

Created: 2020-06-11 17:18 (UTC)

Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler

Company: GBH International

Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: This is consistent with NFPA 101 and will not require FR treatments.

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Scott Newman

Company: Walgreens

Affiliation: None

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: In alignment with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)

Full Name: Kenneth Tyree

Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh

Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)

Full Name: Christopher Kachura

Company: Southeast Fire Protection

Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: A

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Jameson Wendell
Company: Merck Co
Affiliation: User

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: I agree.

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)
Full Name: Shay Rankhorn
Company: Ballad Health
Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: Against

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)
Full Name: Douglas Miller
Company: Local 190
Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: I think there should be a fire retardant requirement.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)
Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas
Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue
Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)
Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed
Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp
Affiliation: member

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)

Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos

Company: City Of Tamarac

Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: I agree that there is needed language indicating the ASTM information and approved test methods.

Created: 2020-06-08 17:27 (UTC)

Full Name: Julian Burns

Company: Quality Power Solutions, Inc.

Affiliation: IEC

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: Only makes clearer

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)

Full Name: Matthew Mertens

Company: North Shore Fire Department

Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 1-3

FOR

Reason: It appears without this statement there will be no direction as to the product used.

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Parrish

Company: Telgian Corporation

Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 1-3

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Scott Newman

Company: Walgreens

Affiliation: None

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: In alignment with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)

Full Name: Kenneth Tyree

Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh

Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)

Full Name: Christopher Kachura

Company: Southeast Fire Protection

Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: A

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Jameson Wendell

Company: Merck Co

Affiliation: User

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Shay Rankhorn

Company: Ballad Health

Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: For

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)

Full Name: Douglas Miller

Company: Local 190

Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: There is redundancy between the first and second code. Therefore eliminating the second one seems to be best to eliminate confusion.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)

Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas

Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)

Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed

Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp

Affiliation: member

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-08 18:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Jeffrey Hugo

Company: NFSA

Affiliation: NFSA

CAM 1-6

FOR

Reason: Motion to Accept Public Comment No. 34 Public Comment No. 34 (PC-34) eliminates the changes of First Revision No. 78 (FR-78) and reverts the section back to the same text as written and (nearly) unchanged since the 2003 edition of NFPA 1 Fire Code. The 2021 revision of concern to NFPA 1, Section 18.2.3.2.2.1 started with Public Input No. 84 (PI-84) and continued with FR-78 that singles out buildings protected by NFPA 13R systems and reduces the fire apparatus access distance from 450 ft to 300 ft. The original PI-84 sought to reduce the apparatus to and around the buildings protected by all types of sprinkler systems (NFPA 13, NFPA 13R and NFPA 13D) to 300 ft, but the committee arbitrarily selected only buildings protected by NFPA 13R to be reduced, leaving NFPA 13 and NFPA 13D at 450 ft. The ballot for FR-78 produced two negative comments: one from Terin Hopkins asking if there was data to justify the distance reduction of 150 ft and another from Kelly Nicoletto who cited the lack of technical substantiation to justify the change. PC-34 was drafted and submitted by the National Fire Sprinkler Association (NFSA) to the committee to address the two negative comments. At the second draft meeting, the committee rejected PC-34 without addressing the two negative comments or providing any technical substantiation for reducing the distance for fire apparatus access by 150 ft—singling out buildings protected by NFPA 13R systems. The committee statement for rejecting this public comment simply stated that NFPA 13R is a life safety system and not a property protection system. This is not a technical substantiation but is simply a statement. As mentioned, the 450 ft increase has been in the NFPA 1 Fire Code since the 2003 edition. The heights and areas for residential buildings protected by NFPA 13R have not changed. The latest codes modified the use of NFPA 13R upon pedestal and podium buildings based upon concerns expressed at the 2015 NFPA summit titled, Workshop on Life Safety Sprinkler System Challenge. The 2018 edition of NFPA 5000 and the International Building Code (IBC) addressed attics over 55 ft in pedestal and podium buildings and the 2021 IBC reduced all residential buildings protected by NFPA 13R to a maximum of three stories. The NFPA 1 technical committee left buildings protected by NFPA 13D and NFPA 13 at the existing distance of 450 ft. If NFPA 13R was reduced to 300 feet because it is only a life safety system, why was NFPA 13D not adjusted to the same distance? There are more residential buildings permitted today in the IBC and NFPA 5000 protected by NFPA 13D than when NFPA 1 first allowed the apparatus distance to be increased to 450 ft. in 2003. NFPA 13R is a life safety system, but it has an increased system demand and duration, plus a fire department connection and often a standpipe system whereas NFPA 13D does not. The NFSA is asking the NFPA membership to return the code language back to where it has been for the last six edition

Created: 2020-06-11 13:58 (UTC)

Full Name: James Narva

Company: NASFM

Affiliation: National Association of State Fire Marshals

CAM 1-6

AGAINST

Reason: It is felt such a proposal would actually decrease the overall level of safety of occupants, and communities

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Parrish

Company: Telgian Corporation
Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 1-6

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)
Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos
Company: City Of Tamarac
Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 1-6

AGAINST

Reason: 13R system does not provide full/throughout protection and should be closer to an emergency access road than others. This current language you will receive an incentive but the building is closer to an access road.

Created: 2020-06-08 14:23 (UTC)
Full Name: Warren Olsen
Company: Fire Safety Consultants, Inc.
Affiliation: Illinois Fire Inspectors Association

CAM 1-6

AGAINST

Reason: I am not convinced that either of the increases (150 to 450-feet and 150 to 300-feet) based on the use of a 13, 13R, or 13D has been justified. Therefore, the increase allowed with 13R systems to 300-feet is more acceptable than increasing it to 450-feet.

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)
Full Name: Matthew Mertens
Company: North Shore Fire Department
Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 1-6

AGAINST

Reason: the travel distance for 13R at 450' is too long where concealed spaces are not addressed.

Created: 2020-06-11 17:18 (UTC)

Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler
Company: GBH International
Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: Valet trash collection exists now and needs to be regulated. Simply eliminating regulation will not make the activity go away.

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Scott Newman
Company: Walgreens
Affiliation: None

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: In alignment with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Jameson Wendell
Company: Merck Co
Affiliation: User

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)
Full Name: Shay Rankhorn
Company: Ballad Health
Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: For

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)
Full Name: Douglas Miller
Company: Local 190

Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: Needs to be addressed but maybe not in 101 if NFPA 1 will be covering it.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)

Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas

Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)

Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed

Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp

Affiliation: member

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-08 22:51 (UTC)

Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler

Company: GBH International

Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: In the absence of regulation the type of valet trash collection service will not go away but simply remain unregulated and will be unsafe. This type of service has been going on for a long time and should be regulated for safety. The opposite action in 101-10 and 101-11 should be opposed.

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)

Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos

Company: City Of Tamarac

Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 1-8

FOR

Reason: I agree that if language was removed from section 30.7.5, this reference would direct code officials to a non-existent section.

Created: 2020-06-11 17:25 (UTC)

Full Name: Rick Swan

Company: IAFF Local 2881/CAL FIRE Fight

Affiliation: International Association of Fire Fighters

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: Supporters of this CAM will tell you that this is for the elderly, the very folks that will need support from incoming fire fighters to evacuate during emergencies. Allowing trash cans into the exit path will only cause more hazards to the very folk's supporters say why a trash valet is needed. Convenience should never be placed over safety. Allowing anything in the hallways is a hazard and should not be allowed. It has been stated that without this CAM that trash valet will be unregulated. The current language already says trash valet shall not be permitted. By opposing this CAM and supporting NFPA 101, CAM 101-10/101-20 and 101-11/101-21 will correlate the two documents, again, not allowing trash valet.

Created: 2020-06-11 13:58 (UTC)

Full Name: James Narva

Company: NASFM

Affiliation: National Association of State Fire Marshals

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: The National Association of State Fire Marshal (NASFM) is opposed to CAM 1-8 20.9.2.2 Trash and Recycling Collection Services. The introduction of trash in corridors of any occupancy goes against the basic principles of egress for occupant and creates a fire and life safety, property protection and fire fighter safety hazard, and is in direct violation of NFPA 1. Specifically chapter 19 which prohibits “waste materials from accumulating in an area that can create a fire hazard or hazard to life or property (19.1.2), and chapter 14 which requires the means of egress to “be continuously maintained free of all obstructions or impediments to full and instant use in the case of fire or other emergency” 14.4.1). The placement of trash in the exit corridor adds an unwanted fuel package to the fire load which creates an added fire hazard and creates obstructions in the means of egress. The NFPA 1 Technical Committee (TC) removed the provisions of valet trash and added new requirements prohibiting its use. The NFPA 101 Residential TC in their acceptance SR 6587 and 6588 failed to address the Correlating Committee note “Consider deleting the proposed valet trash pick-up requirements and either reference or extract criteria from NFPA 1. Valet trash requirements appear to be within the scope of NFPA 1 rather than NFPA 101.” We agree with the Correlating Committee and believe it is as it’s more than a life safety issue, which is supported by the scope of NFPA 1, specifically: •1.1.1(1) the storage of additional fuel packages in the means of egress is a fire related life safety situation. •1.1.1(8) the addition of trash storage in hallways will impede fire department operations. •1.1.1(11) the additional combustible materials associated with storage of trash will contribute to fire spread and smoke production. •1.1.1(15) the added fuel will create added hazards to firefighter safety due to fire, smoke, and heat production. •1.1.1(16) trash in the hallway will affect the means of egress. The proposed text is in conflict with proven fire safety principles used for many years which prohibit combustible materials in egress corridors and is clear conflict with those chapter 14 and 19 provisions noted above. NASFM recent research has proven that while buildings as a whole may be safer, occupant evacuation times has decreased. Allowing trash into egress corridors would simply compound this issue. Adding this language will create confusion and conflict within the code. Past fire history has shown how combustibles in the means of egress contributes to fire spread, hampers firefighting efforts, and limits the occupant’s ability to egress. Materials, especially combustible materials, are fire fighter safety issues as it creates a new fire load when stored in the means of egress and may inhibit quick and effective firefighting operations. In closing the National Association of State Fire Marshal (NASFM) is opposed to CAM 1-8 on section 20.9.2.2 Tras

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)

Full Name: Kenneth Tyree

Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh

Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: IFMA is opposed to requirements on valet trash. The introduction of trash in corridors of any occupancy goes against the basic principles of egress for occupant and creates a fire and life safety, property protection and fire fighter safety hazard, and is in direct violation of NFPA 1. Specifically chapter 19 which prohibits “waste materials from accumulating in an area that can create a fire hazard or hazard to life or property (19.1.2), and chapter 14 which requires the means of egress to “be continuously maintained free of all obstructions or impediments to full and instant use in the case of fire or other emergency” 14.4.1). The placement of trash in the exit corridor adds an unwanted fuel package to the fire load which creates an added fire hazard, and creates obstructions in the means of egress. The NFPA 1 TC removed the provisions of valet trash and added new requirements prohibiting its use. The NFPA 101 Residential TC in their acceptance SR 6587 and 6588 failed to address the Correlating Committee note “Consider deleting the proposed valet trash pick-up requirements and either reference or extract criteria from NFPA 1. Valet trash requirements appear to be within the scope of NFPA 1 rather than NFPA 101.” We agree with the Correlating Committee and believe it is as it’s more than a life safety issue, which is supported by the scope of NFPA 1, specifically: •1.1.1(1) the storage of additional fuel packages in the means of egress is a fire related life safety situation. •1.1.1(8) the addition of trash storage in hallways will impede fire department operations. •1.1.1(11) the additional combustible materials associated with storage of trash will contribute to fire spread and smoke production. •1.1.1(15) the added fuel will create added hazards to firefighter safety due to fire, smoke, and heat production. •1.1.1(16) trash in the hallway will affect the means of egress.. The proposed text is in conflict with proven fire safety principles used for many years which prohibit combustible materials in egress corridors, and is clear conflict with those chapter 14 and 19 provisions noted above. Adding this language will create confusion and conflict within the code. Past fire history has shown how combustibles in the means of egress contributes to fire spread, hampers firefighting efforts, and limits the occupant’s ability to egress. Materials, especially combustible materials, are fire fighter safety issues as it creates a new fire load when stored in the means of egress and may inhibit quick and effective firefighting operations.

Created: 2020-06-10 22:57 (UTC)
Full Name: Bruce Kral
Company: West Metro Fire Prot Dist
Affiliation: West Metro Fire

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: NFPA's fire code is the proper place to identify allowable conditions for fire code required exit pathways and their reliability. The Life Safety Code should concur with the requirements of the fire code.

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)
Full Name: Christopher Kachura
Company: Southeast Fire Protection
Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: Text should remain for reference.

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Parrish

Company: Telgian Corporation

Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)

Full Name: Matthew Mertens

Company: North Shore Fire Department

Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 1-8

AGAINST

Reason: This is a very broad stroke to allow trash collection services in all building and need further vetting prior to allowance.

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Scott Newman

Company: Walgreens

Affiliation: None

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: In alignment with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)

Full Name: Kenneth Tyree

Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh

Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Jameson Wendell

Company: Merck Co

Affiliation: User

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Shay Rankhorn

Company: Ballad Health

Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: For

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)

Full Name: Douglas Miller

Company: Local 190

Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: These documents should be readily available if there are deficiencies in the system.

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)

Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed

Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp

Affiliation: member

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-08 18:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Jeffrey Hugo

Company: NFSA

Affiliation: NFSA

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: Motion to Accept Public Comment No. 33 Currently NFPA 1 requires records of examinations, approvals, equivalencies, alternates to be kept and maintained by the AHJ. Public comment No. 33 (PC-33) fills a gap in the records and reports section (Section 1.11) of NFPA 1 and complements the changes made by First Revision No. 10 (FR-10). PC-33 closes a loophole that electronic inspection reporting and services are providing to AHJs. When an AHJ uses a third-party service to deliver inspection, testing, and maintenance (ITM) reports, they are done so electronically. The inspection records submitted by the inspection contractor are usually kept in the cloud on a server. The electronic ITM enforcement process is typically viewed through a user dashboard by the AHJ to monitor and enforce fire protection ITM reports per the frequencies prescribed by fire protection ITM standards, such as NFPA 12, NFPA 25, NFPA 72, NFPA 96, NFPA 101, NFPA 2001, etc. The AHJ can view inspection records without downloading them on the AHJ's computer and the document ownership typically remains back to the building owner, but some third-party contracts on document ownership in the cloud are unclear. Section 1.11 addresses many AHJ maintained documents and paper trails for enforcement, but as an electronic document, viewable on a dashboard, it is not usually in the AHJ's possession to enforce. The committee rejected PC-33 because NFPA 1 requires the building owner maintain ITM documentation. This is a true statement, but how does the AHJ enforce a deficiency on a document it does not retain? If other documents that the AHJ processes, reviews, issues and enforces are required to be maintained, then ITM records should be treated the same. PC-33 would not require the AHJ to retain all ITM documentation. PC-33 addresses when the AHJ enforces ITM, such as through a notice of violation or penalty it retains the ITM inspection record as the reason for the enforcement. If an ITM system has deficiencies, the AHJ writes the notice of violation letter with a copy or documentation of the deficiency. The 2021 NFPA 1, through FR-10, will require the AHJ to retain all plan reviews, permits, and all associated notes in Section 1.11. PC-33 does not require all the electronic ITM records are maintained by the AHJ, only those ITM records that are used for enforcement. PC-33 allows the building owners to retain ownership of their documents when the fire protection systems are maintained according to the ITM standards. Respectfully submitted, Jeffrey M. Hugo – National Fire Sprinkler Association

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)

Full Name: Matthew Mertens

Company: North Shore Fire Department

Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 1-9

FOR

Reason: deficiencies and corrective orders are already a part of normal practice.

Created: 2020-06-11 13:58 (UTC)

Full Name: James Narva

Company: NASFM

Affiliation: National Association of State Fire Marshals

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: Places an undue and excessive burden on AHJs

Created: 2020-06-10 22:57 (UTC)

Full Name: Bruce Kral

Company: West Metro Fire Prot Dist

Affiliation: West Metro Fire

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: Requested by who? For how long?

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)

Full Name: Christopher Kachura

Company: Southeast Fire Protection

Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: AHJ is not responsible for maintain owner records.

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Parrish

Company: Telgian Corporation

Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision the code already requires the system owner to retain all records.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)
Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas
Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue
Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: The language is unclear if it allows for a third party reporting service to store the documents and places an unfunded liability on the AHJ for software and storage needs for public records requirements.

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)
Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos
Company: City Of Tamarac
Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: If the property owner is requesting documents, how/why is the AHJ having to maintain these? How will the AHJ be notified that these documents are being requested? This deficiency report should be kept by the servicing company and by the property owner.

Created: 2020-06-08 14:23 (UTC)
Full Name: Warren Olsen
Company: Fire Safety Consultants, Inc.
Affiliation: Illinois Fire Inspectors Association

CAM 1-9

AGAINST

Reason: CAM 1-9 does not include language indicating how long the documents must be maintained for.

Created: 2020-06-11 18:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Pascal Pfeiffer
Company: Axa XL Risk Consulting
Affiliation: EUROPEAN SPRINKLER NETWORK

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Passive systems shall be reinstated in the scope of the document, so were they since the beginning of the work by the technical committee on this document. Passive systems cannot be considered outside of the scope of an integrated fire protection and life safety system as they play an essential role in many circumstances depending on the occupancy to achieve the overall goal of safer facilities and buildings. Parts of those passive systems can also be connected with other purely active systems such as many have outlined before me.

Created: 2020-06-11 17:18 (UTC)
Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler
Company: GBH International
Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Submitter's explanation is persuasive.

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)
Full Name: Kenneth Tyree
Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh
Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-10 22:57 (UTC)
Full Name: Bruce Kral
Company: West Metro Fire Prot Dist
Affiliation: West Metro Fire

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Removed terms not needed.

Created: 2020-06-10 20:29 (UTC)
Full Name: Scott Eckstein
Company: Richardson Fire Department
Affiliation: Inspector

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: no conflicts

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)
Full Name: Christopher Kachura
Company: Southeast Fire Protection
Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: A

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Thomas Parrish
Company: Telgian Corporation
Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: The inclusion of passive features is an important part of the building's fire protection goals and design. These passive components need to be confirmed as part of the system testing. The Automatic Fire Alarm Association (AFAA) Supports this Motion.

Created: 2020-06-10 15:02 (UTC)
Full Name: Michael Spaziani
Company: FM Global
Affiliation: FM Global

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Passive fire protection features are often an integral aspect of an active system. Active fire protection systems are designed and installed based on passive features present. A fire door is a passive system, its position will affect the performance of certain active systems. Therefore, it must be part of any test of an integrated system.

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Jameson Wendell
Company: Merck Co
Affiliation: User

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 18:55 (UTC)

Full Name: Russell Leavitt

Company: Telgian Corporation

Affiliation: Member of NFPA 4 Technical Committee

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: This revision restricts the inclusion of passive systems with integrated system systems. Many passive systems are interconnected with active systems and to eliminate the requirement to include passive systems as a part of the standard is shortsighted and clearly does not meet the purpose of the standard. It is clear that passive systems are intended to be included where integrated with active systems by the annex language in the 2018 edition which includes passive systems such as fire resistive and smoke-resistant assemblies. Passive systems often include "active" components such as smoke dampers, etc. Please support this CAM.

Created: 2020-06-09 16:39 (UTC)

Full Name: Jonathan Flannery

Company: AHA - ASHE

Affiliation: American Society for Healthcare Engineering

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Coordinating the passive fire protection features along with the active fire protection features is an important part of integrated systems testing.

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Shay Rankhorn

Company: Ballad Health

Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: For

Created: 2020-06-09 13:54 (UTC)

Full Name: Jason Beers
Company: JLL Healthcare Solutions
Affiliation: Healthcare

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: The change in scope reflects the needs in the field.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)
Full Name: Douglas Miller
Company: Local 190
Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Code reads better in pass vote.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)
Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas
Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue
Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-09 12:33 (UTC)
Full Name: Scott Hammond
Company: NEMIC
Affiliation: certification

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Due to a lack of enforcement of inspection of passive fire life safety systems (ie: fire dampers, smoke dampers, fire doors) this proposal may assist and create an awareness of the importance of testing the entire fire life safety system, not just the active integrated systems.

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)
Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed

Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp
Affiliation: member

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)
Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos
Company: City Of Tamarac
Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: I agree that this should apply to both active and passive systems.

Created: 2020-06-08 15:35 (UTC)
Full Name: Douglas Fisher
Company: Fisher Engineering, Inc.
Affiliation: Tech Committee

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: I agree with the CAM for all of the reasons noted by the submitter. I disagree with the technical committee statement. Passive components are not necessarily inspected or verified during the installation process. In addition, passive components are only included in NFPA 3 if specifically listed in NFPA 3 (and if NFPA 3 applies to the project). NFPA 3 references Integrated Testing per NFPA 4 as part of the commissioning process. If NFPA 4 eliminates passive components, then how will they become part of the commissioning process since NFPA 3 references NFPA 4. There are many instances where passive components are needed to be reviewed, inspected and included in integrated testing to not only ensure those passive features were installed correctly but also to ensure that the integrated system functions properly. For example, a stair pressurization system relies on the performance of passive firestop systems and gasketing to ensure pressure differentials are maintained. If those passive systems are not included in the integrated test, they can be overlooked under the assumption that someone else has reviewed them. Further, as noted by Mr. Koffel, the change proposed by the technical committee was not based on public input but, rather, a committee input intent on cleaning up the document. There has not been any public concern noted via the PI process to indicate that the public wants "passive" to be removed and have NFPA 4 only apply to active fire protection and life safety measures. For the above reasons, I strongly support the CAM.

Created: 2020-06-08 14:35 (UTC)
Full Name: Thomas Parrish
Company: Telgian Corporation
Affiliation: AFAA

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: The Automatic Fire Alarm Association (AFAA) supports this motion because there are many factors that influence fire spread in a building. NFPA 4 was developed to ensure that all of the integrated building features would work together within the building. These factors include both active and passive systems. The deletion of the word active is appropriate because we want the testing included within the scope of NFPA 4 to include all systems including the passive ones such as fire stop requirements. In most cases the NFPA 4 testing is our last chance to catch any deficiencies and there is absolutely no reason why this document should only apply to active systems. Respectfully submitted, Tom Parrish, V.P AFAA, Chair AFAA Codes and Standards.

Created: 2020-06-08 14:23 (UTC)
Full Name: Warren Olsen
Company: Fire Safety Consultants, Inc.
Affiliation: Illinois Fire Inspectors Association

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: Passive integrated fire protection and life safety system components are an important part of the overall protection of a building and should be tested during the testing of active systems. Language that excludes passive systems should not be incorporated within NFPA 4 as was done by the technical committee.

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)
Full Name: Matthew Mertens
Company: North Shore Fire Department
Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 4-1_4-5

FOR

Reason: system integration affects both passive and active systems, and should be tested accordingly.

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Scott Newman
Company: Walgreens

Affiliation: None

CAM 4-1_4-5

AGAINST

Reason: In alignment with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-11 17:18 (UTC)

Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler

Company: GBH International

Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: It is important to explain how fire resistance ratings are to be determined.

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)

Full Name: Kenneth Tyree

Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh

Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-10 20:29 (UTC)

Full Name: Scott Eckstein

Company: Richardson Fire Department

Affiliation: Inspector

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: no conflicts

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)

Full Name: Christopher Kachura

Company: Southeast Fire Protection

Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: A

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Jameson Wendell
Company: Merck Co
Affiliation: User

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)
Full Name: Douglas Miller
Company: Local 190
Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: More clear cut guidelines in the pass vote.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)
Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas
Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue
Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: Agree to more detailed text

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)
Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed
Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp
Affiliation: member

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)
Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos
Company: City Of Tamarac
Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: I agree with putting more information into the body of the standard than in the annex. Further explanation and references to specific approvals are beneficial.

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)
Full Name: Matthew Mertens
Company: North Shore Fire Department
Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 30-2

FOR

Reason: It is time to begin defining the test methods implied.

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Scott Newman
Company: Walgreens
Affiliation: None

CAM 30-2

AGAINST

Reason: Disagree with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Thomas Parrish
Company: Telgian Corporation
Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 30-2

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)
Full Name: Shay Rankhorn
Company: Ballad Health
Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 30-2

AGAINST

Reason: Against

Created: 2020-06-11 17:18 (UTC)
Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler
Company: GBH International
Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: The committee agreed that fixtures, furnishings and decorations add fire hazard and they are present in health care occupancies.

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)
Full Name: Kenneth Tyree
Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh
Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)
Full Name: Christopher Kachura
Company: Southeast Fire Protection
Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: A

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Jameson Wendell

Company: Merck Co
Affiliation: User

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)
Full Name: Shay Rankhorn
Company: Ballad Health
Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: For

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)
Full Name: Douglas Miller
Company: Local 190
Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: Furnishings should be addressed in NFPA 99.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)
Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas
Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue
Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: Agree to new text

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)
Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed
Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp
Affiliation: member

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)
Full Name: Matthew Mertens
Company: North Shore Fire Department
Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 99-5

FOR

Reason: clarity and direction

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Scott Newman
Company: Walgreens
Affiliation: None

CAM 99-5

AGAINST

Reason: Disagree with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Thomas Parrish
Company: Telgian Corporation
Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 99-5

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision

Created: 2020-06-09 16:39 (UTC)
Full Name: Jonathan Flannery
Company: AHA - ASHE
Affiliation: American Society for Healthcare Engineering

CAM 99-5

AGAINST

Reason: There is no added value of adding this requirement to NFPA 99. This requirement is already contained in NFPA 1 and NFPA 101 which are referenced by NFPA 99. Adding this to NFPA 99 would set up potential coordination issues for this requirement in the future.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:54 (UTC)
Full Name: Jason Beers
Company: JLL Healthcare Solutions
Affiliation: Healthcare

CAM 99-5

AGAINST

Reason: These requirements are included in other standards such as NFPA 101 and are not needed to be included in this section. The proposed text would be redundant and unnecessary.

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)
Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos
Company: City Of Tamarac
Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 99-5

AGAINST

Reason: This information is already found in the occupancy chapter of NFPA 101, section 19.7.5. If this is meant to be a stand-alone standard, then I would suggest adding the exact language found in section 19.7.5 of NFPA 101 into NFPA 99.

Created: 2020-06-11 17:18 (UTC)
Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler
Company: GBH International
Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: This is a pointer for those jurisdictions that adopt NFPA 101 but not NFPA 1.

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Scott Newman
Company: Walgreens
Affiliation: None

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: In alignment with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)

Full Name: Kenneth Tyree

Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh

Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)

Full Name: Christopher Kachura

Company: Southeast Fire Protection

Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: A

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Jameson Wendell

Company: Merck Co

Affiliation: User

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)

Full Name: Douglas Miller

Company: Local 190

Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: Play areas in NFPA 101 for life safety.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)
Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas
Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue
Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)
Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed
Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp
Affiliation: member

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)
Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos
Company: City Of Tamarac
Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: NFPA 1 has specific requirements for this indoor play structure which is lacking in NFPA 101. This is a good addition to reference and send code officials to the correct section/code.

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)
Full Name: Matthew Mertens
Company: North Shore Fire Department
Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 101-9

FOR

Reason: fire load and resistance is now directed.

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Thomas Parrish
Company: Telgian Corporation
Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 101-9

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)
Full Name: Shay Rankhorn
Company: Ballad Health
Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 101-9

AGAINST

Reason: Against

Created: 2020-06-11 17:25 (UTC)
Full Name: Rick Swan
Company: IAFF Local 2881/CAL FIRE Fight
Affiliation: International Association of Fire Fighters

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: Allowing trash cans into the exit path will only cause more hazards to the very folk's supporters say why a trash valet is needed. Convenience should never be placed over safety. Allowing anything in the hallways is a hazard and should not be allowed. By supporting this CAM and opposing NFPA 1 CAM 1-8 will correlate the two documents, again, not allowing trash valet.

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Scott Newman
Company: Walgreens
Affiliation: None

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: In alignment with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-11 13:58 (UTC)

Full Name: James Narva

Company: NASFM

Affiliation: National Association of State Fire Marshals

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: The National Association of State Fire Marshal (NASFM) supports public comment 117 and 188 on removal of the proposed requirements on valet trash in apartment buildings. The introduction of trash in corridors of any occupancy goes against the basic principles of egress for occupant and creates a fire and life safety, property protection and fire fighter safety hazard, and is in direct violation of section 7.1.10.1 Maintenance. Means of egress shall be continuously maintained free of all obstructions or impediments to full instant use in the case of fire or other emergency. Also, sections 30 and 31.3.2.1.1 lists trash collection rooms as a hazardous area and requires protection over and above the occupancy requirements. Sections 30 and 31.7.2.2 prohibits contents and furnishings of a highly flammable character from use outside the dwelling unit. The NFPA 1 TC removed the provisions of valet trash and added new requirements prohibiting its use. The NFPA 101 Residential Technical Committee (TC) in their acceptance SR 6587 and 6588 failed to address the Correlating Committee note "Consider deleting the proposed valet trash pick-up requirements and either reference or extract criteria from NFPA 1. Valet trash requirements appear to be within the scope of NFPA 1 rather than NFPA 101." We agree with the Correlating Committee and believe it is as it's more than a life safety issue, which is supported by the scope of NFPA 1, specifically: •7.1.1(1) the storage of additional fuel packages in the means of egress is a fire related life safety situation. •7.1.1(8) the addition of trash storage in hallways will impede fire department operations. •7.1.1(11) the additional combustible materials associated with storage of trash will contribute to fire spread and smoke production. •7.1.1(15) the added fuel will create added hazards to firefighter safety due to fire, smoke, and heat production. •7.1.1(16) trash in the hallway will affect the means of egress. The proposed text is in conflict with proven fire safety principles used for many years which prohibit combustible materials in egress corridors. Past fire history has shown how combustibles in the means of egress contributes to fire spread, hampers firefighting efforts, and limits the occupant's ability to egress. Materials, especially combustible materials, are fire fighter safety issues as it creates a new fire load when stored in the means of egress and may inhibit quick and effective firefighting operations. There are no permit requirement or any means for the AHJ to approve or prohibit the use of valet trash services based on other issues with the occupancy. There has been no technical justification on the container size or testing requirement. No fire testing or fire modeling has been performed to justify or validate the proposed requirements in the residential setting. Additionally, the container shall not be allowed to obstruct the minimum egress width but who will be able to enf

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)

Full Name: Kenneth Tyree

Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh

Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: IFMA moves public comment 117 and 188 on removal of the proposed requirements on valet trash in apartment buildings. The introduction of trash in corridors of any occupancy goes against the basic principles of egress for occupant and creates a fire and life safety, property protection and fire fighter safety hazard, and is in direct violation of section 7.1.10.1 Maintenance. Means of egress shall be continuously maintained free of all obstructions or impediments to full instant use in the case of fire or other emergency. Also 30 and 31.3.2.1.1 lists trash collection rooms as a hazardous area and requires protection over and above the occupancy requirements. 30 and 31.7.2.2 prohibits contents and furnishings of a highly flammable character from use outside the dwelling unit. The NFPA 1 TC removed the provisions of valet trash and added new requirements prohibiting its use. The NFPA 101 Residential TC in their acceptance SR 6587 and 6588 failed to address the Correlating Committee note "Consider deleting the proposed valet trash pick-up requirements and either reference or extract criteria from NFPA 1. Valet trash requirements appear to be within the scope of NFPA 1 rather than NFPA 101." We agree with the Correlating Committee and believe it is as it's more than a life safety issue, which is supported by the scope of NFPA 1, specifically: •7.1.1(1) the storage of additional fuel packages in the means of egress is a fire related life safety situation. •7.1.1(8) the addition of trash storage in hallways will impede fire department operations. •7.1.1(11) the additional combustible materials associated with storage of trash will contribute to fire spread and smoke production. •7.1.1(15) the added fuel will create added hazards to firefighter safety due to fire, smoke, and heat production. •7.1.1(16) trash in the hallway will affect the means of egress. The proposed text by the Residential TC have many concerns for AHJ's as well as fire and life safety: The proposed text is in conflict with proven fire safety principles used for many years which prohibit combustible materials in egress corridors. Past fire history has shown how combustibles in the means of egress contributes to fire spread, hampers firefighting efforts, and limits the occupant's ability to egress. Materials, especially combustible materials, are fire fighter safety issues as it creates a new fire load when stored in the means of egress and may inhibit quick and effective firefighting operations. There are no permit requirement or any means for the AHJ to approve or prohibit the use of valet trash services based on other issues with the occupancy. There has been no technical justification on the container size or testing requirement, the industry has had discussion on these as well and pose a significant cost to the property owner or resident.

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Jameson Wendell

Company: Merck Co

Affiliation: User

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)

Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas

Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)
Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed
Company: Dar Alhandasah Constl Grp
Affiliation: member

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)
Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos
Company: City Of Tamarac
Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: There is much debate over trash valet services and am not certain where this landed in the legislative session but I agree this service should be removed from the code as exits can be continuously blocked and this adds additional fuel loads into paths of egress.

Created: 2020-06-08 14:23 (UTC)
Full Name: Warren Olsen
Company: Fire Safety Consultants, Inc.
Affiliation: Illinois Fire Inspectors Association

CAM 101-10_101-20

FOR

Reason: Storage, of any type, should not be permitted within an egress corridor. I have been in my daughter's apartment building where valet trash collection is utilized and it is a constant struggle to maintain the corridor free of obstructions caused by the trash collection cans. Additionally, the composition (flammability or combustibility) of the trash within the can cannot be regulated.

Created: 2020-06-11 17:18 (UTC)

Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler
Company: GBH International
Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Valet trash services need to be regulated.

Created: 2020-06-10 22:57 (UTC)
Full Name: Bruce Kral
Company: West Metro Fire Prot Dist
Affiliation: West Metro Fire

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: The criteria, if this is allowed, should be in the fire code, NFPA 1. "Valet" trash is too similar to a trade name. Door Side or Door Step trash are better alternatives. An operational permit should be required so that AHJs can confirm the criteria are met on an annual basis. Indelible marking on the container and lid indicating the fire rating must be added including the testing laboratory. Lid should be "tightly fitting" to anticipate spillage from exiting occupants and/or firefighter operations. 22 gallons is much too large of a container especially in a public setting prone to vandalism and fire setting. Unsprinklered settings should have more stringent fire rated containers (150kW/m2). 30.7.5.3 should be removed. 1) Not knowing what's going to in those containers, all containers should be rated. This will also lead to the use of trash bags (15 gal container...) 2) "limited combustible exteriors" is too vague to consistently enforce. Again, in a more public exposed setting like a balcony, container ratings are more important.

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)
Full Name: Christopher Kachura
Company: Southeast Fire Protection
Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Should remain.

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Thomas Parrish
Company: Telgian Corporation
Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Shay Rankhorn

Company: Ballad Health

Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Against

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)

Full Name: Douglas Miller

Company: Local 190

Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: Trash services if not regulated can pose a life safety hazards.

Created: 2020-06-08 22:51 (UTC)

Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler

Company: GBH International

Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: In the absence of regulation the type of valet trash collection service will not go away but simply remain unregulated and will be unsafe. This type of service has been going on for a long time and should be regulated for safety. The opposite action in 1-8 should be supported.

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)

Full Name: Matthew Mertens

Company: North Shore Fire Department

Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 101-10_101-20

AGAINST

Reason: While I oppose the idea of valet trash, if it is allowed in some juris, it needs to have parameters to be enforced. This language needs revision, but is better than having no direction at all.

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)

Full Name: Kenneth Tyree

Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh

Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)

Full Name: Christopher Kachura

Company: Southeast Fire Protection

Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: A

Created: 2020-06-10 15:04 (UTC)

Full Name: Joel Edwards

Company: Reedy Creek Fire Dept

Affiliation: Fire Marshal

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: The proposed amendment would provide two reasonable options for existing high-rise residential buildings. While retroactive requirements in residential buildings are not popular, clear voice instructions are required to effectively execute the emergency action plan required in high-rise structures.

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Jameson Wendell

Company: Merck Co

Affiliation: User

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Shay Rankhorn

Company: Ballad Health

Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: For

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)

Full Name: Douglas Miller

Company: Local 190

Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: These guidelines need to be in the code so fire announcement and evacuation have guidelines.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)

Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas

Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)

Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed

Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp

Affiliation: member

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)
Full Name: Matthew Mertens
Company: North Shore Fire Department
Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 101-17

FOR

Reason: movement for voice evac systems in high rise is past due. While the language may be interpreted to retroactively enforce voice in existing buildings, very few to any communities will enforce retroactive requirements on high-rise. However, it does provide direction that when replaced the voice system is the standard to be achieved.

Created: 2020-06-11 17:18 (UTC)
Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler
Company: GBH International
Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 101-17

AGAINST

Reason: I am concerned about the need for retrofit.

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Scott Newman
Company: Walgreens
Affiliation: None

CAM 101-17

AGAINST

Reason: Disagree with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-11 13:58 (UTC)
Full Name: James Narva
Company: NASFM
Affiliation: National Association of State Fire Marshals

CAM 101-17

AGAINST

Reason: If successful, this would require retrofitting existing high-rise buildings so the required fire alarm system shall be capable of occupant notification via voice communication or public address system. It is believed this is an excessive requirement that would not improve overall safety above the already existing fire alarm system.

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Parrish

Company: Telgian Corporation

Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 101-17

AGAINST

Reason: The Automatic Fire Alarm Association (AFAA) has determined that this proposal is attempting to cover installation requirements that presently exist in NFPA 72. What is being proposed is far less than what is currently required by the code. All alarm and communication systems shall be installed per NFPA 72. Public address systems are not listed for Fire Alarm use.

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)

Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos

Company: City Of Tamarac

Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 101-17

AGAINST

Reason: I believe this needs to be a requirement in chapter 30 to get into new buildings as I am not sure if the intent is to make this retro-active into existing buildings. We are having a hard enough time getting fire sprinklers past into existing buildings. Language appears to be good but not certain the intent.

Created: 2020-06-08 14:35 (UTC)

Full Name: Thomas Parrish

Company: Telgian Corporation

Affiliation: AFAA

CAM 101-17

AGAINST

Reason: ALL building fire alarm systems shall be installed per NFPA 72. NFPA 72 has very strict requirements that exceed what is being proposed above. This CAM should not allow for lesser systems to be installed in places that system survivability is paramount since you are doing partial or selective evacuation in high rises. You will have significantly longer evacuation and on-scene times for responding personnel. Tom Parrish, VP AFAA, Chair AFAA Codes & Standards

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Scott Newman

Company: Walgreens

Affiliation: None

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: In alignment with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)

Full Name: Kenneth Tyree

Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh

Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-10 20:29 (UTC)

Full Name: Scott Eckstein

Company: Richardson Fire Department

Affiliation: Inspector

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: no conflicts

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)

Full Name: Christopher Kachura

Company: Southeast Fire Protection

Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: A

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Jameson Wendell
Company: Merck Co
Affiliation: User

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)
Full Name: Douglas Miller
Company: Local 190
Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: Code is better stated in pass vote.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)
Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas
Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue
Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: Agree

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)
Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed
Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp
Affiliation: member

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)
Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos
Company: City Of Tamarac
Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: Language clarifies existing language and provides additional guidance for the manufacturer and/or evaluator.

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)
Full Name: Matthew Mertens
Company: North Shore Fire Department
Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 790-8

FOR

Reason: makes sense

Created: 2020-06-11 17:18 (UTC)
Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler
Company: GBH International
Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 790-8

AGAINST

Reason: Evaluation should be at the installation site.

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Thomas Parrish
Company: Telgian Corporation
Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 790-8

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision

Created: 2020-06-09 20:21 (UTC)
Full Name: John Taylor

Company: HCT, LLC
Affiliation: Healthcare Consulting

CAM 790-8

AGAINST

Reason: Acceptable performance of equipment may be assured when evaluated at the installation site connected to the system it serves. Evaluating at the manufacturer's site only assures operation under ideal conditions.

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)
Full Name: Shay Rankhorn
Company: Ballad Health
Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 790-8

AGAINST

Reason: Against

Created: 2020-06-08 20:26 (UTC)
Full Name: David Carpenter
Company: City of Florence, Alabama
Affiliation: Inspector

CAM 790-8

AGAINST

Reason: 10.2.1. I agree with for cord plug connection. 10.2.2. The language appears to remove FEB/AHJ responsibility on hardwired equipment. Not sure how a hardwired evaluation can be made at the factory since the facility/installation wiring method would be available for evaluation.

Created: 2020-06-08 17:27 (UTC)
Full Name: Julian Burns
Company: Quality Power Solutions, Inc.
Affiliation: IEC

CAM 790-8

AGAINST

Reason: The Standard 790 Title states " Standard for Competency of Third-Party Field Evaluation Bodies". To include the Manufacture's location would not be where equipment is installed. At the Manufacture's location would constitute a "Listing" application. One purpose for a field evaluation is to verify that the unlisted equipment is being used in an area suitable for its application ie. not installed outdoors if not rated or installed in a hazardous Class 1 Division 1 area if not rated. The 790 Committee rejected both the original PI and the PC. This CAM should be rejected.

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Scott Newman

Company: Walgreens

Affiliation: None

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: In alignment with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-11 12:55 (UTC)

Full Name: George Barrier

Company: Charlotte Fire Department

Affiliation: Charlotte Fire Department / NCOEM

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: I understand there is no engineering basis nor has there been any engineering performed by a licensed Professional Engineer in support of the use of spot shores and to allow the support of trench soils without use of uprights or panels. In addition, the language in this motion will mislead firefighters to assume that spot shoring is safe at any trench incident. Spot shoring does have limited applicability to a narrow range of specific conditions, but this motion fails to in any way address those specific scenarios with no guidance available. This Motion creates an UNSAFE workspace. More work is yet to be done. George D, Barrier, PE (704) 201-1487

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)

Full Name: Kenneth Tyree

Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh

Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Agree with above comments

Created: 2020-06-10 19:42 (UTC)

Full Name:
Company: Lambertville FD
Affiliation: Non-member

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Spot shoring not appropriate for unstable soil conditions found during trench rescue operations

Created: 2020-06-10 19:08 (UTC)
Full Name: Jeff Brady
Company: Midland Fire Department
Affiliation: Midland Fire Department

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Spot shoring is a dangerous practice not backed up by science that creates a false sense of safety to rescuers. The fire service should error on the side of caution and treat all soil as class C. We owe it to our rescuers to operate with safe practices. The safest practice is shoring and sheeting.

Created: 2020-06-10 18:43 (UTC)
Full Name: Jake Hoffman
Company: Toledo Fire Special Operations
Affiliation: Toledo Fire Special Operations

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Physics that apply to rescue spot shoring in Michigan do not cease to exist on the west coast. Get rid of it.

Created: 2020-06-10 18:33 (UTC)
Full Name:
Company:
Affiliation: Romeoville Fire Academy

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: No tab data to support the use of spot shores.

Created: 2020-06-10 18:24 (UTC)
Full Name: Eric Falk
Company: MA District 8 Technical Rescue Team
Affiliation: Coordinator

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Misleading language

Created: 2020-06-10 17:52 (UTC)
Full Name:
Company: Toronto Fire Services
Affiliation: TFS

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: The current language as it is written in the standard will promote the use of spot shoring at a trench rescue incident. There needs to be proper limitations or explanation in the language. Currently, as it is written it will mislead firefighters to thinking that spot shoring is safe at any "trench incident". This creates a serious and dangerous omission of facts.

Created: 2020-06-10 17:15 (UTC)
Full Name: Matt Sherrill
Company:
Affiliation: Fire Department

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Practice lacks science and misleads firefighters that the practice is safe.

Created: 2020-06-10 15:00 (UTC)
Full Name: Eric Saling
Company: West Metro Fire Rescue
Affiliation: West Metro Fire Rescue

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: In unstable soil, spot shoring will only provide a false sense of security. Strut manufactures do not provide tabulated data for spot shoring in unstable soils. Strut activations forces used against unstable soils can facilitate a more rapid collapse of unaffected walls.

Created: 2020-06-10 14:54 (UTC)
Full Name: Brandon Buckley
Company:
Affiliation: St Paul Park Refinery FD

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Spot shoring should not be used on unstable soils or other adverse conditions and should be worded as such or removed.

Created: 2020-06-10 14:44 (UTC)
Full Name: Richard Gregg
Company: Alabama Fire College
Affiliation: Training Supervisor

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Original Text would mislead rescuer into thinking spot shoring with any given trench rescue would be safe

Created: 2020-06-10 14:32 (UTC)
Full Name: Justin Foureur
Company:
Affiliation: None

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Spot shoring is not a suitable option and has no scientific basis for use in trench rescue. It WILL promote the idea to non-trained personnel that spot shoring is ok when it is not. This is not promoting safe work practices.

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Jameson Wendell
Company: Merck Co
Affiliation: User

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-10 14:05 (UTC)

Full Name: David mccarthy

Company: claymont Fire Co

Affiliation: Ff

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: The new text does not sufficiently provide FF information about unstable soils, furthermore it lacks sufficient background to support the changes

Created: 2020-06-10 13:54 (UTC)

Full Name: Chris Bentley

Company: Airdrie Fire Dept

Affiliation: Airdrie Fire Dept

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Language is misleading and will lead to dangerous practices.

Created: 2020-06-10 13:53 (UTC)

Full Name: Matthew Fanfalone

Company:

Affiliation: Waterford regional fire dept

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Spot shoring is unsafe and does not properly protect the rescuers and victim from secondary collapses. Nor is there any conforming data to support spot shoring!

Created: 2020-06-10 13:48 (UTC)

Full Name: nicholas whitlock

Company:

Affiliation: Jefferson township

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: Spot shoring of unstable soil hasn't been proven effective

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)
Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed
Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp
Affiliation: member

CAM 1006-10

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-10 20:29 (UTC)
Full Name: Scott Eckstein
Company: Richardson Fire Department
Affiliation: Inspector

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Skills should not be removed

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)
Full Name: Christopher Kachura
Company: Southeast Fire Protection
Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Should remain.

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Thomas Parrish
Company: Telgian Corporation
Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)
Full Name: Shay Rankhorn
Company: Ballad Health
Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Against

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)
Full Name: Douglas Miller
Company: Local 190
Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Trench safety should be addressed.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)
Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas
Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue
Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: Disagree to remove the language

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)
Full Name: Matthew Mertens
Company: North Shore Fire Department
Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 1006-10

AGAINST

Reason: why would this basic skill be removed from the standard?

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)
Full Name: Kenneth Tyree

Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh
Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: Agree with above request

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)
Full Name: Christopher Kachura
Company: Southeast Fire Protection
Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: A

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Jameson Wendell
Company: Merck Co
Affiliation: User

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 20:21 (UTC)
Full Name: John Taylor
Company: HCT, LLC
Affiliation: Healthcare Consulting

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: Places undo hardship on departments of limited resources. The departments adversely affected additionally serve areas where this equipment is not rated or approved to operate.

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)
Full Name: Douglas Miller
Company: Local 190
Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: I don't think the ems and fire need regulations on patient loading.

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)
Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed
Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp
Affiliation: member

CAM 1500-1

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)
Full Name: Scott Newman
Company: Walgreens
Affiliation: None

CAM 1500-1

AGAINST

Reason: Disagree with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-10 20:29 (UTC)
Full Name: Scott Eckstein
Company: Richardson Fire Department
Affiliation: Inspector

CAM 1500-1

AGAINST

Reason: power-assisted devices save personnel injuries

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Thomas Parrish
Company: Telgian Corporation
Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 1500-1

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)

Full Name: Shay Rankhorn

Company: Ballad Health

Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 1500-1

AGAINST

Reason: Against

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)

Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas

Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 1500-1

AGAINST

Reason: Disagree to remove language

Created: 2020-06-08 18:18 (UTC)

Full Name: Tommy Demopoulos

Company: City Of Tamarac

Affiliation: Assistant Fire Marshal

CAM 1500-1

AGAINST

Reason: I agree with the language as written as this looks out for the safety and well-being of our fire service members and reduces back injuries.

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)

Full Name: Matthew Mertens

Company: North Shore Fire Department

Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 1500-1

AGAINST

Reason: many work injuries are from excessive lifting. power cots save costs and injuries.

Created: 2020-06-11 17:25 (UTC)

Full Name: Rick Swan

Company: IAFF Local 2881/CAL FIRE Fight

Affiliation: International Association of Fire Fighters

CAM 1700-1

FOR

Reason: The scope for NFPA 1700 states, This guide addresses structural fire-fighting strategy, tactics, and tasks as supported by science-based research. Chapter 11 is for Exposure and Hygiene Considerations, not only is Chapter 11 out of the scope of NFPA 1700 the material in Chapter 11 is already covered in NFPA 1500, and is within the scope of NFPA 1500 which states "This standard shall contain minimum requirements for a fire service-related occupational safety and health program." NFPA 1500 Chapter 1400 should be referenced in NFPA 1700 if that is the need.

Created: 2020-06-11 16:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Scott Newman

Company: Walgreens

Affiliation: None

CAM 1700-1

FOR

Reason: In alignment with recommendation

Created: 2020-06-10 18:42 (UTC)

Full Name: Christopher Kachura

Company: Southeast Fire Protection

Affiliation: AFSA

CAM 1700-1

FOR

Reason: A

Created: 2020-06-10 14:14 (UTC)

Full Name: Jameson Wendell

Company: Merck Co

Affiliation: User

CAM 1700-1

FOR

Reason: I agree

Created: 2020-06-09 13:31 (UTC)
Full Name: Douglas Miller
Company: Local 190
Affiliation: NFPA piping committee

CAM 1700-1

FOR

Reason: Not sure that it is needed in NFPA 1700

Created: 2020-06-09 09:54 (UTC)
Full Name: Yasser Amer Ahmed
Company: Dar Alhandasah Conslt Grp
Affiliation: member

CAM 1700-1

FOR

Reason: It's recommended

Created: 2020-06-11 17:18 (UTC)
Full Name: Marcelo Hirschler
Company: GBH International
Affiliation: GBH International

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: No justification was submitted to delete the chapter.

Created: 2020-06-11 11:43 (UTC)
Full Name: Kenneth Tyree
Company: West Virginia State Fire Marsh
Affiliation: IFMA

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: It's only a guide and the Chapter is only a part of a guide and not a standard.

Created: 2020-06-10 20:29 (UTC)
Full Name: Scott Eckstein
Company: Richardson Fire Department
Affiliation: Inspector

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: Keep chapter

Created: 2020-06-10 15:46 (UTC)
Full Name: Thomas Parrish
Company: Telgian Corporation
Affiliation: Telgian / AFAA

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: Support the committee decision

Created: 2020-06-10 12:40 (UTC)
Full Name: Joseph Jardin
Company: Fire Department City Of New Yo
Affiliation: FDNY

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: Support TC Position

Created: 2020-06-09 16:15 (UTC)
Full Name: Shay Rankhorn
Company: Ballad Health
Affiliation: ASHE

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: Against

Created: 2020-06-09 13:28 (UTC)
Full Name: Jeffrey Lucas

Company: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue
Affiliation: Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: Disagree to delete

Created: 2020-06-08 13:36 (UTC)
Full Name: Matthew Mertens
Company: North Shore Fire Department
Affiliation: NSFD

CAM 1700-1

AGAINST

Reason: without validation or purpose to remove an entire chapter does not make sense.
