative with Comments
3 Negative with Comments
0 Abstention

Not Returned
Brooks, Paul D.
Brunacini, Alan V.
Crawford, Robert John
De Clercq, Frank

Affirmative All
Bingham, William L.
Brown, Michael R.
Bruegman, Randy R.
Bryson, William W.
Caussin, John J.
Grant, Michael
Hanify, Thomas
Harms, Todd A.
Hoevelmann, Jason M.
Jenkins, Tom
Lawrence, Cortez
Lima, Frank
Masters, Michael D.
Rainey, Gary
Rohr, David L.
Ross, Chris
Sanders, Mark A.
Silvernail, James L.
Smeby, L. Charles
Turno, Donald H. J.
Varone, J. Curtis

Negative with Comment

Brown, Richard M.
I oppose this change because it conflicts with the existing 1710 Standard language that was added by the NFPA Standards Council when the 1710 Standard was first adopted. This change effectively eliminates the discretion that Agencies Having Jurisdiction have to determine what equivalent performance is.

Greensweig, Daniel J.
I oppose this change because it conflicts with the existing 1710 Standard language that was added by the NFPA Standards Council when the 1710 Standard was first adopted. This change effectively eliminates the discretion that Agencies Having Jurisdiction have to determine what equivalent performance is.

Spain, Catherine L.
I oppose this change because it conflicts with the existing 1710 Standard language that was added by the NFPA Standards Council when the 1710 Standard was first adopted. This change effectively eliminates the discretion that Agencies Having Jurisdiction have to determine what equivalent performance is.
4.1.2.3.1 Alarm Handling.

The fire department shall establish a performance objective of having an alarm answering time of not more than 15 seconds for at least 95 percent of the alarms received and not more than 40 seconds for at least 99 percent of the alarms received, as specified by NFPA 1221.

4.1.2.3.1.1 Any call not answered within 20 seconds shall be routed to a secondary answering (alternate) center if the primary center is full. An alarm should sound if a call is not answered (not processed, just answered) within 60 seconds.

4.1.2.3.2 When the alarm is received at a public safety answering point (PSAP) and transferred to a secondary answering point or communication center, the agency responsible for the PSAP shall establish a performance objective of having an alarm transfer time of not more than 30 seconds for at least 95 percent of all alarms processed, as specified by NFPA 1221.

4.1.2.3.3 The fire department shall establish a performance objective of having an alarm processing time of not more than 60 seconds for at least 90 percent of the alarms and not more than 90 seconds for at least 99 percent of the alarms, as specified by NFPA 1221.

4.1.2.3.3.1 Emergency alarm processing for the following call types shall be completed within 90 seconds 90 percent of the time and within 120 seconds 99 percent of the time:

1. Calls requiring emergency medical dispatch questioning and pre-arrival medical instructions
2. Calls requiring language translation
3. Calls requiring the use of a TTY/TDD device or audio/video relay services
4. Calls of criminal activity that require information vital to emergency responder safety prior to dispatching units
5. Hazardous material incidents
6. Technical rescue
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Committee Statement

Committee Statement: Correlate changes with 1221.
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Ballot Results
This item has passed ballot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible Voters</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Returned</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative All</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative with Comments</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative with Comments</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstention</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not Returned
Brooks, Paul D.
Brunacini, Alan V.
Crawford, Robert John
De Clercq, Frank

Affirmative All
Bingham, William L.
Brown, Michael R.
Bruegman, Randy R.
Bryson, William W.
Caussin, John J.
Grant, Michael
Hanify, Thomas
Harms, Todd A.
Hoevelmann, Jason M.
Jenkins, Tom
Lawrence, Cortez
Lima, Frank
Masters, Michael D.
Rainey, Gary
Rohr, David L.
Ross, Chris
Sanders, Mark A.
Silvernail, James L.
Smeby, L. Charles
Turno, Donald H. J.
Varone, J. Curtis

Negative with Comment
Brown, Richard M.
See statement sent to NFPA from NLC and ICMA
Greensweig, Daniel J.
See statement sent to NFPA from NLC and ICMA.
Spain, Catherine L.
See statement sent to NFPA from NLC and ICMA.
5.2.3.2.2
In jurisdictions with tactical hazards, high-hazard occupancies, high incident frequencies, or a high number of incidents, or geographical restrictions, or other pertinent factors as identified by the AHJ, these fire companies shall be staffed with a minimum of five or six on-duty personnel members.

5.2.3.2.2.1
In jurisdictions with tactical hazards, high-hazard occupancies, or dense urban areas, as identified by the AHJ, these fire companies shall be staffed with a minimum of six on-duty members.

Submitter Information Verification
Submitter Full Name: [Not Specified]
Organization: [Not Specified]
Street Address:
City:
State:
Zip:
Submittal Date: Tue Oct 08 18:44:37 EDT 2013

Committee Statement
Committee Statement: Complies with the manual of style and clarifies when 5 or 6 members may be needed.
Response Message:

Ballot Results
✔ This item has passed ballot

28 Eligible Voters
4 Not Returned
21 Affirmative All
0 Affirmative with Comments
3 Negative with Comments
0 Abstention

Not Returned
Brooks, Paul D.
Brunacini, Alan V.
Crawford, Robert John
De Clercq, Frank

Affirmative All
Bingham, William L.
Brown, Michael R.
Bruegman, Randy R.
Bryson, William W.
Caussin, John J.
Grant, Michael
Negative with Comment

Brown, Richard M.
See statement sent to NFPA from NLC and ICMA
Greensweig, Daniel J.
See statement sent to NFPA from NLC and ICMA.
Spain, Catherine L.
See statement sent to NFPA from NLC and ICMA.
### 6.3 Training Systems.

6.3.1 The fire department shall have a training program and policy that ensure that members are trained and competency is maintained to execute all responsibilities consistent with the department’s organization and deployment as addressed in Chapters 4 and 5.

6.3.2 The agency must demonstrate in its annual report that it has ensured competency for necessary knowledge, skills, and abilities based on the community’s specific hazards and risks, to include at least the hazards specifically addressed in this standard, for each member that is considered part of the effective response force.

6.3.3 The agency must adopt training standards based on the sited hazards and risk, set appropriate objectives to achieve the standards, and demonstrate that it is meeting the objectives as part of demonstrating training and competency.

---

### Submitter Information Verification

**Submitter Full Name:** [ Not Specified ]

**Organization:** [ Not Specified ]

**Street Address:**

**City:**

**State:**

**Zip:**

**Submittal Date:** Tue Oct 08 18:46:42 EDT 2013

### Committee Statement

**Committee Statement:** The proposed text clarifies the committee intent on training requirements and provides a requirement for a report to the aih on training.

**Response Message:**

### Ballot Results

- This item has passed ballot

  - 28 Eligible Voters
  - 4 Not Returned
  - 21 Affirmative All
  - 3 Affirmative with Comments
  - 0 Negative with Comments
  - 0 Abstention

**Not Returned**

- Brooks, Paul D.
- Brunacini, Alan V.
- Crawford, Robert John
- De Clercq, Frank
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bingham, William L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Michael R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruegman, Randy R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryson, William W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caussin, John J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant, Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanify, Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harms, Todd A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoevelmann, Jason M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins, Tom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence, Cortez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima, Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters, Michael D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainey, Gary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohr, David L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders, Mark A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvernail, James L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smeby, L. Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turno, Donald H. J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varone, J. Curtis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative with Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Richard M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support the language in this section with the provision that I do not support minimum standards discussed elsewhere in the 1710 Standard. Training programs should be developed to mitigate hazards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensweig, Daniel J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support the language in this section with the provision that I do not support minimum standards discussed elsewhere in the 1710 Standard. Training programs should be developed to mitigate hazards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain, Catherine L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support the language in this section with the provision that I do not support minimum standards discussed elsewhere in the 1710 Standard. Training programs should be developed to mitigate hazards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.3.1.2 In jurisdictions with tactical hazards, high-hazard occupancies, high incident frequencies, or other pertinent factors as identified by the AHJ, these companies shall be staffed with a minimum of five or six on-duty members.

5.2.3.1.2.1 In jurisdictions with tactical hazards, high-hazard occupancies, or dense urban areas, as identified by the AHJ, these fire companies shall be staffed with a minimum of six on-duty members.
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Committee Statement: To comply with the manual of style and clarify when 5 or 6 members may be used.
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Ballot Results

✔ This item has passed ballot
28 Eligible Voters
4 Not Returned
21 Affirmative All
0 Affirmative with Comments
3 Negative with Comments
0 Abstention

Not Returned
Brooks, Paul D.
Brunacini, Alan V.
Crawford, Robert John
De Clercq, Frank

Affirmative All
Bingham, William L.
Brown, Michael R.
Bruegman, Randy R.
Bryson, William W.
Caussin, John J.
Grant, Michael
Hanify, Thomas
Harms, Todd A.
Hoevelmann, Jason M.
Jenkins, Tom
Lawrence, Cortez
Lima, Frank
Masters, Michael D.
Rainey, Gary
Rohr, David L.
Ross, Chris
Sanders, Mark A.
Silvernail, James L.
Smeby, L. Charles
Turno, Donald H. J.
Varone, J. Curtis

**Negative with Comment**
Brown, Richard M.
See statement sent to NFPA from NLC and ICMA
Greensweig, Daniel J.
See statement sent to NFPA from NLC and ICMA.
Spain, Catherine L.
See statement sent to NFPA from NLC and ICMA.
This model is an example of how a community-wide risk management plan can be utilized to protect both citizens and property. While NFPA 1710 is scoped strictly to focus strictly on deployment, staffing, and service levels, the realization that this is one component of a total community fire protection planning process. An AHJ can determine that other components that could reduce the risks of fire and therefore adopt stronger building and fire prevention codes, enforce those more vigorously, and enhance their public life safety education components. These models are included for that purpose. Figure B.1 illustrates a fire department process map.

Also see NFPA 1730, Chapter 5, which establishes a process to identify and analyze community risks to assist in the development and implementation of a community risk reduction (CRR) plan. Detailed guidance on conducting a CRR plan is provided in Annex B of NFPA 1730.

Figure B.1 illustrates a fire department process map.
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✔ This item has passed ballot

28 Eligible Voters
4 Not Returned
18 Affirmative All
5 Affirmative with Comments
1 Negative with Comments
0 Abstention
I support the changes but I believe that community risk assessment (CRA) language should be included in the 1710 Standard itself. The CRA should be the starting point for deployment decisions. This is the approach taken in the new 1730 Standard.

List NFPA Metro Chief's Whitepaper on assessing vulnerability here

I support the changes but I believe that community risk assessment (CRA) language should be included in the 1710 Standard itself. The CRA should be the starting point for deployment decisions. This is the approach taken in the new 1730 Standard.

I support the changes but I believe that community risk assessment (CRA) language should be included in the 1710 Standard itself. The CRA should be the starting point for deployment decisions. This is the approach taken in the new 1730 Standard.
An early, aggressive, and offensive primary interior attack on a working fire, where feasible, is usually the most effective strategy to reduce loss of lives and property damage. In Figure A.5.2.2.2.1, the line, which combines temperature rise and time, represents a rate of fire propagation in an unsprinklered room, which combines temperature rise and time. It roughly corresponds to the percentage of property destruction. At approximately 10 minutes into the fire sequence, the hypothetical room of origin flashes over. Extension outside the room begins at this point.

Figure A.5.2.2.2.1 Fire Propagation Curve.

Consequently, given that the progression of a structure fire to the point of flashover (i.e., the very rapid spreading of the fire due to superheating of room contents and other combustibles) generally occurs in less than 10 minutes, two of the most important elements in limiting fire spread are the quick arrival of sufficient numbers of personnel and equipment to attack and extinguish the fire as close to the point of its origin as possible. For more information, refer to Fire Service Today, “Reduced Staffing: At What Cost,” and NIST, “Hazard I Fire Hazard Assessment Method.” Also, refer to National Fire Academy, “Fire Risk Analysis: A Systems Approach,” and Office of the Ontario Fire Marshal, Shaping the Future of Fire Ground Staffing and Delivery Systems within a Comprehensive Fire Safety Effectiveness Model.

The ability of adequate fire suppression forces to significantly influence the outcome of a structure fire is undeniable and predictable. Data generated by NFPA and used by the committee in developing this standard provide empirical data that rapid and aggressive interior attack can substantially reduce the human and property losses associated with structure fires [see Table A.5.2.2.2.1(a) and Table A.5.2.2.2.1(b)].

Table A.5.2.2.2.1(a) Fire Extension in Residential Structures, 1994–1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Civilian Deaths</th>
<th>Civilian Injuries</th>
<th>Average Dollar Loss per Fire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confined to room of origin</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>35.19</td>
<td>$ 3,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond the room, but confined to floor of origin</td>
<td>19.68</td>
<td>96.86</td>
<td>$ 22,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond floor of origin</td>
<td>26.54</td>
<td>63.48</td>
<td>$ 31,912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Residential structures include dwellings, duplexes, manufactured homes (also called mobile homes), apartments, row houses, townhouses, hotels and motels, dormitories, and barracks.

Source: NFPA Annual Fire Experience Survey and National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS).

The NFPA Fire Analysis and Research Division provided the data in Table A.5.2.2.2.1(b) as an update of Table A.5.2.2.2.1(a).

Table A.5.2.2.2.1(b) Fire Extension in Residential Structures, 2002–2005 Home Structure Fires, 2006–2010 Rate per 1000 Fires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extension Flame Spread</th>
<th>Civilian Deaths</th>
<th>Civilian Injuries</th>
<th>Average Dollar Loss per Fire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NFPA Annual Fire Experience Survey and National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS).
### Extension Flame Spread

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate per 1000 Fires</th>
<th>Civilian Deaths</th>
<th>Civilian Injuries</th>
<th>Average Dollar Loss per Fire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confined fires (identified by incident type) or contained fire identified by incident type*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confined to room fire or flame damage confined to object of origin</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>47.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confined to room of origin, including confined fires by incident type and fires confined to object</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>25.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond the room, but confined to floor of origin</td>
<td>17.62</td>
<td>22.73</td>
<td>80.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond floor of origin</td>
<td>27.48</td>
<td>24.63</td>
<td>59.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NFIRS 5.0 has six categories of confined structure fires: cooking fires confined to the cooking vessel, confined chimney or flue fire, confined incinerator fire, confined fuel burner or boiler fires or delayed ignitions, confined commercial compactor fires, and trash or rubbish fires in a structure with no flame damage to the structure or its contents.

Note: Residential occupancies include homes, hotels and motels, dormitories, and residential board and care facilities. These are national estimates of homes include one- and two-family homes (including manufactured housing) and apartments or other multifamily housing. These statistics are national estimates based on homes include one- and two-family homes (including manufactured housing) and apartments or other multifamily housing. These statistics are national estimates based on fires reported to U.S. municipal fire departments and so exclude fires reported only to federal or state agencies or industrial fire brigades. National estimates are projections. Casualty and loss projections can be heavily influenced by the inclusion or exclusion of one unusually serious fire. Property damage has not been adjusted for inflation.

Source: NFPA Annual Fire Experience Survey and National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS).
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Brown, Richard M.
I oppose this change because there is an underlying supposition that a rapid and aggressive interior attack can substantially reduce the human and property losses associated with structural fires. I believe this raises significant safety concerns for first responders. The incident commander should have the discretion to promulgate and execute a strategy for fire suppression that enhances safety and minimizes the risk to his employees during mission execution. The safety of responders should never be sacrificed for the preservation of property.
Greensweig, Daniel J.
I oppose this change because there is an underlying supposition that a rapid and aggressive interior attack can substantially reduce the human and property losses associated with structural fires. I believe this raises significant safety concerns for first responders. The incident commander should have the discretion to promulgate and execute a strategy for fire suppression that enhances safety and minimizes the risk to his employees during mission execution. The safety of responders should never be sacrificed for the preservation of property.

Spain, Catherine L.
I oppose this change because there is an underlying supposition that a rapid and aggressive interior attack can substantially reduce the human and property losses associated with structural fires. I believe this raises significant safety concerns for first responders. The incident commander should have the discretion to promulgate and execute a strategy for fire suppression that enhances safety and minimizes the risk to his employees during mission execution. The safety of responders should never be sacrificed for the preservation of property.
5.2.4.1.2 Personnel assigned to the initial arriving company shall have the capability to implement an initial rapid intervention crew (IRIC).
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5.2.4.2 Single-Family Dwelling Initial Full Alarm Assignment Capability.

5.2.4.2.1
The fire department shall have the capability to deploy an initial full alarm assignment within a 480-second travel time to 90 percent of the incidents as established in Chapter 4.

5.2.4.2.2*
The initial full alarm assignment to a structure fire in a typical 2000 ft\(^2\) (186 m\(^2\)), two-story single-family dwelling without basement and with no exposures shall provide for the following:

1. Establishment of incident command outside of the hazard area for the overall coordination and direction of the initial full alarm assignment with a minimum of one individual member dedicated to this task
2. Establishment of an uninterrupted water supply of a minimum of 400 gpm (1520 L/min) for 30 minutes with supply line(s) maintained by an operator
3. Establishment of an effective water flow application rate of 300 gpm (1140 L/min) from two handlines, each of which has a minimum flow rate of 100 gpm (380 L/min) with each handline operated by a minimum of two individuals members to effectively and safely maintain the line
4. Provision of one support person member for each attack and backup line deployed to provide hydrant hookup and to assist in laying of hose lines, utility control, and forcible entry
5. Provision of at least one victim search and rescue team with each such team consisting of a minimum of two individuals members
6. Provision of at least one team, consisting of a minimum of two individuals members, to raise ground ladders and perform ventilation
7. If an aerial device is used in operations, one person member to function as an aerial operator and maintain primary control of the aerial device at all times
8. Establishment of an IRIC consisting of a minimum of two properly equipped and trained individuals members

5.2.4.2.3
When an incident escalates beyond an initial full alarm assignment, or when significant risk is present to the member due to the magnitude of the incident, the incident commander shall request an EMS crew consisting of a minimum of two members to provide treatment and transport for injured members and civilians.

5.2.4.2.4*
Fire departments that respond to fires in high-, medium-, or low-hazard occupancies that present hazards greater than those found in the low-hazard occupancy described in 5.2.4.2 shall deploy additional resources on the initial alarm.

Submitter Information Verification

Submitter Full Name: [ Not Specified ]
Organization: [ Not Specified ]
Street Address: [ Not Specified ]
City: [ Not Specified ]
State: [ Not Specified ]
Zip: [ Not Specified ]
Submittal Date: Tue Oct 08 19:09:11 EDT 2013

Committee Statement
Committee Statement: The committee is adding open air strip mall, garden style apartment and high-rise building. The committee discussed the importance of having EMS crews available for treatment of firefighters/citizens at the onset of deployment and arrival at the scene. This resource was included in more significant incidents like high-rise, strip malls and garden apartment incidents, but the committee felt that residential initial full alarm assignment capability should not be increased. The committee decided that the incident commander should request this EMS capability as a component of an additional alarm assignment for residential fire responses when situations dictate.

Response Message:

Ballot Results

- This item has passed ballot
- 28 Eligible Voters
- 4 Not Returned
- 20 Affirmative All
- 1 Affirmative with Comments
- 3 Negative with Comments
- 0 Abstention

Not Returned
- Brooks, Paul D.
- Brunacini, Alan V.
- Crawford, Robert John
- De Clercq, Frank

Affirmative All
- Bingham, William L.
- Brown, Michael R.
- Bruegman, Randy R.
- Bryson, William W.
- Caussin, John J.
- Grant, Michael
- Hanify, Thomas
- Harms, Todd A.
- Hoevelmann, Jason M.
- Jenkins, Tom
- Lawrence, Cortez
- Lima, Frank
- Masters, Michael D.
- Rainey, Gary
- Rohr, David L.
- Ross, Chris
- Sanders, Mark A.
- Silvernail, James L.
- Smeby, L. Charles
- Varone, J. Curtis

Affirmative with Comment
- Turno, Donald H. J.

Although I agree that the added strip mall, apartment and high-rise is better in assisting FD in setting members on duty the Committee did not included any small medium or large industries that may be within its response and the industry not having its own emergency response. Nor did the Committee give guidance on how it review these...
facilities or ones that fall between those mentioned and determine numbers needed.

**Negative with Comment**
Brown, Richard M.
See statement sent to NFPA from NLC and ICMA
Greensweig, Daniel J.
See statement sent to NFPA from NLC and ICMA.
Spain, Catherine L.
See statement sent to NFPA from NLC and ICMA.
First Revision No. 11-NFPA 1710-2013 [ New Section after 5.2.4.1.1 ]

5.2.4.3  Open-Air Strip Shopping Center Initial Full Alarm Assignment Capability

5.2.4.3.1  The fire department shall have the capability to deploy an initial full alarm assignment within a 480-second travel time to 90 percent of the incidents as established in Chapter 4.

5.2.4.3.2  The initial full alarm assignment to a structure fire in a typical open-air strip shopping center ranging from 13,000 ft² to 196,000 ft² (1203 m² to 18,209 m²) in size shall provide for the following:

(1) Establishment of incident command outside the hazard area for the overall coordination, direction, and safety of the initial full alarm assignment with a minimum of two members dedicated to managing this task.

(2) Establishment of two uninterrupted water supplies at a minimum of 500 gpm (1892 L/min) each for 30 minutes, with each supply line maintained by an operator.

(3) Establishment of an effective water flow application rate of 500 gpm (1892 L/min) from three handlines, each of which has a minimum flow rate of 150 gpm (568 L/min), with each handline operated by a minimum of two members to effectively and safely maintain each handline.

(4) Provision of one support member for each attack, backup, and exposure line deployed to provide hydrant hookup and to assist in laying of hose lines, utility control, and forcible entry.

(5) Provision of at least two victim search-and-rescue teams, each team consisting of a minimum of two members.

(6) Provision of at least two teams, each team consisting of a minimum of two members, to raise ground ladders and perform ventilation.

(7) If an aerial device(s) is used in operations, one member to function as an aerial operator and maintain primary control of the aerial device at all times.

(8) The establishment of an RIC consisting of an officer and at least three members who are fully equipped and trained in RIC operations.

(9) The establishment of an initial medical care component consisting of at least two members capable of providing immediate on-scene emergency medical support and transport that provides rapid access to civilians or members potentially needing medical treatment. Where this level of emergency medical care is provided by outside agencies or organizations, these agencies and organizations shall be included in the deployment plan and meet these requirements.

(10) Establishment of an IRIC consisting of a minimum of two properly equipped and trained members.
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The committee added the initial first alarm capabilities in the document to provide additional guidance on deployment of resources to these typically found occupancies. The initial response capability was based on a review of the task needed to be performed when responding to a fire in an open air mall. The task reviewed is based on the following: The first engine should lay appropriate supply line(s) and take a position on the front of the building while leaving room for the aerial apparatus. The second engine shall ensure that a water supply is established to the first engine and building fire protection systems. This company is responsible for deploying the back-up or second handline. The third engine shall position in the rear when possible. The third engine is responsible for hoseline operation in the rear and support of the rescue and truck companies operating in this area. Hoselines advanced through rear entrances to the involved store or into exposures must be coordinated with engines operating through the front to avoid opposing hoselines. Advise the incident commander of the rear conditions and if a sprinkler connection is located in the rear of the building and charge it if required. The fourth engine shall assume the duties of the RIC and water supply to the third engine in rear if needed. The first truck should take a position in front of the involved store(s). This will allow for the use of the aerial for roof access, ground ladder deployment, use of the master stream and auxiliary equipment on the unit when needed. The second truck shall take a position in the rear with a primary assignment of gaining access to the roof. Use of the aerial is preferred but care must be given to overhead hazards. Lighting of the roof and the rear area should be addressed early. The rescue company should position in the rear. The rescue is primarily responsible for gaining access to the rear of the involved occupancy and the immediate exposures on both sides. Initial Line Intensity, size, and location of the fire, along with available staffing, are the factors that determine what initial line must be deployed. A 1250 ft² (25' X 50') store would require at least 250 GPM if fully involved in fire. This GPM can be produced by one 2½-inch handline, or two 1½-inch handlines with the 15/16-inch tips with a total flow of 370 GPM. A 2½-inch line requires two companies to maneuver inside a structure; two 1½-inch lines require the same amount of staffing but result in an increase of 120 GPM. Back-Up Line The back-up line for most fires within these types of structures will need to be capable of delivering the same amount of water as the attack line or more. The line should be of sufficient length to reach the location of the initial attack line or to be advanced to the area beyond the initial line, if required. Exposure Protection Horizontal fire spread or extension is the most significant concern in strip shopping centers. Fire separations are not required between each occupancy. Therefore, exposures to each side of the involved store must be examined early to check extension resulting from rapid mushrooming of heat and combustible gases under the roof. Operations in the Rear The number and size of handlines deployed shall be determined by the flow required and mode of operation (offensive or defensive). Hoselines in the rear are normally used for rear attack, exposure protection, and roof operations. Forcible Entry The initial function is gaining entry in both the front and rear. The rear access is more difficult. Extra security may make gaining entry difficult. Rear door entry and removal of bars from windows is time consuming. Rescue and Primary Search The primary concern at strip shopping centers, as in all occupancies, is life safety. Tag lines shall be used by crews working without a hoseline. Companies must be aware of the potential life hazard in basements and second stories. Company officers must quickly evaluate the life hazard potential associated with the fire situation. Ladder Deployment Early laddering of the roof must be accomplished to provide a ready route for crews to assess conditions above the fire and carryout other assigned roof top duties. Once crews are assigned to the roof, at least one additional means of escape must be provided. The ability to access a safe haven on the opposite side of a firewall is considered a secondary egress. Interior roof access from the fire structure before the fire is under control shall not be used. Additional information and background on open air strip shopping centers may be reviewed in the Fire and Rescue Departments of Northern Virginia, Emergency Operations Manual, Fires in Strip Shopping Centers, Second Edition.
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5.2.4.4 Apartment Initial Full Alarm Assignment Capability.

5.2.4.4.1 The fire department shall have the capability to deploy an initial full alarm assignment within a 480-second travel time to 90 percent of the incidents as established in Chapter 4.

5.2.4.4.2 The initial full alarm assignment to a structure fire in a typical 1200 ft$^2$ (111 m$^2$) apartment within a three-story, garden-style apartment building shall provide for the following:

(1) Establishment of incident command outside the hazard area for the overall coordination, direction, and safety of the initial full alarm assignment with a minimum of two members dedicated to managing this task.

(2) Establishment of two uninterrupted water supplies at a minimum of 400 gpm (1520 L/min) each for 30 minutes, with each supply line maintained by an operator.

(3) Establishment of an effective water flow application rate of 300 gpm (1140 L/min) from three handlines, each of which has a minimum flow rate of 100 gpm (380 L/min), with each handline operated by a minimum of two members to effectively and safely maintain each handline.

(4) Provision of one support member for each attack, backup, and exposure line deployed to provide hydrant hookup and to assist in laying of hose lines, utility control, and forcible entry.

(5) Provision of at least two victim search-and-rescue teams, each team consisting of a minimum of two members.

(6) Provision of at least two teams, each team consisting of a minimum of two members, to raise ground ladders and perform ventilation.

(7) If an aerial device is used in operations, one member to function as an aerial operator and maintain primary control of the aerial device at all times.

(8) The establishment of an RIC consisting of an officer and at least three members who are fully equipped and trained in RIC operations.

(9) The establishment of an initial medical care component consisting of at least two members capable of providing immediate on-scene emergency medical support, and transport that provides rapid access to civilian or members potentially needing medical treatment. Where this level of emergency medical care is provided by outside agencies or organizations, those agencies and organizations must be included in the deployment plan and meet these requirements.

(10) Establishment of an IRIC consisting of a minimum of two properly equipped and trained members.
Statement: on deployment of resources to these typically found occupancies. The initial response capability was based on a review of the task needed to be performed when responding to a fire in a garden apartment. The task reviewed is based on the following: The garden apartment building is a low rise, three to five story apartment building surrounded by landscaped grounds and parking lots. Construction of these units places multiple apartments under one roof with one floor housing one to four units. The buildings may be attached and consist of multiple addresses. A fire incident in one apartment can create numerous exposure issues for the first responders. Depending on terrain, floor levels above ground can vary from front to rear and side to side. Many garden style apartments may have a balcony that extends from the unit and may be made of combustible or non-combustible materials. The bottom floor may contain a combination of apartments and storage areas, utility rooms, laundry facilities, and trash rooms. The quantity or combustibility of contents is expected to develop relatively light rates of spread and heat release. Subsequently the individual apartment within the garden style apartment building is considered a light hazard occupancy as described in NFPA 1142 Standard on Water Supplies for Suburban and Rural Fire Fighting. Typical unit responsibilities: First due engine –on-scene report, supply line layout, position leaving room for the truck company, size-up, advance initial attack line to the fire apartment, conduct search as the line is advanced. Second due engine – water supply for the first engine, advance back up or second hoseline. Third due engine – secondary water supply, check for fire extension, visual inspection of side opposite first due engine, hose line to the floor above through an alternate entrance than the initial attack line. Fourth due engine – rapid intervention crew (RIC). First due truck – position on fire front with first engine; force entry as needed, search, ventilation, ladders (fire floor), aerial to roof. Second due truck – opposite the position of the first truck (typically the rear or side C of the building); force entry if needed, search, ventilation, rear laddering, possible roof operations, check attic (floor above). Rescue Company – position away from structure; force entry if needed, search exposure apartments, ventilation, ladders. Additional information and background on garden style apartment buildings may be reviewed in the Fire and Rescue Departments of Northern Virginia, Emergency Operations Manual, Fires in Garden-Type Apartments.
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5.2.4.5 High-Rise Initial Full Alarm Assignment Capability.

5.2.4.5.1 The fire department shall have the capability to deploy an initial full alarm assignment within a 610-second travel time to 90 percent of the incidents as established in Chapter 4.
5.2.4.5.2
Initial full alarm assignment to a fire in a building with the highest floor greater than 75 ft (23 m) above the lowest level of fire department vehicle access shall provide for the following:

(1) Establishment of a stationary incident command post outside the hazard area for overall coordination and direction of the initial full alarm assignment with a minimum of one officer with an aide dedicated to these tasks. All operations shall be conducted in compliance with the incident command system.

(2) Establishment of an uninterrupted water supply to the building standpipe/sprinkler connection sufficient to support fire attack operations maintained by an operator. If the building is equipped with a fire pump, one additional member with a radio shall also be sent to the fire pump location to monitor and maintain operation.

(3) Establishment of an effective water flow application rate on the fire floor at a minimum of 500 gpm (1892 L/m) from two handlines, each operated by a minimum of two members to safely and effectively handle the line.

(4) Establishment of an effective water flow application rate on the floor above the fire floor at a minimum of 250 gpm (946 L/m) from at least one handline, with each handline deployed operated by a minimum of two members to safely and effectively handle the line.

(5) Establishment of an IRIC consisting of two properly equipped and trained members two floors below the fire floor (non-IDLH atmosphere) or on the ground floor if the fire is on the second floor or below.

(6) As soon as possible, establishment of an RIC consisting of four properly equipped and trained members to replace the IRIC two floors below the fire floor (non-IDLH atmosphere) or on the ground floor if the fire is on the second floor or below.

(7) Provision of two or more search-and-rescue teams consisting of a minimum of two members each.

(8) Provision of one officer, with an aide dedicated to these tasks, to establish oversight at or near the entry point on the fire floor(s) and on the floor above the fire.

(9) Provision of two or more evacuation management teams to assist and direct building occupants with evacuation or sheltering actions, with each team consisting of a minimum of two members.

(10) Provision of one or more members to account for and manage elevator operations.

(11) Provision of a minimum of one trained incident safety officer.

(12) Provision of a minimum of one officer two floors below the fire floor to manage the interior staging area.

(13) Provision of a minimum of two members to manage member rehabilitation. At least one of the members shall be trained to the ALS level.

(14) Provision of an officer and a minimum of three members to conduct vertical ventilation operations.

(15) Provision of a minimum of one officer to manage the building lobby operations.

(16) Provision of a minimum of two members to transport equipment to a location below the fire floor.

(17) Provision of one officer to manage external base operations.

(18) Provision of a minimum of two crews trained in emergency medical services with on-scene transport capability, each crew with a minimum of two members. At least one of the members shall be trained to the ALS level.
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