



Submitter Substantiation

Certified Amending Motion **1-3**

June 2020

There are three reasons for this change to be important.

First: In this cycle, NFPA 101 approved the following new language:

“10.3.9.2 Fire retardant treatments for natural cut Christmas trees. Where fire retardant treatments are applied to natural cut Christmas trees, the fire retardant treatment shall comply with both Test Method 1 and Test Method 2 of ASTM E3082, Standard Test Methods for Determining the Effectiveness of Fire Retardant Treatments for Natural Christmas Trees.”

The motion recommends parallel language for NFPA 1.

Second: The technical committee rejected the comment with the rationale that: “Natural cut Christmas trees are not required to have a fire retardant coating applied. This requirement will create confusion and people may think that they need to do something in addition to keeping their natural cut Christmas tree watered.” This does not address the issue since the proposed language requires the fire test only “where the treatments are applied” and so this section would not be applicable if the treatment is not applied. It does not require anyone to apply a treatment but ensures that, if a treatment is applied, such a treatment will be effective. This fire test was developed by ASTM on request by the Natural Christmas Tree Association, who are very worried about the efficacy of some of fire retardant treatments. They found that using poorly formulated and untested treatments can accelerate the drying out of the Christmas tree and thus actually worsen the fire danger instead of lowering the danger. They asked ASTM to develop a fire test and it got done in committee E05. ASTM E3082 contains two fire tests: a small-scale one and a large scale one and a treatment must meet both in order to pass.

Third: statistics indicate that Christmas trees are involved in many fires and those fires can be deadly (especially for natural Christmas trees, which is why they are not allowed in many occupancies). NFPA statistics show that, between 2011 and 2015, U.S. fire departments responded to an estimated 200 structure fires, per year, caused by Christmas trees resulting in an annual average of 6 deaths, 16 injuries and \$14.8 million in property damage. When comparing Christmas tree fires to other reported home fires, 1 out of every 32 home fires that began with a Christmas tree resulted in a death compared to 1 death out of every 143 reported home fires overall.

Respectfully submitted,

Marcelo M. Hirschler –

GBH International – for NAFRA (North American Flame Retardant Alliance)



Report of the Technical Committee on Fire Code

Certified Amending Motion 1-3

June 2020

The Report of the Technical Committee on Fire Code is presented as found in the First Draft Report and Second Draft Report for the A2020 of NFPA 1, *Fire Code*. The revisions were submitted to letter ballot of the responsible Committee(s) in accordance with the *Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards*. The reports and ballot results can be found on the next edition tab of the Document Information page for NFPA 1 at www.nfpa.org/1next.

TC Chair Statement:

The technical committee reviewed the proposed new language in PI-3 and PC-7 during the First and Second Draft meetings. NFPA 1 does not require or recognize the use of fire-retardant products on natural cut Christmas trees. It was determined that putting these proposed requirements into the Code would create confusion for the user, who might assume they were required to apply fire retardant product to their natural cut trees, which is not the intent of the committee.

It should be noted that NFPA 101 has included the requirements for natural cut Christmas trees in section 10.3.9.2 (NFPA 101) and the text is proposed to be extracted via Tentative Interim Amendment TIA No.1497 into NFPA 1 section 12.6.9.6.5. As of May 22, 2020 the Technical Committee has voted affirmative on the TIA language as published in the preliminary results. However, the TIA is still being processed for public comment.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth E. Bush

on behalf of the Technical Committee on Fire Code



Submitter Substantiation

Certified Amending Motion 1-6
June 2020

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 editions. The NFSA understands some of the concerns for buildings protected by NFPA 13R systems, but adjustments have been made to compensate and address some of these matters in both the ICC and NFPA code making arenas. To make such substantial changes without solid technical justification is not how model codes should adjust to the times. Support this motion, return the document back to where it has been, and together, we can address this matter next cycle when technical substantiation, if any, is provided.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey M. Hugo – National Fire Sprinkler Association



Report of the Technical Committee on Fire Code

Certified Amending Motion **1-6**
June 2020

The Report of the Technical Committee on Fire Code is presented as found in the First Draft Report and Second Draft Report for the A2020 of NFPA 1, *Fire Code*. The revisions were submitted to letter ballot of the responsible Committee(s) in accordance with the *Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards*. The reports and ballot results can be found on the next edition tab of the Document Information page for NFPA 1 at www.nfpa.org/1next.

TC Chair Statement:

The technical committee added new language in section 18.2.3.2.2.2 (FR-78) based on PI-84. The FR passed ballot with 22 affirmative and 2 negative. The new language reduces the maximum distance from any portion of the exterior wall of the first story of a building which is protected throughout by an approved automatic fire sprinkler system installed in accordance with NFPA 13R and fire department access roads from 450 ft to 300 ft. This reduction in distance is intended to allow fire crews to gain quicker access to a structure under fire conditions. The committee recognized that life safety, not property protection, is the primary consideration for automatic sprinkler systems designed in accordance with NFPA 13R. Improved fire department access may be necessary to control fires in unprotected combustible concealed spaces in these buildings.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth E. Bush

on behalf of the Technical Committee on Fire Code



Submitter Substantiation

Certified Amending Motion **1-8**

June 2020

CAM 1-8 has one intent: to preserve the integrity of the NFPA Code and Standard Making Process. For the first time that the proponent of this motion can recall, one NFPA Technical Committee is attempting to undermine and void the code provisions written by, and under the scope of, another NFPA Technical Committee. If CAM 1-8 is successful, it will reverse the attempt by the NFPA 1 TC to undermine the NFPA 101 Residential Occupancy TC's scope as established by the NFPA Standards Council. Supporting this CAM will also ensure that this body does not promulgate codes and standards within the NFPA process that directly conflict with each other.

While the code provisions of this section specifically address valet trash services, the underlying technical topic is immaterial. This issue is about the scope of the NFPA 101 Residential Occupancies TC and their authority to adopt provisions to regulate an activity that can significantly impact the life safety of building occupants. For those that wish to debate the valet trash provisions adopted by the NFPA 101 Residential Occupancies TC, the appropriate venue for this will be under CAMs 101-10/101-20 and 101-11/101-21.

It is important to note that if this CAM is not successful, the precedent that will be set by this action will allow the NFPA 1 TC to subsequently undermine provisions within other NFPA Codes and Standards documents. As an example:

- If the NFPA 1 TC did not agree with the design densities for Light Hazard fire sprinkler systems in NFPA 13, could the NFPA 1 TC write a code change proposal that states, “The provisions of 19.3.3.2.1 of NFPA 13, as it relates to Light Hazard design densities, shall not be permitted.”?

- If the NFPA 1 TC did not agree with the staffing requirements contained in NFPA 1710, could the NFPA 1 TC write a code change proposal that states, “The provisions of 5.2.4 of NFPA 1710 shall not be permitted.”?

From the above examples, it is obvious that the scopes of the NFPA TCs, as established by the NFPA Standards Council, need to be respected and upheld by supporting this CAM.

Ultimately, this is a document scope issue and is the reason we see the NFPA 1 TC at odds with the NFPA 101 Residential Occupancy TC on this issue. The question is: Should the provisions of valet trash be regulated under NFPA 101 or NFPA 1? The NFPA 101 Residential Occupancy TC appears to view this as an occupant life safety issue and clearly under their scope while the NFPA 1 TC appears to view this as firefighter safety issue and under their scope. Arguably, every issue contained in every NFPA code or standard can be represented as a firefighter safety issue. However, that does not mean that NFPA 1’s scope then allows the NFPA 1 TC to override the scope of every other NFPA TC. The NFPA Standards Council establishes document scopes for a reason and we are seeing it here today. This issue is primarily an occupant life safety issue and, therefore, under the scope of the NFPA 101 Residential Occupancy TC.

In conclusion, the proponent of the CAM requests the NFPA Membership to **SUPPORT** this CAM and reject the NFPA 1 TC’s attempt to undermine the scope and authority of the NFPA 101 Residential Occupancy TC.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony C. Apfelbeck, CFPS, CBO, FIFireE

Director of Building and Fire Safety

City of Altamonte Springs



Report of the Technical Committee on Fire Code

Certified Amending Motion 1-8

June 2020

The Report of the Technical Committee on Fire Code is presented as found in the First Draft Report and Second Draft Report for the A2020 of NFPA 1, *Fire Code*. The revisions were submitted to letter ballot of the responsible Committee(s) in accordance with the *Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards*. The reports and ballot results can be found on the next edition tab of the Document Information page for NFPA 1 at www.nfpa.org/1next.

TC Chair Statement:

The committee addressed valet trash during the First Draft via a FR which failed ballot and resulted in CI-58. During the Second Draft, the committee developed SR-61 to exclude the provisions for valet trash in NFPA 101 from being extracted into NFPA 1. The technical committee noted the differences in scope from NFPA 101 and NFPA 1 as the reason for the different approaches. In addition to occupant life safety, the scope of NFPA 1 also includes firefighter safety and property protection. The technical committee was concerned with the increased fuel load created by valet trash in apartment corridors. They also noted it would violate the requirement for corridors to be kept free and clear of obstructions in order to remain available for use during emergency conditions; and also acknowledged that the presence of valet trash containers in egress corridors could pose an additional unacceptable risk to first responders during firefighting operations.

SR-61 passed ballot with 21 affirmative, 1 affirmative with comment, and 5 negative votes.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth E. Bush

on behalf of the Technical Committee on Fire Code



Submitter Substantiation

Certified Amending Motion **1-9**

June 2020

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



Report of the Technical Committee on Fire Code

Certified Amending Motion **1-9**
June 2020

The Report of the Technical Committee on Fire Code is presented as found in the First Draft Report and Second Draft Report for the A2020 of NFPA 1, *Fire Code*. The revisions were submitted to letter ballot of the responsible Committee(s) in accordance with the *Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards*. The reports and ballot results can be found on the next edition tab of the Document Information page for NFPA 1 at www.nfpa.org/1next.

TC Chair Statement:

The technical committee reviewed the proposed new language on inspection, testing and maintenance (ITM) records during both the First Draft (PI-136) and the Second Draft (PC-33). The ITM documentation and maintenance of records is the responsibility of the building owner and not the AHJ. In addition to the current requirements for ITM in NFPA 1, the committee acknowledged that the building may be regulated by multiple AHJs other than governmental authorities and that other state/local laws also regulate record retention.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth E. Bush

on behalf of the Technical Committee on Fire Code



Submitter Substantiation

Certified Amending Motion **4-1/4-5**

June 2020

Commissioning and Integrated Testing CMI-AAA Committee Proposed in SR-4-NFPA 4-2019 the removal of passive systems from the scope of NFPA 4 explicitly stating that integrated testing is only applicable for active fire protection systems.

This is an oversight as there are integrated active systems that have passive system testing components. Eliminating passive fire protection systems from the scope of NFPA 4 leaves a gap in the industry.

NFPA 3 (2021) 3.3.20.5 defines a passive fire protection system as

Any component of a building or structure that provides protection from fire or smoke without any type of system activation or movement.

The annex (A.3.3.20.5) provides examples of passive fire protection systems, but also provides the clarity that

Passive fire protection systems can include active components and can be impacted by active systems, such as fire dampers.

NFPA 3 (2021) 3.3.21.1 defines an integrated system as

A combination of systems that operate together as a whole to achieve the fire protection and life safety objectives.

The annex (A.3.3.21.1 and Figure A.3.3.21.1) provides clear examples and depictions of active and passive fire protection systems harmoniously working in tandem.

Smoke control systems serve as a good example of an integration between passive and active fire protection systems.

NFPA 92 (2018) 8.4.4.5 requires that egress doors are tested using a spring type scale and recorded. 8.4.4.6 requires that door opening forces required by building code are not exceeded. Further, section 8.6.1 requires periodic testing (semi-annually for dedicated systems and annually for non-dedicated systems) of both active and passive fire protection components. Lastly, 8.6.4 states that all data points shall coincide with the acceptance test for comparison measurements. Since this system is comprised of multiple individual systems of which various disciplines are required for testing, this periodic testing falls under the jurisdiction of NFPA 4. Therefore, to prevent a gap in the industry it is prudent that we reject SR-4 and keep passive fire protection systems within the purview of NFPA 4.

Respectfully,

Joshua Brackett, PE, SASHE, CHFM



Submitter Substantiation

Certified Amending Motion 4-1/4-5

June 2020

Second Revision #4 (SR#4) was based upon Committee Input #10 (CI#10). There were no Public Comments submitted on CI#10. The Committee Statement for SR#4 states the following:

“The purpose of revising the language was to clarify the integrated testing is only for active systems.”

The revision is not a clarification; but rather, a technical change to the document that passed by one vote (21-10). The Committee failed to provide a reason for changing the scope statement.

The title of NFPA 4 includes “Life Safety Systems” which are defined as:

Those systems that enhance or facilitate evacuation, smoke control, compartmentalization, and/or isolation.

As such, the title implies that passive fire protection features are within the scope. The document also defines “integrated system” as:

A combination of systems that are required to operate together as a whole to achieve overall fire protection and life safety objectives.

NFPA 550 clearly shows that fire safety objectives are met with a combination of active and passive fire protection features. By deleting passive systems from the scope of NFPA 4, the document is incomplete and fails to address the integrated systems that include passive fire protection features. Many active fire protection systems that are integrated with passive fire protection systems or whose performance is dependent upon passive fire protection systems. If the Committee intends to restrict the scope of the document to active fire protection systems, the change made by SR#4 is incomplete. In addition to the definition of life safety system including concepts such as compartmentation, the definition of passive fire protection system

was retained along with the associated Annex note. The Annex note for passive fire protection system includes the following sentence:

Passive fire protection systems can include active components and can be impacted by active systems, such as fire dampers.

Other Annex notes for the definitions of “individual system” and “integrated system” still contain language referring to passive fire protection systems such as automatic closing doors, egress components, and door systems.

In other words, although the scope statement was revised by SR#4, the title of the standard, definitions, and Annex notes clearly indicate that passive fire protection systems and features can be part of how the overall fire protection and life safety objectives are met.

Summary

Fire protection engineers utilize a combination of active and passive fire protection systems to achieve the desired fire safety objectives. To limit the scope of NFPA 4 to only address active fire protection systems eliminates the complete testing of integrated fire protection systems. The Committee failed to change related portions of the document including the title.

This issue is not about the services provided during periodic inspections and tests. NFPA 4 applies when there is a requirement for testing integrated systems. With the proposed change in the scope of NFPA 4, stakeholders will only know that the active systems that comprise a portion of the overall integrated systems are functioning properly.

Respectfully submitted,

William E. Koffel, P.E., FSFPE, SASHE



Report of the Technical Committee on Commissioning and Integrated Testing

Certified Amending Motion **4-1/4-5**
June 2020

The Report of the Technical Committee on Commissioning and Integrated Testing is presented as found in the First Draft Report and Second Draft Report for the A2020 of NFPA 4, *Standard for Integrated Fire Protection and Life Safety System Testing*. The revisions were submitted to letter ballot of the responsible Committee(s) in accordance with the *Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards*. The reports and ballot results can be found on the next edition tab of the Document Information page for NFPA 4 at www.nfpa.org/4next.

TC Chair Statement:

Mr. Brackett and Mr. Koffel expressed concern removing passive fire protection and life safety systems from the scope of NFPA 4. Both Mr. Brackett and Mr. Koffel believe that passive protection are a part of a larger total system. However, the Technical Committee decided that passive fire and life safety components are already inspected and/or verified during the installation process and commissioned in accordance with NFPA 3, *Standard for Commissioning of Fire Protection and Life Safety Systems*.

Respectfully submitted,

Maurice M. Pilette

on behalf of the Technical Committee on Commissioning and Integrated Testing



Submitter Substantiation

Certified Amending Motion **30-2**

June 2020

This change is needed because it clarifies what test needs to be used (in various sections of this chapter of NFPA 30) to assess fire resistance rating. Otherwise, the testing could be done using other tests which would not generate the values corresponding to the NFPA documents referenced in the section. In fact, the designation of fire resistance is often, incorrectly, applied to many fire tests that don't assess fire resistance ratings.

The technical committee rejected the initial public input (which simply referenced the most widely used test, ASTM E119) with the rationale: "IBC 703.3 and NFPA 5000 provide a variety of acceptable methods for establishing fire resistance ratings. Specifying ASTM E119 is limiting."

For that reason, the public comment is broader and brings in the full language extracted from NFPA 5000 (building code), which is functionally very similar to what is in the IBC, in 703.3. This explains that fire resistance rating can be assessed by testing to ASTM E119 or UL 263 (the same test) or by calculations, as permitted in NFPA 5000 and the IBC.

The technical committee rejected the public comment with a different rationale to that applied to the public input, as it stated: "There is no evidence that the lack of these references has been a problem; furthermore, the reference to building codes adds no stronger justification for including the proposed change."

The problem remains that codes, like NFPA 30, should explain what standard is to be used to determine a result (and they virtually always do). Here we have a case where fire resistance ratings are required in numerous locations in Chapter 9 of NFPA 30 but there is neither a general statement as to how to determine those fire resistance ratings nor a specific requirement in each section.

Section 9.2, where this language is proposed to be added, is entitled “Definitions specific to Chapter 9”. Therefore, this is the right location for the general requirement.

There is a reference to ASTM E119 in the chapter (now in section 9.5.3) but it is to a modified version of the test that only goes to 10 minutes (which obviously does not allow you to assess either a 1-hour fire resistance rating, or one that is higher).

Respectfully submitted,

Marcelo M. Hirschler –

GBH International – for NAFRA (North American Flame Retardant Alliance)



Report of the Correlating Committee on Flammable and Combustible Liquids

Certified Amending Motion **30-2**
June 2020

The Report of the Correlating Committee on Flammable and Combustible Liquids is presented as found in the First Draft Report and Second Draft Report for the Annual 2020 revision cycle of NFPA 30, *Flammable and Combustible Liquids Code*. The revisions were submitted to letter ballot of the responsible Technical Committees and Correlating Committee in accordance with the *Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards*. The reports and ballot results can be found on the next edition tab of the Document Information page for NFPA 30 at www.nfpa.org/30next.

CC Chair Statement:

The chair of the CC on Flammable and Combustible Liquids defers to Peter J. Willse, chair of the TC on Storage and Warehousing of Containers and Portable Tanks, for the technical committee's position below. The CC noted no issues with correlation regarding this CAM.

Respectfully submitted,

John A. LeBlanc

on behalf of the Correlating Committee on Flammable and Combustible Liquids

TC Chair Statement:

The Committee acknowledges and appreciates the code revision proposed changes submitted by Mr. Hirschler as Public Input and Public Comment. However, as the Committee noted in its Committee Statement for FR-432, which was created in response to Public Input No. 26 and in its statement resolving Public Input No. 27, Section 703.3 of the International Building Code (IBC)

and Paragraph 2.3.38 of NFPA 5000 (2018) recognize a variety of testing methods to assess a fire resistance rating, and those methods are not limited to ASTM E119. The Committee acknowledges that the methods identified by Mr. Hirschler in Public Comment No. 1 are recognized test methods for determining fire resistance; however in the Committee Statement accompanying the rejection of PC-1, the Committee noted that no evidence has been provided to the Committee that the lack of these references has been a problem for someone using the code. The Committee believes that its responsibility is to set the rating necessary for building construction but leaves it to the specific building code in force within a jurisdiction to establish which test method should be the source for testing of fire resistance rating.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter J. Willse

on behalf of the Flammable Liquids Technical Committee on Storage and Warehousing of
Containers and Portable Tanks



Submitter Substantiation

Certified Amending Motion **99-5**

June 2020

This change is important for the following reason.

At the first revision the technical committee added to the chapter on Features of Fire Protection a new clause, 16.3, that reads: “16.3 Fixtures, Furnishings, and Decorations. Fixtures, furnishings, and decorations shall meet the requirements of the applicable codes for the use of the space.”, with the rationale that “Fixtures, furnishings and decorations can add to the fire load and increase fire risk in a facility and comply with the applicable codes to ensure safety.” (FR 1060). That made total sense, because Chapter 14 includes significant information about the fire safety of furnishings (including specially upholstered furniture and mattresses). Therefore, my comment (and this proposed revision) did two things: (a) added upholstered furniture and mattresses because they are specifically covered in another chapter of NFPA 99 and (b) added an annex note sending the user to NFPA 101 or NFPA 1, which is where most requirements for fixtures, furnishings and decorations can be found.

At the second draft meeting the technical committee changed its mind and, instead of adding the useful information to the code, deleted even the information it had added in the first revision, with the rationale that “The requirements within other applicable codes and standards are required whether or not 16.3 exists or not. This text does not seem to add any value nor does it direct the reader to another code for any requirement.”

The technical committee rationale is misleading, since, while the presence, or not, of a sentence in NFPA 99 does not alter code requirements, the purpose of the original addition of 16.3 was to warn health care facility operators that such products can increase the fire risk.

The public comment highlighted those furnishings that are most critical in adding fire risk and added annex information on where to find the requirements. Health care facilities clearly contain a variety of furnishings (including upholstered furniture and mattresses), and decorations and, therefore it is important to know that these products add to the fire risk and to know where to look for the requirements.

Respectfully submitted,

Marcelo M. Hirschler –

GBH International – for NAFRA (North American Flame Retardant Alliance)



Report of the Correlating Committee on Health Care Facilities

Certified Amending Motion **99-5**
June 2020

The Report of the Correlating Committee on Health Care Facilities is presented as found in the First Draft Report and Second Draft Report for the A2020 of NFPA 99, *Health Care Facilities*. The revisions were submitted to letter ballot of the responsible Technical Committees and Correlating Committee in accordance with the *Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards*. The reports and ballot results can be found on the next edition tab of the Document Information page for NFPA 99 at www.nfpa.org/99next.

CC Chair Statement:

As the chair of the CC on Health Care Facilities, I will be providing the report on both the Correlating Committee's position and the Technical Committee's position on this CAM to accept PC-21. The submitter of a PC related to this debate (PC-54) is a colleague of the Technical Committee Chair, David Klein. To avoid any conflict of interest, Mr. Klein has recused himself from this debate.

The technical committee reviewed public comment PC-21 that sought to modify section 16.3 by adding an annex note and some parenthetical guidance on the application of codes for fixtures, furnishings, and decorations. This language (section 16.3) was newly added in the First Draft. Upon further review of the accepted language from the First Draft, and the proposed language in PC-21 and PC-54, the TC developed SR-986, removing the entire new section 16.3. The requirements for fixtures, furnishings and decoration, as found in other Codes (NFPA 1 and NFPA 101), are required regardless of this new section. The technical committee did not see any added value in the section nor a direct code reference within the body of the section to assist the user.

There are no correlation issues associated with this motion.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael A. Crowley

on behalf of the Correlating Committee on Health Care Facilities

TC Chair Statement:

A public comment related to this CAM (PC-54) was submitted by a colleague. Therefore, I am recusing myself from this debate.

Respectfully submitted,

David P. Klein

on behalf of the Technical Committee on Fundamentals



Submitter Substantiation

Certified Amending Motion **101-9**

June 2020

There are three reasons for this change:

First: This change simply gives a pointer to know where to find the fire safety requirements for playgrounds if NFPA 101 is used but NFPA 1 is not also used.

Second: Section 10.19 of NFPA 1-2018 addresses indoor children's playgrounds (for the NFPA 1-2021 edition, this section became Section 10.20 because a new section 10.15 was added). The second draft of NFPA 1 expanded the applicability of the requirements, from children's playgrounds to all indoor play structures (and this second revision has no associated amending motion, meaning it was approved). The requirements now apply to all play structures, including structures intended for adults, because the potential exists for severe fire safety issues. Indoor play structures can cover a wide range of activities and are not limited to children's play structures. Some examples of these are; indoor skydiving, permanent haunted houses, very large and tall rock-climbing walls in gymnasiums of schools and universities, laser tag facilities with elevated and large structures having massive concealed spaces, indoor archery ranges with foam 3d targets and any number of other indoor activities with recreational structures located within a building. A growing number of "I" Occupancy structures are now adding adult playgrounds. A climbing or skydiving facility may be well over 1000 square feet in area/footprint and may even be over 42 feet in height. The structure in many cases needs to be considered a special structure with special design considerations needed. There are often many potential fire safety issues dealing with concealed spaces and flame spread requirements, and NFPA 1 addresses them.

Third: The technical committee states that this pointer should go into Chapter 10, but that is not the proper place because NFPA 101 Chapter 10 deals with interior finish, contents and

furnishings (including decorations). Indoor play structures are special structures erected indoors and they are neither interior finish (which addresses the products attached to walls, ceilings, or floors), nor contents (such as upholstered furniture or mattresses, which can be relocated within the occupancy), nor furnishings (such as decorations). They are not decorations because they serve a functional purpose, and not a decorative purpose. They are actual structures used for various activities and they are found indoors within any number of occupancies. Therefore, they belong in a core chapter and Chapter 11 is the right location. In a certain way, these structures are not dissimilar to animal housing facilities (covered by 11.12), with the main difference being that they are indoors. Note that this section, as contained in NFPA 1 (and as proposed for NFPA 101), would not apply to play structures outdoors.

Respectfully submitted,

Marcelo M. Hirschler –

GBH International – for NAFRA (North American Flame Retardant Alliance)



Report of the Correlating Committee on Safety to Life

Certified Amending Motion **101-9**
June 2020

The Report of the Correlating Committee on **Safety to Life** is presented as found in the First Draft Report and Second Draft Report for the Annual 2020 revision cycle of NFPA 101, *Life Safety Code*. The revisions were submitted to letter ballot of the responsible Technical Committees and Correlating Committee in accordance with the *Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards*. The reports and ballot results can be found on the next edition tab of the Document Information page for NFPA 101 at www.nfpa.org/101next.

CC Chair Statement:

The chair of the CC on Safety to Life defers to Carl Wren, chair of the TC on Industrial, Storage, and Miscellaneous Occupancies for the technical committee's position. There are no correlative issues associated with this motion.

Respectfully submitted,

Wayne Carson

on behalf of the Correlating Committee on Safety to Life

TC Chair Statement:

The technical committee reviewed the proponent's public comment PC-18 and rejected it on the grounds that indoor play structures are not special structures in the context of Chapter 11 of NFPA 101, which includes such special structures as high-rise buildings, limited-access structures, water surrounded structures, underground structures, and the like. Rather, indoor play structures would be more appropriately regulated as building contents and furnishings and any

requirement would be better located in Chapter 10, Interior Finish, Contents, and Furnishings, and reviewed by the appropriate technical committee.

Respectfully submitted,

Carl Wren

on behalf of the Safety to Life Technical Committee on Industrial, Storage, and Miscellaneous Occupancies

Submitter Substantiation

Certified Amending Motion **101-10/101-20**

June 2020



Valet trash services has failed to achieve traction in both NFPA 1 and the ICC

International Fire Code. This attempt to gain approval for valet trash provisions in NFPA 101 directly undermines the ability of the NFPA 1 Technical Committee to regulate a known and ongoing fire hazard to building occupants and firefighters.

Proponents of valet trash will argue that the scope of NFPA 101 allows the committee to regulate these services, however, if valet trash is approved it will contradict numerous fire code sections found within NFPA 1 and will create confusion for AHJ's and code officials throughout the country. Supporters will also argue that the technical aspects of valet trash are irrelevant and that this is purely a scoping issue between two standards, while this Certified Amending Motion is being argued as a scoping issue, we cannot ignore the technical merits nor the fire safety issues that valet trash presents to our egress routes and compartmentalized fuel loads in apartment buildings.

The proposed text for valet trash services is in direct conflict with proven fire safety principles which have been in place for decades. The prohibition of combustibile materials within the means of egress is a sacred, tried and true fire safety principle. During the second revision of NFPA 1, more than a **dozen** proposals from the valet trash industry **failed ballot**, as numerous members of the fire code committee recognized the hazards of valet trash and the direct code conflicts that allowing this practice would create if approved within NFPA 1. Furthermore, the NFPA 101 Correlating Committee also voted and passed ballots to consider deleting the valet trash provisions submitted under FR-6741 and FR-6898 on December 11, 2018, as they felt the scope of valet trash requirements **falls within the requirements of NFPA 1 vs. NFPA 101.** (Reference: *NFPA 101 Correlating Committee notes No. 45-NFPA 101-2018 and No. 46-NFPA 101-2018*)

The scope of NFPA 1 addresses some of the following conditions in Section 1.1.1:

- **Hazards from** outside fire in vegetation, **trash**, building debris and other materials. 1.1.1(8)
- Interior finish, decorations, furnishings and **other combustibles that contribute to fire spread, fire load and smoke production.** 1.1.1(11)
- **Conditions affecting firefighter safety.** 1.1.1(15)

The scope of NFPA 101 does not mirror NFPA 1, in fact NFPA 101 states the following:

Section 1.1.9 - Areas not addressed - The *Code* does not address the following:

- General **fire prevention** or building construction features **that are normally a function of fire prevention codes** and building codes. 1.1.9 (1)

At its core, NFPA 1 is a fire prevention code which establishes a reasonable level of fire safety requirements to protect building occupants and firefighters from the hazards of fire.

In conclusion, the proponents of this CAM believe that the ability to regulate valet trash should fall within the scope of NFPA 1, not NFPA 101. Our organization respectfully requests the voting membership **SUPPORT** this Certified Amending Motion. Doing so will subvert attempts to undercut the ability of NFPA 1 to regulate these services.

Respectfully submitted,

Ty Darby

Codes and Standards Representative

International Association of Firefighters



Submitter Substantiation

Certified Amending Motion **101-10/101-20**
June 2020

Additional requirements regarding valet trash are not needed. The Code currently prohibits putting items in the corridor that create a higher hazard than what is expected in that occupancy.

In addition, the Code also requires the corridor be kept free and clear of obstructions. The introduction of trash into the corridor creates a hazard to fire and life safety, firefighter safety, and property.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher Hiener



Report of the Correlating Committee on Safety to Life

Certified Amending Motion **101-10/101-20**
June 2020

The Report of the Correlating Committee on Safety to Life is presented as found in the First Draft Report and Second Draft Report for the Annual 2020 revision cycle of NFPA 101, *Life Safety Code*. The revisions were submitted to letter ballot of the responsible Technical Committees and Correlating Committee in accordance with the *Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards*. The reports and ballot results can be found on the next edition tab of the Document Information page for NFPA 101 at www.nfpa.org/101next.

CC Chair Statement:

The chair of the CC on Safety to Life defers to James Lathrop, chair of the TC on Residential Occupancies, for the technical committee's position. It is noted that a correlation issue might exist between NFPA 1 and NFPA 101 depending on the outcome of their respective CAMs if NFPA 101 includes valet trash requirements and NFPA 1 prohibits their application (see CAM 1-8). The CC determined that such requirements are within the scope of NFPA 101 by taking no action to remove them. Any conflicting requirements will need to be resolved by the Standards Council prior to issuance of the codes.

Respectfully submitted,

Wayne Carson

on behalf of the Correlating Committee on Safety to Life

TC Chair Statement:

The technical committee reviewed public comments that sought to delete the new requirements for valet trash services in apartment buildings. It was determined that such services currently

exist and regulations are needed to ensure the safety of residents where valet trash service is provided. Further, the TC concluded that such regulations are within the scope of NFPA 101, rather than NFPA 1, which was questioned by the correlating committee.

Respectfully submitted,

James Lathrop

on behalf of the Safety to Life Technical Committee on Residential Occupancies



Submitter Substantiation

Certified Amending Motion **101-11/101-21**

June 2020

Valet trash services has failed to achieve traction in both NFPA 1 and the ICC International Fire Code. This attempt to gain approval for valet trash provisions in NFPA 101 directly undermines the ability of the NFPA 1 Technical Committee to regulate a known and ongoing fire hazard to building occupants and firefighters.

Proponents of valet trash will argue that the scope of NFPA 101 allows the committee to regulate these services, however, if valet trash is approved it will contradict numerous fire code sections found within NFPA 1 and will create confusion for AHJ's and code officials throughout the country. Supporters will also argue that the technical aspects of valet trash are irrelevant and that this is purely a scoping issue between two standards, while this Certified Amending Motion is being argued as a scoping issue, we cannot ignore the technical merits nor the fire safety issues that valet trash presents to our egress routes and compartmentalized fuel loads in apartment buildings.

The proposed text for valet trash services is in direct conflict with proven fire safety principles which have been in place for decades. The prohibition of combustible materials within the means of egress is a sacred, tried and true fire safety principle. During the second revision of NFPA 1, more than a **dozen** proposals from the valet trash industry **failed ballot**, as numerous members of the fire code committee recognized the hazards of valet trash and the direct code conflicts that allowing this practice would create if approved within NFPA 1.

Furthermore, the NFPA 101 Correlating Committee also voted and passed ballots to consider deleting the valet trash provisions submitted under FR-6741 and FR-6898 on December 11, 2018, as they felt the scope of valet trash requirements **falls within the requirements of NFPA**

1 vs. NFPA 101. (Reference: NFPA 101 Correlating Committee notes No. 45-NFPA 101-2018 and No. 46-NFPA 101-2018)

The scope of NFPA 1 addresses some of the following conditions in Section 1.1.1:

- **Hazards from** outside fire in vegetation, **trash**, building debris and other materials. 1.1.1(8)
- Interior finish, decorations, furnishings and **other combustibles that contribute to fire spread, fire load and smoke production.** 1.1.1(11)
- **Conditions affecting firefighter safety.** 1.1.1(15)

The scope of NFPA 101 does not mirror NFPA 1, in fact NFPA 101 states the following:

Section 1.1.9 - Areas not addressed - The *Code* does not address the following:

- General **fire prevention** or building construction features **that are normally a function of fire prevention codes** and building codes. 1.1.9 (1)

At its core, NFPA 1 is a fire prevention code which establishes a reasonable level of fire safety requirements to protect building occupants and firefighters from the hazards of fire.

In conclusion, the proponents of this CAM believe that the ability to regulate valet trash should fall within the scope of NFPA 1, not NFPA 101. Our organization respectfully requests the voting membership **SUPPORT** this Certified Amending Motion. Doing so will subvert attempts to undercut the ability of NFPA 1 to regulate these services.

Respectfully submitted,

Ty Darby

Codes and Standards Representative

International Association of Firefighters



Submitter Substantiation

Certified Amending Motion **101-11/101-21**
June 2020

Additional requirements regarding valet trash are not needed. The Code currently prohibits putting items in the corridor that create a higher hazard than what is expected in that occupancy. In addition, the Code also requires the corridor be kept free and clear of obstructions. The introduction of trash into the corridor creates a hazard to fire and life safety, firefighter safety, and property.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher Hiener



Report of the Correlating Committee on Safety to Life

Certified Amending Motion **101-11/101-21**
June 2020

The Report of the Correlating Committee on Safety to Life is presented as found in the First Draft Report and Second Draft Report for the Annual 2020 revision cycle of NFPA 101, *Life Safety Code*. The revisions were submitted to letter ballot of the responsible Technical Committees and Correlating Committee in accordance with the *Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards*. The reports and ballot results can be found on the next edition tab of the Document Information page for NFPA 101 at www.nfpa.org/101next.

CC Chair Statement:

The chair of the CC on Safety to Life defers to James Lathrop, chair of the TC on Residential Occupancies, for the technical committee's position below. It is noted that a correlation issue might exist between NFPA 1 and NFPA 101 depending on the outcome of their respective CAMs if NFPA 101 includes valet trash requirements and NFPA 1 prohibits their application (see CAM 1-8). The CC determined that such requirements are within the scope of NFPA 101 by taking no action to remove them. Any conflicting requirements will need to be resolved by the Standards Council prior to issuance of the codes.

Respectfully submitted,

Wayne Carson on behalf of the Correlating Committee on Safety to Life

TC Chair Statement:

The technical committee reviewed public comments that sought to delete the new requirements for valet trash services in apartment buildings. It was determined that such services currently exist and regulations are needed to ensure the safety of residents where valet trash service is provided. Further, the TC concluded that such regulations are within the scope of NFPA 101, rather than NFPA 1, which was questioned by the correlating committee.

Respectfully submitted,

James Lathrop

on behalf of the Safety to Life Technical Committee on Residential Occupancies



Motion Substantiation

Certified Amending Motion **101-17**
June 2020

NFPA 101 Original HRB-SAC Proposal

The intent of the section is to provide some form of communication in an existing high-rise building. Many building occupants of high-rise buildings expect there to be, at a minimum, an alarm and/or notification system and yet it is currently not required. While we acknowledge this is not a full NFPA 72 compliant system it is an important step to notifying building occupants of what is occurring. The communication system is vital for first responders to communicate important safety instructions such as whether building occupants should shelter in place, evacuate, or use a specific stair. In recent high-rise fires, including but not limited to Grenfell Tower (London, England) and Marco Polo Condo (Honolulu, Hawaii), the importance of communication with the building occupants has become even more apparent. This proposal would allow battery backup as the secondary power supply since these are existing buildings and we acknowledge that a secondary power supply is not always readily available. Some existing apartment buildings already have systems that do not comply with NFPA 72. This would allow those systems to remain in use and not require them to be replaced. It is within the prerogative of a Code to allow a system other than what is required by a Standard.

Revised Proposal Draft

The intent of the section is to provide some form of communication in an existing high-rise building. Many building occupants of high-rise buildings expect there to be, at a minimum, an alarm and/or notification system and yet it is currently not required. While we acknowledge this is not a full NFPA-72 compliant system it is an important step to notifying building occupants of

what is occurring. The communication system is vital for first responders to communicate important safety instructions such as whether building occupants should shelter-in-place, evacuate, or use a specific evacuation staircase. ~~stairs~~. High-rise fires occur daily across North America as well as globally, the importance of voice communication to the building occupants has become even more apparent. Building occupants expect clear communications from first responders with respect to the incident in the building and actions to be followed in the interest of life safety. This proposal would allow battery backup as the secondary power supply since these are existing buildings and we acknowledge that a secondary power supply is not always readily available. Some existing apartment buildings already have systems that do not comply with NFPA-72. This would allow those systems to remain in use and not require them to be replaced. It is within the prerogative of a Code to allow a system other than what is required by a Standard.

Respectfully submitted,

Jack J. Murphy

HRB-SAC Committee, Principal Member



Report of the Correlating Committee on Safety to Life

Certified Amending Motion **101-17**
June 2020

The Report of the Correlating Committee on Safety to Life is presented as found in the First Draft Report and Second Draft Report for the Annual 2020 revision cycle of NFPA 101, *Life Safety Code*. The revisions were submitted to letter ballot of the responsible Technical Committees and Correlating Committee in accordance with the *Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards*. The reports and ballot results can be found on the next edition tab of the Document Information page for NFPA 101 at www.nfpa.org/101next.

CC Chair Statement:

The chair of the CC on Safety to Life defers to James Lathrop, chair of the TC on Residential Occupancies, for the technical committee's position below. There are no correlation issues associated with this motion.

Respectfully submitted,

Wayne Carson

on behalf of the Correlating Committee on Safety to Life

TC Chair Statement:

The technical committee reviewed public comment PC-196 that sought to add requirements for voice communication fire alarm notification in existing, high-rise apartment buildings.

Justification for the public comment included the contribution of the lack of voice notification to the tragic outcomes of the Grenfell Tower (London, UK) and Marco Polo Condo (Honolulu, HI) high-rise apartment building fires. No technical substantiation, however, was provided to support

that claim. The technical committee was unable to support a mandatory requirement to retrofit potentially thousands of existing buildings with no technical substantiation.

Respectfully submitted,

James Lathrop

on behalf of the Safety to Life Technical Committee on Residential Occupancies



Submitter Substantiation

Certified Amending Motion **790-8**

June 2020

A product cannot always be evaluated in the end installation. Some end users will not allow a product to be delivered without the field label. Some manufactures require multiple products be field labeled which can only be performed at the manufacturer's facility. For cord connected products, the end user can move the product from the place evaluated to another place in the facility. So long as the field report provides the details of the evaluation, that should provide the end user with the parameters of the evaluation.

Respectfully submitted,

Rich Trainor

TUV SUD America, Inc.



Report of the NEC[®] Correlating Committee

Certified Amending Motion **790-8**
June 2020

The report of the Correlating Committee on the National Electrical Code is presented as found in the First Draft Report and Second Draft Report for the Annual 2020 revision cycle of NFPA 790, *Standard for the Competency of Third-Party Field Evaluation Bodies*. The revisions were submitted to letter ballot of the responsible Technical Committees and Correlating Committee in accordance with the *Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards*. The reports and ballot results can be found on the next edition tab of the Document Information page for NFPA 790 at www.nfpa.org/doc#next.

CC Chair Statement:

In its review of Certified Amending Motion No.790-8 on Section 10.2.1 of NFPA 790, the National Electrical Code Correlating Committee has not identified any correlation issues or conflicts that would result from this amending motion. For a discussion of the technical issues associated with Certified Amending Motion No. 790-8, the Correlating Committee defers to Julian Burns, chair of the Technical Committee on Electrical Equipment Evaluation.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry Ayer, Chair of the NEC[®] Correlating Committee



Report of the Technical Committee on Electrical Equipment Evaluation

Certified Amending Motion **790-8**
June 2020

The Report of the Technical Committee on Electrical Equipment Evaluation is presented as found in the First Draft Report and Second Draft Report for the Annual 2020 revision cycle of NFPA 790, *Standard for the Competency of Third-Party Field Evaluation Bodies*. The revisions were submitted to letter ballot of the responsible Committee(s) in accordance with the *Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards*. The reports and ballot results can be found on the next edition tab of the Document Information page for NFPA 790 at www.nfpa.org/doc#next.

TC Chair Statement:

This Cam is related to PC No.1-NFPA 790-2019 Section 10.2.1.

This PC was discussed at length and all Committee members had input including representatives from other NRTL's on the Committee. The title of NFPA 790 document is "Standard for Competency of Third-Party Field Evaluation Bodies". Section 10.2.1 provides requirements for a field evaluation which states: "shall be completed at the final installation site."

Mr. Trainor's CAM wishes to expand Section 10.2.1 to include the manufacturer's location, which would not constitute a field evaluation. If an evaluation is conducted at the manufacturer's location it is and should be a "Listing" application. The whole point of a "Field Evaluation" is to permit flexibility. One purpose of a Field Evaluation is to verify that the equipment is being used in an area suitable for its application i.e. not installed outdoors if not rated, installed in a hazardous Class 1 Division 1 area if not rated for such an area etc.

Section 10.2.2 permits preliminary evaluation/inspection to address any manufacturing flaws or discrepancies prior to final installation.

The 790 Committee rejected both the original PI and the PC. This CAM should be rejected so not to create confusion throughout the industry as to where a Field Evaluation is to be conducted.

Respectfully submitted,

Julian Burns

Committee Chair, on behalf of the Technical Committee on Electrical Equipment Evaluation



Submitter Substantiation

Certified Amending Motion **1006-10**

Designing shoring methods that are needed to protect people from the hazards of collapse (structural or soil) is a scientific endeavor that bears tremendous responsibility and liability. From a legal aspect, shoring designs are limited to licensed professional engineers. Section 12.7.7 NFPA 1006 (2021 edition) presents a job performance requirement for trench rescue technicians that is essentially a prescriptive shoring design. The original (1st Draft) of the language prescribes the use of spot shoring to support soil without incorporating uprights or panels for use in collapsed soil conditions. **“Utilize spot shoring techniques to support soil without incorporating uprights or panels as part of the shoring plan, given a trench collapse incident, trench rescue toolbox, tabulated data, and trench shoring plan, so that the soil is prevented from further collapse.”**

In our first comments on the draft language myself and a group of licensed professional engineers (see list below for member details) with years of experience in rescue operations provided geotechnical academic and empirical evidence that this prescriptive design was not safe for the unstable soil conditions associated with trench collapse incidents. In addition to the fact that there is no engineering or scientific principle, theory or data to show that spot shoring is an acceptable means to retain soil that has undergone failure, we presented statements from all of the major strut manufacturers which showed that none of them endorsed or supported the use of spot shoring in soils that have failed. Upon review of our comments the 1006 committee provided the following: **SR-14-NFPA- The committee agreed spot shoring should not be used in non-stable soil. However, it is an acceptable trench stabilization technique in stable soil conditions when supported by tabulated data.** The committee then amended the language by removing the words “collapse” and “further” from the language.

The amended 12.3.7 section now reads: **Utilize spot shoring techniques to support soil without incorporating uprights or panels as part of the shoring plan, given a trench incident, trench rescue toolbox, tabulated data, and trench shoring plan, so that the soil is prevented from collapse.**

While the amended language does not include the use of spot shoring in collapsed soil conditions, it does not preclude it. The committee now understands and agrees that spot shoring should not be used in non-stable soil conditions, the amended language fails to provide any language that would make the end user aware of that. Without adequate limitations or explanation, the language “given a trench incident” will mislead firefighters to thinking that spot shoring is safe at any “trench incident”. This creates a serious and dangerous omission by the committee. It is the responsibility of the committee members to provide safe job performance requirements and this amended language does not do that.

At this point in the revision of Standard 1006, if NFPA rules prevent the inclusion of the criteria needed to keep firefighters safe while using “spot shoring” the group of professional engineers listed below and I highly recommend that the language in the 1006 (2021 edition) revert back to the “spot shoring” language found in the 2017 edition. Of course, that means that spot shoring would not be addressed in the new standard. The omission of the specific criteria needed to safely use spot shoring found in the 1006 proposed language is misleading and dangerous and would be better not being addressed than being addressed inaccurately or inadequately.

Respectfully submitted,

Ron Zawlocki

(Dr. Oliver Taylor P.E.-PhD, Dr. Marie LaBaw P.E.-PhD, Don Barrier P.E., Craig Dashner P.E.)



Report of the Correlating Committee on Professional Qualifications

Certified Amending Motion **1006-10**
June 2020

The Report of the Correlating Committee on Professional Qualifications is presented as found in the First Draft Report and Second Draft Report for the Annual 2020 revision cycle of NFPA 1006, *Standard for Technical Rescue Personnel Professional Qualifications*. The revisions were submitted to letter ballot of the responsible Technical Committees and Correlating Committee in accordance with the *Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards*. The reports and ballot results can be found on the next edition tab of the Document Information page for NFPA 1006 at www.nfpa.org/1006next.

CC Chair Statement:

The chair of the CC on Professional Qualifications defers to Orlando Hernandez, chair of the TC on Rescue Technician Professional Qualifications, for the technical committee's position below.

Respectfully submitted,

William Peterson

on behalf of the Correlating Committee on Professional Qualifications

TC Chair Statement:

The committee reviewed the public comment and supporting material provided by the submitter, the committee does agree that spot shoring should not be used in non-stable soil. However, it is an acceptable trench stabilization technique in stable soil conditions when supported by tabulated data which is why the committee chose to modify the text with the intent of attempting to meet the submitters comment. It is the position of the committee that NFPA 1006 is for individual competencies for those who are to be qualified to any of the levels and disciplines within NFPA

1006. It should also be noted that NFPA 1006 does not address organizational and management responsibility, meaning that it is up to the organization to determine what practices or tactics they will engage in or not engage based on safety factors. Even if an individual is qualified to a specific discipline or level within NFPA 1006, it falls upon the organization to determine what tactics or skills they will or will not engage in.

Respectfully submitted,

Orlando Hernandez

on behalf of the Rescue Technician Professional Qualification Technical Committee



Submitter Substantiation

Certified Amending Motion **1500-1**

June 2020

I did vote yes in the beginning, however, unbeknownst to me there was a 6 month field test that was completed recommending against the purchase of power gurneys. We had many failures causing our personnel to have to order a second ALS ambulance for transportation. The gurneys also will not configure into a sitting position for our older elevators, causing firefighters to hand carry patients down stairs, out of buildings. We had to cancel the testing due to the aforementioned concerns and injuries to our firefighters. Recommendation to change the verbiage from shall to should or something upon which the committee can agree. Internally a report was prepared by our Supply and Maintenance Chief terminating the field test due to the problems we encountered.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronnie Villanueva

Los Angeles City Fire Department



Report of the Technical Committee for Fire Service Occupational Safety

Certified Amending Motion **1500-1**
June 2020

The Report of the Committee on Fire Service Occupational Safety is presented as found in the First Draft Report and Second Draft Report for the Annual 2020 revision cycle of NFPA 1500, *Standard on Fire Department Occupational Safety, Health, and Wellness Program*. The revisions were submitted to letter ballot of the responsible Technical in accordance with the *Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards*. The reports and ballot results can be found on the next edition tab of the Document Information page for NFPA 1500 at www.nfpa.org/1006next.

TC Chair Statement:

The committee reviewed the public input and public comment and supporting material provided by the submitter, a majority of the committee agreed that powerlift ambulance stretcher would assist and reduce weighted lifting to those loading and unloading patients. In its substantiation the committee cited that this would reduce the workload for ambulance attendants and that it would reduce the instances of injuries related to loading and unloading of patients. This is because the powerlift stretchers reduce the stress and weight bearing responsibilities of personnel when lifting stretchers both on the scene of an EMS incident and while loading and unloading the ambulance. The repetitive stress of lifting patients is frequently cited as a leading cause for workplace injuries when performing EMS duties.

Respectfully submitted,

Randy Krause,

on behalf of the Fire Service Occupational Safety Technical Committee



Report of the Technical Committee on Fundamentals of Fire Control Within a Structure Utilizing Fire

Dynamics

Certified Amending Motion **1700-1**

June 2020

The Report of the Technical Committee on Fundamentals of Fire Control Within a Structure Utilizing Fire Dynamics is presented as found in the First Draft Report and Second Draft Report for the Annual 2020 revision cycle of NFPA 1700, *Guide to Structural Fire Fighting*. The revisions were submitted to letter ballot of the Technical Committee in accordance with the *Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards*. The reports and ballot results can be found on the next edition tab of the Document Information page for NFPA 1700 at www.nfpa.org/1700next.

TC Chair Statement:

The technical committee reviewed the public comment that sought to delete the Chapter on Exposure and Hygiene Considerations. It was determined that exposure (contamination control) and firefighter hygiene is a strategic and/or tactical consideration related to structural fire fighting. As the scope of this Guide contemplates development of policies, procedures and guidelines as supported by science-based research, the content of Chapter 11 will complement the objectives of documents allied with the objectives of reducing firefighter contamination and enhancing firefighter health. This chapter in the Guide will serve as an added resource for the user and point to other NFPA Standards that address the issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph Jardin

on behalf of the Committee on Fundamentals of Fire Control Within a Structure Utilizing Fire
Dynamics