

**Standards Council Meeting  
 July 29-August 1, 2013  
 Preliminary Minutes  
 NFPA Headquarters  
 1 Batterymarch Park  
 Quincy, MA  
 617-770-3000**

**Members Present**

**James T. Pauley, Chair**  
**Kerry M. Bell**  
**Randall K. Bradley**  
**J. C. Harrington**  
**James E. Golinveaux**  
**Bonnie Manley**

**Danny L. McDaniel**  
**James A. Milke**  
**Daniel O'Connor**  
**Richard P. Owen**  
**John A. Rickard**  
**Michael D. Snyder**

13-8-1	It was voted to issue NFPA 25, <i>Standard for the Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance of Water-Based Fire Protection Systems</i> , with an issuance date of August 1, 2013 and an effective date of August 21, 2013, as acted on at the Association Meeting, with amendments and appeals as indicated in Minute Items 13-8-1-a-1 thru 13-8-1-c-1 (D#13-18), 13-8-1-d-1 (D#13-19), 13-8-1-e-1 (D#13-17), 13-8-1-f, 13-8-1-g (D#13-8), and other actions as indicated in Minute Item 13-8-1-h.
13-8-1-a-1 thru 13-8-1-c-1	<p><b>DECISION/D#13-18:</b> At its meeting of July 29 – July 31, 2013, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Kenneth E. Isman of the National Fire Sprinkler Association. The appeal requests that the 2014 edition of NFPA 25, <i>Standard for the Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance of Water-Based Fire Protection Systems</i> be issued with acceptance of three Certified Amending Motions (CAM) as follows: CAM 25-4 which sought to Accept an Identifiable Part of Proposal 25-47, CAM 25-5 which sought to Accept Comment 25-32 and CAM 25-7 which sought to Accept Comment 25-34. Specifically, the appeal seeks to add requirements to include a timeframe for the correction or repair of impairments, non-critical deficiencies and critical deficiencies.</p> <p>As background, the Technical Committee on Inspection Testing and Maintenance of Water-Based Systems (TC) rejected Proposals 25-47, 25-61 and 25-62 which sought to add a timeframe for the correction or repair of impairments, non-critical deficiencies and critical deficiencies. Comments 25-31, 25-32 and 25-34 which sought to accept the related Proposals with further modifications were submitted but were rejected by the TC. Subsequently, CAMs 25-4, 25-5 and 25-7 were made at the 2013 Association</p>

	<p>Technical Meeting. These amending motions passed on the floor but failed the subsequent balloting of the TC. This means, by operation of NFPA rules, that no change from the existing edition should occur and that the portion of the standard sought to be modified by the Association amendments is returned to previous edition text. See <i>Regulations Governing Committee Projects</i> at 4.7.1(c). In this case, since there was no corresponding previous edition text, the new requirements and associated annex material are deleted.</p> <p>The appeal requests that the Council overturn the results yielded by the standards development process. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the results of that process only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results yielded by the NFPA standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that the 2014 edition of NFPA 25 shall not contain requirements that include a timeframe for the correction or repair of impairments, non-critical deficiencies and critical deficiencies.</p> <p>Council Member James Golinveaux recused himself during the hearing, deliberation and vote on this issue.</p>
13-8-1-d-1	<p><b>DECISION/D# 13-19:</b> At its meeting of July 29 – July 31, 2013, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Kenneth E. Isman of the National Fire Sprinkler Association. The appeal requests that the 2014 edition of NFPA 25, <i>Standard for the Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance of Water-Based Fire Protection Systems</i>, be issued with the acceptance of Comment 25-44 (Certified Amending Motion [CAM] 25-9). Specifically, the appeal seeks to add a new section for additive injection systems to read as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>4.1.10 Additive Injection Systems.</b> The building owner shall be responsible for maintaining any additive injection systems including anti-microbial and corrosion inhibitor fluids.</p> <p>As background, the Technical Committee on the Inspection Testing and Maintenance of Water-Based Systems (TC) rejected Proposal 25-76, which sought to add a new section for additive injection systems. At the Comment stage, Comment 25-44 again sought acceptance of Proposal 25-76 but the TC rejected the Comment. At the 2013 Association Technical Meeting, an amending motion was made to Accept Comment 25-44 seeking the acceptance of Proposal 25-76 (CAM 25-9). This motion passed on the floor, but it failed the subsequent balloting of the TC. This means, by operation of NFPA rules, that no change from the existing edition should occur and that the portion</p>

	<p>of the standard sought to be modified by the Association amendment is returned to previous edition text. See <i>Regulations Governing Committee Projects</i> at 4.7(c). In this case, since there was no corresponding previous edition text, the proposed new section 4.1.10 is deleted.</p> <p>The appeal requests that the Council overturn the result yielded by the standards development process. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the results of that process only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results yielded by the NFPA standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that proposed section 4.1.10 will not be added to the 2014 edition of NFPA 25.</p> <p>Council Member James Golinveaux recused himself during the hearing, deliberation and vote on this issue.</p>
13-8-1-e-1	<p><b>DECISION/D#13-17:</b> At its meeting of July 29 – July 31, 2013, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Kenneth E. Isman of the National Fire Sprinkler Association. The appeal requests that the 2014 edition of NFPA 25, <i>Standard for the Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance of Water-Based Fire Protection Systems</i> be issued with revisions to Sections 8.3.1.1 and 8.3.1.2; and with the deletion of Section 8.3.2.1 and Annex A.8.3.1.1.</p> <p>As background, the Technical Committee on the Inspection Testing and Maintenance of Water-Based Systems (TC) Accepted in Principle Proposal 25-175 which modified the water recirculation requirements in testing fire pump assemblies in Section 8.3.2.1. Comment 25-99 sought to further revise the language in Section 8.3.2.1 and was rejected by the TC. The TC, however, did accept Comment 25-92 which added new Sections 8.3.1.1, A.8.3.1.1 and 8.3.1.2, including water recirculation requirements.</p> <p>At the 2013 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session), CAM 25-17 sought to Accept Comment 25-99. This amending motion passed on the floor but failed the subsequent balloting of the TC. This means, under NFPA rules, the recommendation that comes to Council is that no change from the existing edition should occur in Section 8.3.2.1 [see <i>Regs</i> 4.7.1(c)]. The appellant alleges that the combination of returning to previous edition text in 8.3.2.1 and accepting Comment 25-92 (thereby adding Sections 8.3.1.1, A.8.3.1.1 and 8.3.1.2) results in a conflict between these provisions.</p> <p>In order to ascertain the TC’s position on this potential conflict, an informational ballot was conducted. The committee was asked if the recommendations resulting from the</p>

	<p>standards development process resulted in conflicting text. The ballot results were inconclusive.</p> <p>The appeal requests that the Council overturn the action that was recommended by the standards development process. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results yielded by the NFPA standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that in the 2014 edition of NFPA 25, Section 8.3.2.1 will return to previous edition text, and Sections 8.3.1.1, A.8.3.1.1 and 8.3.1.2 will remain unchanged from the ROC text.</p> <p>If the appellant, TC or others wish to address the issues that have been raised in this appeal, they can do so in the regular revision process, or if the issues are believed to be of an emergency nature, a Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) can be submitted.</p> <p>Council Member James Golinveaux recused himself during the hearing, deliberation and vote on this issue.</p>
13-8-1-f	<p>Amendment No. 25-6 (CAM 25-19): Accept Comment 25-107. This amendment failed to pass the ballot of the Technical Committee. The resulting recommendation is to return the text related to the amendment to previous edition text. There were two comments received on this amendment that merely endorsed the action that was already proposed through the standards development process thus, no action that merits Council intervention is required. Accordingly the Council rejected the amendment and accepted the results yielded by the NFPA standards development process.</p> <p>Council Member James Golinveaux recused himself during the deliberation and vote on this issue.</p>
13-8-1-g	<p><b>DECISION/D#13-8:</b> At its meeting of July 29 – July 31, 2013, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Roland Huggins of the American Fire Sprinkler. The appeal requests that the 2014 edition of NFPA 25, <i>Standard for the Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance of Water-Based Fire Protection Systems</i> be issued with rejection of Comment 25-162. Specifically, the appellant seeks to delete new Chapter 16, <i>Special Requirements from Other NFPA Documents</i>.</p> <p>As background, Proposal 25-10 which sought to add new Chapter 16, <i>Board and Care Facilities with NFPA 13D Systems</i>, was submitted to the Technical Committee on Inspection Testing and Maintenance of Water-Based Systems (TC). The TC rejected Proposal 25-10 but during the Report on Comments (ROC) meeting, accepted</p>

	<p>Comment 25-162 which added a new Chapter 16 that is essentially an extract of NFPA 101<sup>®</sup>, <i>Life Safety Code</i><sup>®</sup>. Subsequently, a Notice of Intent to Make a Motion to reject Comment 25-162 was received and certified as an Amending Motion for the 2013 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). However, the CAM 25-29 was not pursued at the Tech Session. The making and debating of such motions is an important part of the standards development process. It allows the committees to reconsider their actions through the reballoting of successful Amending Motions, and the debate of the NFPA membership present provides an important addition to the record for Council review.</p> <p>On appeal, the Standards Council accords great respect and deference to the standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process, only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. Moreover, in circumstances such as these, where the appellants have failed to take advantage of all the steps available within the process, the Council is especially reluctant to consider overturning the results that have been yielded by that process. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in these appeals. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results yielded by the standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that new Chapter 16, <i>Special Requirements from Other NFPA Documents</i> will remain unchanged from the ROC text.</p> <p>Council Member James Golinveaux recused himself during the hearing, deliberation and vote on this issue.</p>
13-8-1-h	<p>It was voted to approve an editorial correction recommended by the Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance of Water-Based Systems Technical Committee to revise the text of NFPA 25, 8.3.4.3 to read as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>8.3.4.3</b> When provided, active fuel maintenance systems shall be listed for fire pump service. <del>and installed in accordance with NFPA 20 requirement for a new installation.</del></p> <p>This text change to 8.3.4.3 is necessary to achieve correlation and consistency between NFPA 25 and NFPA 20. The 2013 edition of NFPA 20 removed the new installation requirements from their Annual 2012 Report on Comments and therefore it is inappropriate for NFPA 25 to reference NFPA 20 in this case.</p> <p>Council Member James Golinveaux recused himself during the deliberation and vote on this issue.</p>
13-8-2	<p>It was voted to issue NFPA 58, <i>Liquefied Petroleum Gas Code</i>, with an issuance date of August 1, 2013 and an effective date of August 21, 2013, as acted on at the Association Meeting, with an amendment and appeal as indicated in Minute Items 13-8-2-a and 13-8-2-b-1 (D#13-9) and with other actions as indicated in Minute Items 13-8-14 and 13-8-15.</p>

13-8-2-a	Amendment No. 58-1 (CAM 58-2): Accept Proposal 58-73. This amendment passed the ballot of the Technical Committee and there were no appeals. The Council, therefore, voted to accept the amendment.
13-8-2-b-1	<p><b>DECISION/D#13-9:</b> At its meeting of July 29 – July 31, 2013, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Richard Fredenburg of North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. The appeal requests that the 2014 edition of NFPA 58, <i>Liquefied Petroleum Gas Code</i> be issued with acceptance of Comment 58-50. Specifically, the appeal seeks to add a new section 6.6.3.1(H) to read as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>6.6.3.1(H)</b> Containers shall be set upon a firm foundation or otherwise firmly secured.</p> <p>As background, the Technical Committee on Liquefied Petroleum Gas (TC) rejected Proposal 58-85 which sought to add a new Section 6.6.3.1(H). As result, Comment 58-50 which sought acceptance of Proposal 58-85 was submitted and rejected by the TC. Subsequently, Certified Amending Motion (CAM) 58-3 which sought to Accept Comment 58-50 was made at the 2013 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). This amending motion passed on the floor but failed the subsequent balloting of the TC. This means that, by operation of NFPA rules, the recommendation that comes to Council is that no change from the existing edition should occur, and the portion modified by the Association amendment is returned to previous edition text. See Regulations Governing Committee Projects (<i>Regs</i>) at 4.7.1(c). In this case, since there was no corresponding previous edition text, the new section 6.6.3.1(H) is deleted.</p> <p>The appeal requests that the Council overturn the result that was yielded by the standards development process. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the results of that process only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results yielded by the NFPA standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that the new section 6.6.3.1(H) will not be added to the 2014 edition of NFPA 58.</p>
13-8-3	It was voted to issue NFPA 70 <sup>®</sup> , <i>National Electrical Code</i> <sup>®</sup> , with an issuance date of August 1, 2013 and an effective date of August 21, 2013, as acted on at the Association Meeting, with amendments and appeals as indicated in Minute Items 13-8-3-a, 13-8-3-b (D#13-11), 13-8-3-c, 13-8-3-d (D#13-10), 13-8-3-e, 13-8-3-f, 13-8-3-g-1 thru 13-8-3-g-3 (D#13-13), 13-8-3-h, 13-8-3-i-1 thru 13-8-3-l-1 (D#13-12), 13-8-3-m (D#13-7), 13-8-3-n, 13-8-3-o (D#13-5), and with other actions as indicated in Minute Items 13-8-3-p, and 13-8-16. See related Minute Item 13-8-17-d (D#13-14).
13-8-3-a	Amendment No. 70-1 (CAMs 70-2 and 70-3): Related Motions to Reject Comments 2-33 and 2-34. This amendment failed to pass the ballot of the Technical Correlating

	<p>Committee. The resulting recommendation is to return the text related to the amendment to previous edition text. There were no appeals, accordingly the Council rejected the amendment and accepted the results yielded by the NFPA standards development process.</p>
13-8-3-b	<p><b>DECISION/D#13-11:</b> At its meeting of July 29 – July 31, 2013, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Marcelo Hirschler of GBH International. The appeal requests that the 2014 edition of NFPA 70<sup>®</sup>, <i>National Electrical Code</i><sup>®</sup> be issued with acceptance of Comment 3-21. Specifically, the appeal seeks to add a new Exception in Section 300.22(B) that reads as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Exception: Wiring that is specifically listed for use within an air-handling space (plenum) shall be permitted to be installed in air ducts, but only if the wiring is directly associated with the air distribution system and the total length of such wiring does not exceed 1.2 m (4 ft).</p> <p>The Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that the new Exception is not added.</p> <p>A full decision on this agenda items will be issued in due course, and will automatically be sent to all interested parties as soon as it becomes available.</p>
13-8-3-c	<p>Amendment No. 70-2 (CAMs 70-7, 70-8, 70-9 and 70-10): Related Motions to Reject Comments 6-4, 6-5, 6-6 and 6-7. This amendment failed to pass the ballot of the Code Making Panel. The resulting recommendation is to return the text related to the amendment to previous edition text. There were no appeals, accordingly the Council rejected the amendment and accepted the results yielded by the NFPA standards development process.</p>
13-8-3-d	<p><b>DECISION/D#13-10:</b> At its meeting of July 29 – August 1, 2013, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Travis Lindsey of Travis Lindsey Consulting Services Inc. The appeal requests that the 2014 edition of NFPA 70<sup>®</sup>, <i>National Electrical Code</i><sup>®</sup> (NEC) be issued with rejection of Comment 6-37. Specifically, the appeal seeks to delete the proposed new Exception that reads as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Exception: Type XHHW-2 insulated conductors shall not be subject to this ampacity adjustment.</p> <p>As background, Code-Making Panel 6 (CMP-6) rejected Proposal 6-41 to add a new Exception to Section 310.15(B)(3)(c). Subsequently, CMP-6 Accepted in Principle Comment 6-37 to add the new Exception to Section 310.15(B)(3)(c). Certified Amending Motion (CAM) 70-12 which sought to Reject Comment 6-37 was made at the 2013 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). This amending motion was not supported by the NFPA membership in attendance, and failed on the floor.</p> <p>The appeal requests that the Council overturn the action that was recommended by the</p>

	<p>codes and standards development process. This recommendation represents the consensus judgment of both the responsible Code-Making Panel and National Electrical Code Correlating Committee, a judgment that was also supported by votes of the NFPA membership. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results yielded by the NFPA standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that the new Exception added in Section 310.15(B)(3)(c) in the Panel Meeting Action of Comment 6-37 will not be deleted.</p>
13-8-3-e	<p>Amendment No. 70-3 (CAM 70-13): Accept Comment 7-14. This amendment failed to pass the ballot of the Code Making Panel. The resulting recommendation is to return the text related to the amendment to previous edition text. There were no appeals, accordingly the Council rejected the amendment and accepted the results yielded by the NFPA standards development process.</p>
13-8-3-f	<p>Amendment No. 70-4 (CAM 70-19): Accept Comment 11-28. This amendment failed to pass the ballot of the Code Making Panel. The resulting recommendation is to return the text related to the amendment to previous edition text. There were no appeals, accordingly the Council rejected the amendment and accepted the results yielded by the NFPA standards development process.</p>
13-8-3-g-1 thru 13-8-3-g-3	<p><b>DECISION/D#13-13:</b> At its meeting of July 29 – July 31, 2013, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Thomas Wysocki of Guardian Services, Inc. The appeal requests that the proposed 2014 edition of NFPA 70<sup>®</sup>, National Electrical Code<sup>®</sup> (NEC) be issued with the acceptance of Certified Amending Motion (CAM) 70-21, a Group Amending Motion to Accept Proposal 12-129 and Comment 12-60. The Council has voted to uphold the appeal of Mr. Wysocki to issue the NEC with the acceptance of CAM 70-21. The effect of the successful appeal is that two items are deleted. The following sentence from 645.5(E)(4) is deleted:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The ventilation system shall be so arranged, with approved smoke detection devices, that upon the detection of fire or products of combustion in the underfloor space, the circulation of air will cease.</p> <p>The following proposed Exception to Section 645.4(2) is also deleted:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Exception: Where information technology equipment is installed in a critical operations data system in compliance with 645.10(B), a procedure shall be permitted that controls the cessation of the air circulation within the room or zone.</p>



	<p>The Council also considered related appeals from Stanley Kaufman of CableSafe, Inc. and Stephen W. McCluer of Schneider Electric Information Technology. To the extent that these appeals oppose Wysocki's appeal or request alternative action, they are denied.</p> <p>Council Member Jim Pauley recused himself during the hearing, deliberation and vote on this issue.</p> <p>A full decision on this agenda items will be issued in due course, and will automatically be sent to all interested parties as soon as it becomes available.</p>
13-8-3-h	<p>Amendment No. 70-6 (CAM 70-22): Accept Comment 12-65. This amendment passed the ballot of the Technical Correlating Committee and the Code Making Panel and there were no appeals. The Council, therefore, voted to accept the amendment.</p>
13-8-3-i-1 thru 13-8-3-l-1	<p><b>DECISION/D#13-12:</b> At its meeting of July 29 – July 31, 2013, the Standards Council considered an appeal from James Conrad of RSCC Wire &amp; Cable LLC. The appeal requests that the 2014 edition of NFPA 70<sup>®</sup>, <i>National Electrical Code</i><sup>®</sup> (NEC) be issued with the withdrawal of the following: CAM 70-26 to accept Comment 13-54; CAM 70-27 to accept Comment 13-59; CAM 70-29 to accept Comment 13-76 and CAM 70-31 to accept Comment 13-101. Specifically, the appeal seeks to retain the changes approved by NEC Code Making Panel 13 during the Report on Comments stage in Sections 695.6, 695.14, 700.10 and 708.10 with respect to increasing the minimum required thickness of concrete encasement for the fire protection of wiring from 2 inches to 4 inches and other related modifications.</p> <p>The Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that the related text will return to previous edition text. Specifically, in Sections 695.6, 695.14, 700.10 and 708.10, the minimum required thickness of concrete encasement for the fire protection of wiring will remain at 2 inches and that the other related text will return to the previous edition text.</p> <p>Council Members James Golinveaux and James Milke recused themselves during the hearing, deliberation and vote on this issue.</p> <p>A full decision on this agenda items will be issued in due course, and will automatically be sent to all interested parties as soon as it becomes available.</p>
13-8-3-m	<p><b>DECISION/D#13-7:</b> At its meeting of July 29 – July 31, 2013, the Standards Council considered an appeal from David Wechsler representing the American Chemistry Council. The appeal is twofold, and requests 1) that the 2014 edition of NFPA 70<sup>®</sup>, <i>National Electrical Code</i><sup>®</sup> (NEC) be issued without proposed new Section 506.6 Material Groups, and 2) that NFPA499, <i>Recommended Practice for the Classification of Combustible Dusts and of Hazardous (Classified) Locations for Electrical Installations in Chemical Process Areas</i> be placed into a new cycle to address the establishment of Zone Material Dust Groups.</p>

	<p>The Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is to maintain the action of Code-Making Panel 14 to create new Section 506.6 as shown in Proposal 200-14a. Additionally, the Council declined at this time to place NFPA 499 into a new cycle to address the establishment of Zone Material Dust Groups.</p> <p>A full decision on this agenda items will be issued in due course, and will automatically be sent to all interested parties as soon as it becomes available.</p>
13-8-3-n	<p>Amendment No. 70-11 (CAM 70-37): Accept Proposal 15-62 as modified by Panel. This amendment passed the ballot of the Technical Correlating Committee and the Code Making Panel and there were no appeals. The Council, therefore, voted to accept the amendment.</p>
13-8-3-o	<p><b>DECISION/D#13-5:</b> At its meeting of July 29 – July 31, 2013, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Walt Vernon from Mazzetti Engineers. The appeal requests that the 2014 edition of NFPA 70<sup>®</sup>, <i>National Electrical Code</i><sup>®</sup> (NEC<sup>®</sup>) be issued with the rejection of Proposal 15-64. Specifically, the appeal seeks to delete a proposed new requirement in Section 517.30(E) which calls for certain receptacles to have a means to indicate power is being supplied to the receptacle. The proposed receptacle indicator requirement reads as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">....Non-locking-type, 125-volt, 15- and 20-ampere receptacles shall have an illuminated face or an indicator light to indicate that there is power to the receptacle.</p> <p>As background, Code-Making Panel 15 (NEC Panel 15) accepted Proposal 15-64. No related Public Comment was submitted, and Panel 15 did not change or revise its action on Proposal 15-64 during the Comment Stage. No Amending Motion seeking the rejection of Proposal 15-64 could, therefore, be pursued at the 2013 Association Technical Meeting. This means, under NFPA rules, that the recommendation that comes to the Council is to include the receptacle indicator requirement of Proposal 15-64 in the new edition of the NEC.</p> <p>The appeal requests that the Standards Council overturn the recommendation of the standards development process on the grounds that receptacle indicator requirement of Proposal 15-64 is a performance requirement for healthcare facilities, which is properly within the jurisdiction of NFPA 99, <i>Healthcare Facilities Code</i>, not the NEC.</p> <p>On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the results of that process only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. In this case, the Council has found such a basis in its authority to assign jurisdictional scopes among NFPA Committees so as to maximize coordination and avoid overlap and conflict among NFPA Standards. Accordingly the Council has voted to uphold the appeal and issue the new edition of the NEC without the receptacle indicator</p>

	<p>requirement of Proposal 15-64.</p> <p>The assignment of jurisdictional scopes among Committees is the direct responsibility of the Standards Council. See, generally, <i>Regulations Governing Committee Projects (Regs)</i> at Section 3.1. The Council is reluctant, even with jurisdictional scope issues, to reject the result arrived at during the revision process. In this case, however, the Council believes it is appropriate to act. The Council believes that the distinction between performance requirements belonging to NFPA 99 and installation requirements belonging to the NEC is reasonably clear, and that the receptacle indicator requirement is a performance requirement properly within the jurisdiction of NFPA 99. Moreover, the inter-committee coordination between the NEC and other technical committees, including the NFPA 99 Correlating Committee and Technical Committee on Electrical Systems, is an important issue, and the Council, in recent years, has worked to clarify the scopes and responsibilities of the relevant committees. See Standards Council Decision Number D#07-6 (Standards Council Agenda Item #07-7-5-1, July 27, 2007); Standards Council Minute Item SC #10-3-21, March 3, 2010; Standards Council Decision Number D#11-7 (Standards Council Agenda Items #11-8-6-a and #11-8-6-c, August 10, 2011). The Council believes it is important to clarify and implement the guidance expressed in those decisions.</p> <p>The Council recognizes that the NEC Committees have been diligent in its efforts to implement the Council’s decisions regarding jurisdiction. For healthcare-related requirements, the NEC Correlating Committee has set up an intercommittee coordination task group that has already successfully addressed correlation issues with collaboration and input from members of NFPA 99 Committees and from NEC Panel 15. It is regrettable that the situation in this case, through an oversight of the NFPA 99 Committees, was not adequately brought to the attention of the intercommittee task group or NEC Panel 15 so that resolution could have been achieved during the revision process. The Council stresses that the coordination and harmonization among NFPA standards, in accordance with the jurisdictional scopes assigned by the Council, is an important responsibility of NFPA Committees, and, in addition to participating on the intercommittee task group, the membership of the NFPA 99 Committees should, as appropriate, set forth their positions with respect to jurisdictional issues that arise within the NEC through the submission of Public Input and Public Comments on the NEC.</p>
13-8-3-p	<p>It was voted to approve an editorial correction recommended by the Correlating Committee of the National Electrical Code, to issue the 2014 edition of the <i>National Electrical Code</i><sup>®</sup> without Example D.14. This example was based on text that was proposed during the <i>NEC</i><sup>®</sup> <i>Report on Proposals</i>, but was deleted at the <i>NEC</i><sup>®</sup> <i>Report on Comments</i> stage. It does not reflect the requirements for the 2014 Code.</p>
13-8-4	<p>It was voted to issue NFPA 96, <i>Standard for Ventilation Control and Fire Protection of Commercial Cooking Operations</i>, with an issuance date of August 1, 2013 and an effective date of August 21, 2013, as acted on at the Association Meeting, with no appeals and with an amendment as indicated in Minute Item 13-8-4-a.</p>

13-8-4-a	Amendment No. 96-1 (CAM 96-3): Reject Comment 96-8. This amendment passed the ballot of the Technical Committee and there were no appeals. The Council, therefore, voted to accept the amendment.
13-8-5	It was voted to issue NFPA 130, <i>Standard for Fixed Guideway Transit and Passenger Rail Systems</i> , with an issuance date of August 1, 2013 and an effective date of August 21, 2013, as acted on at the Association Meeting, with an amendment and an appeal as indicated in Minute Items 13-8-5-a, 13-8-5-b and 13-8-19-d (D#13-15).
13-8-5-a	Amendment No. 130-1 (CAM 130-1): Return a portion of a Report in the form of an Identifiable Part of Proposal 130-115 and related Comment 130-1. This amendment passed the ballot of the Technical Committee and there were no appeals. The Council, therefore, voted to accept the amendment.
13-8-5-b	<p><b>DECISION/D#13-15:</b> At its meeting of July 29 – July 31, 2013, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Al Ramirez of Underwriters Laboratories LLC. The appeal requests that the Standards Council Reject an Identifiable Part of Comment 130-165 for the proposed 2014 edition of NFPA 130, <i>Standard for Fixed Guideway Transit and Passenger Rail Systems</i>. The Identifiable Parts are the revisions to Sections 12.5.1, 12.5.2, 12.5.3 and associated annex. Specifically, the appellant seeks to retain the title 12.5, Fire Resistive Cables from the Report on Comments (ROC) meetings, and return the remainder of Section 12.5 and associated annex to the Report on Proposals (ROP) text.</p> <p>As background, the Technical Committee on Fixed Guideway Transit and Passenger Rail Systems (NFPA 130 TC) Accepted in Principle Proposal 130-209 to create a new Chapter 12 to consolidate all wire and cable requirements throughout the standard. Comment 130-65 further modified new Section 12.5 and associated annex material.</p> <p>In June 2013, a Certified Amending Motion (CAM) 130-2 that sought to Reject an Identifiable Part of Comment 130-165 was made at the 2013 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). The motion failed. This means, by operation of NFPA rules, that the recommendation that comes to Council is that the changes made by the NFPA 130 TC during the revision process should stand, supplemented by any TIA issues concurrently with the new edition in accordance with the <i>Regulations Governing Committee Projects (Regs)</i> at Section 5.9.</p> <p>In addition to the activities within the regular revision cycle described above, the NFPA 130 TC also, following its October/November 2012 Report on Comments (ROC) meeting, processed a Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) No. 1080, which addressed the methods to meet the fire resistivity requirements. The TIA modified section 5.4.10, 6.3.3.2.10, 7.7.10 and associated annex material of the 2010 edition and modified section 12.5 associated annex of the proposed 2014 edition. The TIA passed the NFPA 130 TC on both technical merit and emergency nature. At its March 6-7, 2013 meeting, the Council voted to defer action on issuing the proposed TIA. The</p>

Council directed the NFPA 130 TC seek further input from the *National Electrical Code*<sup>®</sup> (NEC<sup>®</sup>) Correlating Committee and NEC Code-Making Panel 13 on whether the TIA, if issued, would cause any correlation issues with documents that report through the NEC Project. This input was provided to the Council for their review during their July 2013 meeting. Also provided for the Council review, were informational ballot results that showed the NFPA 130 TC was no longer in support of the issuance of proposed TIA 1080 for either the 2010 or 2014 editions. As no appeal supporting issuance of the TIA has been received, the TIA is considered withdrawn and will not be issued. Hence no action is necessary on the appeal of August Schaefer, as the action requested by the appellant is already recommended by NFPA standards development process.

As this appeal comes to the Council, therefore, it seek to have the Council reject the results of the regular revision cycle on the 2014 edition of NFPA 130. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results yielded by the standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that 2014 edition of NFPA 130 will be issued with the acceptance of Comment 130-65.

The denial of this appeal does not mean that consideration of the issue raised by the appeal should come to an end. The Council requests that the NFPA 502 Chair appoint and chair an intercommittee task group made up of members from the NFPA 130 TC, and include but not be limited to, members from the NEC Correlating Committee, NEC CMP-13 and from the technical committee responsible for NFPA 502, *Standard for Road Tunnels, Bridges, and Other Limited Access Highways*. As noted in a separate Decision (Standards Council Decision Number D#13-16; Standards Council Agenda Items SC#13-8-6-b and 13-8-20-d, July 2013), the issues concerning fire resistive cables in the occupancies covered by NFPA 130 also relate to the occupancies addressed in NFPA 502.

The task group should develop recommendations to appropriately coordinate and correlate the requirements for fire resistive cables. The Council recognizes that there may be considerations that are unique to the occupancies covered by NFPA 502 and NFPA 130, and the task group may take any such considerations into account as it studies the issues and makes recommendations. The Council further recognizes that fire resistive cables are a complicated issue and the technical information is still unfolding and will continue to evolve. The task group, therefore, is asked not only to correlate among the relevant NFPA standards, but also to review the still-unfolding

	<p>technical issues and take these developments into account. The Council believes that this intercommittee task group provides the best means going forward for addressing ongoing issues in a manner that achieves correlation and consistency. These task group recommendations may include, as appropriate, TIAs or suggested text to be processed through the normal revision process.</p> <p>Council Member Kerry Bell recused himself during the hearing, deliberation and vote on this issue.</p>
13-8-6	<p>It was voted to issue NFPA 502, <i>Standard for Road Tunnels, Bridges, and Other Limited Access Highways</i>, with an issuance date of August 1, 2013 and an effective date of August 21, 2013, as acted on at the Association Meeting, with an amendment and an appeal as indicated in Minute Items 13-8-6-a, 13-8-6-b and 13-8-20-d (D#13-16). See Related Minute Item 13-8-20</p>
13-8-6-a	<p>Amendment No. 502-1 (CAM 502-1): Return a portion of a Report in the form of Proposal 502-42 and related Comment 502-12. This amendment passed the ballot of the Technical Committee and there were no appeals. The Council, therefore, voted to accept the amendment.</p>
13-8-6-b	<p><b>DECISION/D#13-16:</b> At its meeting of July 29 – July 31, 2013, the Standards Council considered appeals from Alfredo Ramirez and August Schaefer, both of Underwriters Laboratories LLC.</p> <p>The first appeal (Standards Council Agenda Item 13-8-6-b) requests that the Standards Council Reject an Identifiable Part of Comment 502-27 for the proposed 2014 edition of NFPA 502, <i>Standard for Road Tunnels, Bridges, and Other Limited Access Highways</i>. The Identifiable Parts are the revisions to Section 12.1.2(1) and associated new annex material. Specifically, the appellant seeks to return Section 12.1.2(1) to Report on Proposals (ROP) text that reads the same as the previous edition, as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>12.1.2*</b> Emergency circuits installed in a road tunnel and ancillary areas shall remain functional for a period of not less than 1 hour for the anticipated fire condition, meeting one of the following methods:</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">(1) A fire-resistive cable listed for 2 hours in accordance with ANSI/UL 2196 or other equivalent internationally recognized standards to 950°C (1742°F) when approved by the AHJ.</p> <p><b>A12.1.2</b> The actual duration required for the circuits to be operative will depend upon the duration required for the circuits to be operative for the emergency evacuation and rescue phase – and, in some circumstances, incident management and structural protection. Factors such as the length of the tunnel, evacuation pathways, the use of fixed water-based fire suppression systems, and the proximity of emergency services may influence this period of time.</p>

The second appeal (Standards Council Agenda Item 13-8-20-d) requests the Council not to issue Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) No. 1083. Like the subject matter of the first appeal, TIA No. 1083 relates to Sections 12.1.2 and associated Annex 12.1.2 of the proposed 2014 edition NFPA 502. It also was proposed and balloted on Section 12.1.2(1) and associated annex of the existing 2011 edition of NFPA 502.

As background, the Technical Committee on Road Tunnel and Highway Fire Protection (NFPA 502 TC) Accepted in Principle Proposal 502-109. This resulted in a Committee Action that added two additional methods to meet the fire resistivity requirements of Section 12.1.2. Subsequently, the NFPA 502 TC further modified the text through the acceptance of Comment 502-27. Among other changes, this Comment modified the first of the four methods to meet the fire resistivity requirements of Section 12.1.2 and modified the associated annex text to specifically describe the testing protocol for the fire resistivity requirements of the first method.

In addition to the activities within the regular revision cycle described above, the NFPA 502 TC also, following its October 2012 Report on Comments (ROC) meeting, processed TIA No. 1083, which addressed the methods to meet the fire resistivity requirements. The TIA modified section 12.1.2(1) and associated annex of the 2011 edition and modified Section 12.1.2(1) through (4) and associated annex of the proposed 2014 edition. The TIA passed the NFPA 502 TC on both technical merit and emergency nature. At its March 6-7, 2013 meeting, the Council voted to defer action on issuing the proposed TIA. The Council directed the NFPA 502 TC seek further input from the *National Electrical Code*<sup>®</sup> (NEC<sup>®</sup>) Correlating Committee and NEC Code-Making Panel 13 (CMP-13) on whether the TIA, if issued, would cause any correlation issues with documents that report through the NEC Project. This input was provided to the Council for their review during their July 2013 meeting.

In June 2013, a Certified Amending Motion (CAM) 502-2 that sought to Reject an Identifiable Part of Comment 502-27 was made at the 2013 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). The motion failed. This means, by operation of NFPA rules, that the recommendation that comes to Council is that the changes made by the NFPA 502 TC during the revision process should stand, supplemented by any TIA issued concurrently with the new edition in accordance with the *Regulations Governing Committee Projects (Regs)* at Section 5.9.

The status of TIA 1083, however, was, having been deferred since March for further consideration, unclear. Particularly with respect to the 2014 edition of NFPA 502, it was uncertain whether the NFPA 502 TC supported the TIA No. 1083 or the alternate language concerning the fire resistivity requirements that were contained in Comment 502-27. A two-part informational ballot, therefore, was conducted to determine the NFPA 502 TC's position on the TIA, both as to the 2011 and 2014 editions of NFPA

502. The results showed that the NFPA 502 TC continued to support issuance of the TIA to the existing 2011 edition, but no longer supported the TIA for the 2014 edition, preferring instead the text that the NFPA 502 TC had developed during the regular revision cycle through Comment 502-27. Given the failure of the TIA on the 2014 edition to receive the support of the NFPA 502 TC and the lack of any appeal seeking its issuance, the Council considers that portion of the TIA to be withdrawn. As this appeal comes to the Council, therefore, the appellants seek to have the Council to reject the results of the TIA No. 1083 on the 2011 edition of NFPA 502 and to reject the results of the regular revision cycle on the 2014 edition of NFPA 502. The Council, after review of the entire record, has voted to deny both appeals.

On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the results of that process only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in the appeals. In the view of the Council, these appeals do not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results yielded by the NFPA standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeals. The effect of this action is that the 2014 edition of NFPA 502 will be issued with the acceptance of Comment 502-27, and TIA No. 1083 will be issued on the 2011 edition of NFPA 502.

The denial of the appeals does not mean that consideration of the issue raised should come to an end. The Council requests that the NFPA 502 Chair appoint and chair an intercommittee task group made up of members from the NFPA 502 TC, and include but not be limited to, members from the NEC Correlating Committee, NEC CMP-13 and from the technical committee responsible for NFPA 130, *Standard for Fixed Guideway Transit and Passenger Rail Systems*. As noted in a separate Decision (Standards Council Decision Number D#13-15; Standards Council Agenda Items #13-8-5-b and #13-8-19-d, July 2013), the issues concerning fire resistive cables in the occupancies covered by NFPA 502 also relate to the occupancies addressed in NFPA 130.

The task group should develop recommendations to appropriately coordinate and correlate the requirements for fire resistive cables. The Council recognizes that there may be considerations that are unique to the occupancies covered by NFPA 502 and NFPA 130, and the task group may take any such considerations into account as it studies the issues and makes recommendations. The Council further recognizes that fire resistive cables are a complicated issue and the technical information is still unfolding and will continue to evolve. The task group, therefore, is asked not only to correlate among the relevant NFPA standards, but also to review the still-unfolding technical issues and take these developments into account. The Council believes that this intercommittee task group provides the best means going forward for addressing



	<p>ongoing issues in a manner that achieves correlation and consistency. These task group recommendations may include, as appropriate, TIAs or suggested text to be processed through the normal revision process.</p> <p>Council Member Kerry Bell recused himself during the hearing, deliberation and vote on this issue.</p>
13-8-7	<p>It was voted to issue NFPA 801, <i>Standard for Fire Protection for Facilities Handling Radioactive Materials</i>, with an issuance date of August 1, 2013 and an effective date of August 21, 2013, as acted on at the Association Meeting, with no appeals and with an amendment as indicated in Minute Item 13-8-7-a.</p>
13-8-7-a	<p>Amendment No. 801-1 (CAM 801-1): Accept Comment 801-16. This amendment passed the ballot of the Technical Committee and there were no appeals. The Council, therefore, voted to accept the amendment.</p>
13-8-8	<p>It was voted to issue NFPA 1061, <i>Standard for Professional Qualifications for Public Safety Telecommunicator</i>, with an issuance date of August 1, 2013 and an effective date of August 21, 2013, as acted on at the Association Meeting, with no amendments and with an appeal as indicated in Minute Item 13-8-8-a (D#13-6).</p>
13-8-8-a	<p><b>DECISION/D#13-6:</b> At its meeting of July 29 – July 31, 2013, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Crystal McDuffie of the Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials International (APCO). The appeal requests that the 2014 edition of NFPA 1061, <i>Standard for Professional Qualifications for Public Safety Telecommunications Personnel</i> be returned to its original title, scope and content with the removal of all positions other than that of telecommunicator. Specifically, the appeal seeks to return the Standard to previous edition text; that is NFPA 1061, <i>Standard for Professional Qualifications for Public Safety Telecommunicator</i>, 2007 edition.</p> <p>As background, the Technical Committee on Public Safety Telecommunicator Professional Qualifications (TC) has included a voting APCO representative since April 2000, with brief breaks in service due to APCO personnel changes. A voting representative was on the TC during the recent revision cycle. During the Fall 2011 Report on Proposals (ROP) meeting, the TC accepted a comprehensive set of modifications that included a change in the title and scope of NFPA 1061 as well as the addition of professional qualifications for several new telecommunications personnel. The APCO representative did not return her ROP ballot.</p> <p>At the Fall 2011 Report on Comments (ROC) meeting, the TC further revised these changes based on the Public Comments received. The APCO representative voted affirmatively on all changes. After completion of the Fall 2011 ROC ballot, the TC requested a revision to its Committee scope to include communications positions (See Standards Council Minute Item 11-8-40, August 2011). During consideration of the Correlating Committee on Professional Qualifications (CC) ballot, APCO raised concerns regarding the scope of NFPA 1061. Even though these concerns were raised</p>

	<p>belatedly, the TC, with Council consent, slipped cycle for NFPA 1061 to the Fall 2012 cycle and issued a call for new Public Comments. At the same time the Council approved the requested scope change of the TC. Thereafter, during the second set of ROC meetings, APCO submitted Public Comments which sought to remove the new telecommunications positions, and return both the title and scope of NFPA 1061 to that of the 2007 edition. These Comments were rejected by the TC.</p> <p>At the 2013 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session), APCO made eighteen Certified Amending Motions (CAMs), but chose not to pursue CAMs 3 – 17. APCO did pursue three Certified Amending Motions: 1061-1 (to Accept Comment 1061-2 to return the title of the standard to “Public Safety Telecommunicator”), 1061-2 (Group Amending Motion to Accept Comments 1061-3 and 1061-4 to return the scope and purpose of NFPA 1061 to previous text) and 1061-18 (to Return the Entire Report.) All three motions failed on the floor. The result, therefore, arrived at by the NFPA standards development process is that the 2014 edition of NFPA 1061 should be issued as developed by the TC.</p> <p>The appeal seeks to reject the result yielded by the standards development process, and in effect not issue the 2014 edition of NFPA 1061 as developed by the TC, and instead leave the 2007 edition in place. The 2014 edition, however, was fully considered and approved by both the responsible TC and CC over the course of a revision cycle that was expressly extended in order to allow full consideration of APCO’s views. The work of the committees was, moreover, supported by NFPA membership, which rejected the motions made by APCO. On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through that process only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis on which to overturn the results yielded by the NFPA standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that the 2014 edition of NFPA 1061, <i>Standard for Professional Qualifications for Public Safety Telecommunications Personnel</i> will be issued as developed by the TC.</p> <p>While the Council has denied the appeal, the Council would like to acknowledge APCO’s collaboration and stated willingness to work with NFPA. The Council hopes and anticipates that mutual consultation and cooperation will continue going forward and that APCO will continue its involvement in the NFPA standards development process. In the Council’s view, this is the best way to continue to raise and seek to address any existing or potential scope issues that may emerge.</p>
13-8-9	Administratively Withdrawn from the Agenda
13-8-10	Administratively Withdrawn from the Agenda
13-8-11	The 2013 Revision Cycle Consent Documents were letter balloted by the Council with an issuance date of May 28, 2013 and an effective date of June 17, 2013 as shown

	<p>below: No action is necessary</p> <p>51B <i>Standard for Fire Prevention During Welding, Cutting, and Other Hot Work</i></p> <p>56 <i>Standard for Fire and Explosion Prevention During Cleaning and Purging of Flammable Gas Piping Systems</i></p> <p>77 <i>Recommended Practice on Static Electricity</i></p> <p>306 <i>Standard for the Control of Gas Hazards on Vessels</i></p> <p>403 <i>Standard for Aircraft Rescue and Fire-Fighting Services at Airports</i></p> <p>412 <i>Standard for Evaluating Aircraft Rescue and Fire-Fighting Foam Equipment</i></p> <p>610 <i>Guide for Emergency and Safety Operations at Motorsports Venues</i></p> <p>780 <i>Standard for the Installation of Lightning Protection Systems</i></p> <p>1002 <i>Standard for Fire Apparatus Driver/Operator Professional Qualifications</i></p> <p>1021 <i>Standard for Fire Officer Professional Qualifications</i></p> <p>1026 <i>Standard for Incident Management Personnel Professional Qualifications</i></p> <p>1031 <i>Standard for Professional Qualifications for Fire Inspector and Plan Examiner</i></p> <p>1033 <i>Standard for Professional Qualifications for Fire Investigator</i></p> <p>1143 <i>Standard for Wildland Fire Management</i></p> <p>The following 2014 Revision Cycle Consent Documents were letter balloted by the Council:</p> <p>1720 <i>Standard for the Organization and Deployment of Fire Suppression Operations, Emergency Medical Operations and Special Operations to the Public by Volunteer Fire Departments</i> with an issuance date of <b>June 28, 2013</b> and an effective date of <b>July 18, 2013</b></p> <p>790 <i>Standard for Competency of Third-Party Field Evaluation Bodies</i> with an issuance date of <b>July 5, 2013</b> and an effective date of <b>July 25, 2013</b></p> <p>791 <i>Recommended Practice and Procedures for Unlabeled Electrical Equipment Evaluation</i> with an issuance date of <b>July 5, 2013</b> and an effective date of <b>July 25, 2013</b></p> <p>1123 <i>Code for Fireworks Display</i> with an issuance date of <b>July 26, 2013</b> and an effective date of <b>August 15, 2013</b></p> <p>1851 <i>Standard on Selection, Care, and Maintenance of Protective Ensembles for Structural Fire Fighting and Proximity Fire Fighting</i> with an issuance date of <b>July 26, 2013</b> and an effective date of <b>August 15, 2013</b></p>
13-8-12	<p>The Council voted to issue a Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Section 9.3.3 of the 2010 edition of NFPA 37, <i>Standard for the Installation and Use of Stationary Combustion Engines and Gas Turbines</i> (TIA No. 1101). The TIA achieved the necessary support of the Technical Committee on technical merit and emergency</p>

	nature. No public comments were received and no appeals were filed.
13-8-13	The Council voted to issue a Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Section 6.6.3 of the 2010 and proposed 2014 editions of NFPA 37, <i>Standard for the Installation and Use of Stationary Combustion Engines and Gas Turbines</i> (TIA No. 1102). The TIA achieved the necessary support of the Technical Committee on technical merit and emergency nature. One public comment was received and no appeals were filed.
13-8-14	The Council voted to issue a Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Section 6.12.9 of the proposed 2014 edition of NFPA 58, <i>Liquefied Petroleum Gas Code</i> (TIA No. 1095). The TIA achieved the necessary support of the Technical Committee on technical merit and emergency nature. No public comments were received and no appeals were filed.
13-8-15	The Council voted to issue a Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to sections 11.1.1, A.11.1.1 and 11.15.2 of the 2014 edition of NFPA 58, <i>Liquefied Petroleum Gas Code</i> (TIA No. 1079). The TIA achieved the necessary support of the Technical Committee on technical merit and emergency nature. One public comment was received and no appeals were filed.
13-8-16	The Council voted to issue a Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Sections 516.3(A)(1)(a) and 516.10(A) of the proposed 2014 edition of NFPA 70, <i>National Electrical Code</i> ® (TIA No. 1096). The TIA achieved the necessary support of the Correlating Committee on correlation and emergency nature and the Code Making Panel on technical merit and emergency nature. No public comments were received and no appeals were filed.
13-8-17-d	<p><b>DECISION/D#13-14:</b> At its meeting of July 29 – July 31, 2013, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Joseph Harding of Portable Generator Manufacturers Association regarding issuance of proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) No. 1097 on the 2014 edition of NFPA 70®, <i>National Electrical Code</i>® (NEC®).</p> <p>Section 445.20 requires ground-fault circuit interrupter (GFCI) protection for certain portable generators. The TIA seeks an exception to these requirements for generators manufactured or remanufactured before January 1, 2015. The text of proposed TIA No. 1097 reads as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>445.20 Ground-Fault Circuit Interrupter Protection for Receptacles on 15 kW or Smaller, Portable Generators.</b> All 125-volt, single-phase, 15- and 20 ampere receptacle outlets; that are a part of a 15 kW or smaller, portable generator; either shall have ground-fault circuit interrupter protection for personnel integral to the generator or receptacle, or shall not be available for use when the 125/250 volt locking-type receptacle is in use. If the generator does not have a 125/250 volt locking-type receptacle <u>or was manufactured or remanufactured prior to January 1, 2015</u>, this requirement shall not apply.</p>

	<p>As background, the change proposed in TIA No. 1097 was balloted through NEC Code-Making Panel 13 and the NEC Correlating Committee in accordance with the <i>Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards</i> (Regulations), to determine if it had the necessary three-fourths majority support on merit and emergency nature to establish a recommendation for issuance. The TIA failed all ballots.</p> <p>On appeal, the Standards Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA standards development process. The Council will uphold the results yielded by that process absent a clear and substantial basis for doing otherwise. The Council has found no such basis here, and accordingly has voted to deny the issuance of the TIA. In addition, the Council has declined the appellant's request to issue a revised version of the TIA that he proposed to the Council as a way to address the concerns expressed in the ballot negative comments. This revised TIA has not been reviewed or balloted by the responsible committees, and the Council would rarely consider adopting language that had not received such review. The appellant indicates that he has recently submitted his revised TIA to the Council Secretary. Such a TIA should be processed in the usual manner in accordance with the Regulations.</p>
13-8-18	The Council voted to issue a Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Sections 10.2.3.6(5) and A.10.2.3.6(5) of the 2012 edition of NFPA 99, <i>Health Care Facilities Code</i> (TIA No. 1104). The TIA achieved the necessary support of the Correlating Committee on correlation and emergency nature and the Technical Committee on technical merit and emergency nature. Five public comments were received and no appeals were filed.
13-8-19-d	See Minute Item 13-8-5-b (D#13-15)
13-8-20	The Council voted to issue a Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Sections 12.1.2 and A.12.1.2 of the 2011 edition of NFPA 502, <i>Standard for Road Tunnels, Bridges, and Other Limited Access Highways</i> , (TIA No. 1083). The TIA achieved the necessary support of the Technical Committee on technical merit and emergency nature. Three public comments were received and one appeal was filed. See Minute Item 13-8-6-b (D#13-16).
13-8-20-d	See Minute Item 13-8-6-b (D#13-16)
13-8-21	The Council voted to issue a Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to various Sections of the 2013 edition of NFPA 1951, <i>Standard on Protective Ensembles for Technical Rescue Incidents</i> (TIA No. 1098). The TIA achieved the necessary support of the Technical Committee on technical merit and emergency nature. No public comments were received and no appeals were filed.
13-8-22	The Council voted to issue a Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Section 8.2.5(1) of the 2013 edition of NFPA 1951, <i>Standard on Protective Ensembles for Technical Rescue Incidents</i> (TIA No. 1099). The TIA achieved the necessary support of the Technical Committee on technical merit and emergency nature. No public comments were received and no appeals were filed.
13-8-23	The Council voted to issue a Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to various Sections

	of the 2013 edition of NFPA 1971, <i>Standard on Protective Ensembles for Structural Fire Fighting and Proximity Fire Fighting</i> (TIA No. 1100). The TIA achieved the necessary support of the Technical Committee on technical merit and emergency nature. No public comments were received and no appeals were filed.
13-8-24	The Council reviewed the proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Sections 4.1.11 and 4.1.12 of the 2013 edition of NFPA 1981, <i>Standard on Open-Circuit Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus (SCBA) for Emergency Services</i> (TIA No. 1111). The Council took no action on this proposed TIA at this time.
13-8-25	The Council reviewed the proposed Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to Sections 4.1.8 and 4.1.9 of the 2013 edition of NFPA 1982, <i>Standard on Personal Alert Safety Systems (PASS)</i> (TIA No. 1112). The Council took no action on this proposed TIA at this time.
13-8-26	The Council voted to issue a Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA) to various Sections of the 2012 edition of NFPA 2112, <i>Standard on Flame-Resistant Garments for Protection of Industrial Personnel Against Flash Fire</i> (TIA No. 1105). The TIA achieved the necessary support of the Technical Committee on technical merit and emergency nature. No public comments were received and no appeals were filed.
13-8-27	The Council reviewed an appeal of Gregory J. Cahanin, Fire Code Consulting. The appeal requests the Council to, in some fashion, "expunge" a certain NFPA 13 Task Group memorandum from the record and to direct the NFPA 13 Technical Committee and Chair to take certain actions with respect to the appointment and conduct of a new task group. After a review and consideration of the appeal and the record before it, the Council finds no basis to take any of the requested actions and accordingly has denied the appeal.
13-8-28	<p>At the March 2013 meeting, the Council reviewed the request of William Reilly of Victaulic that NFPA establish a new standard for the application of hybrid, gas, and fine water droplet systems. After review of all the material before it, the Council voted to publish a notice to solicit public comments on the need for the project, information on resources on the subject matter, those interested in participating, if established, and other organizations actively involved with the subject. The Council was specifically looking for manufacturers that are actively developing hybrid droplet systems and whether there are enough common installation practices and procedures available to support a standard, and the intended application for this technology. The Council was also seeking input on whether the subject matter could be covered by an existing technical committee or possibly through the creation of a new document.</p> <p>During the July Council meeting, after review of the entire record, the Council has voted not to approve the development of a document on hybrid, gas, and fire water droplet systems at this time. In making this decision, the Council notes that there is insufficient information to determine whether and in what manner this technology is appropriate for standards development. The Council notes that the Research Foundation is currently embarking on a research project that will result in more detailed information on this new system. Following the completion of this Research</p>

	Foundation project and/or the development of further data or information relevant to this technology, consideration may be given to submission of a renewed request for the Standards Council to consider this subject.																														
13-8-29	<p>Consider the request of Chief Kenneth Richards on behalf of the Technical Committee (TC) on Fire Service Training that NFPA establish a new standard for training structures, props, and equipment. At its October 2010 Council Meeting (Minute Item 10-10-12), the Committee had submitted a request to the Council asking for a new standard on training structures, props, and equipment. The Council suggested an option to the Committee to consider making the existing document, NFPA 1402, <i>Guide to Building Fire Service Training Centers</i>, a standard to make the material relating to the live training structures, props and equipment mandatory and placing all the advisory material in the Annex. At the March 2011 Council Meeting (Minute Item 11-3-27), the Committee reported back to the Council that they would address the issue at the next revision cycle of NFPA 1402.</p> <p>For this July Council Meeting, the TC resubmitted the request, noting that they considered making the document a standard and rejected that idea. After a review of the entire record, the Council voted to not proceed with the establishment of a new standard. In reviewing this new request the Council does not see any new information to change the original decision of the Council at their October 2010 meeting (Minute Item 12-8-52). In addition, the Council does not believe that addressing training buildings and props in two separate documents would benefit the users, and harmonization of the two documents could present duplication issues with both documents.</p>																														
13-8-30	Consider the request from Brian Montgomery, Chair of the Non-structural Fire Fighting SCBA Committee to approve a committee scope and a title change for the Committee. This Committee was approved by the Council at their October, 2012 meeting. After a review of all the material before it, the Council voted to defer action on this committee scope and title change and have requested the Committee revisit the wording of the scope for consistency and report back to the Council at its October 2013 meeting.																														
13-8-31	<p>The Council approved the requests from NFPA Committees to change revision cycles for the following documents:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Doc No.</th> <th>Current Edition</th> <th>Next Rev Cycle</th> <th>Cycle Change</th> <th>Permanent or One Time Move</th> <th>Revision Cycle For Each Document</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>2013</td> <td>F2015</td> <td>F2015 to F2016</td> <td>Permanent Move</td> <td>3 to 4 year cycle</td> </tr> <tr> <td>31</td> <td>2011</td> <td>F2014</td> <td>F2014 to F2015</td> <td>One Time Move</td> <td>4 to 5 year cycle</td> </tr> <tr> <td>37</td> <td>2010</td> <td>F2013</td> <td>F2017 to F2016</td> <td>Permanent Move</td> <td>4 to 3 year cycle</td> </tr> <tr> <td>96</td> <td>2014</td> <td>A2016</td> <td>A2016 to F2016</td> <td>One Time Move</td> <td>3 to 3 ½ year cycle</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Doc No.	Current Edition	Next Rev Cycle	Cycle Change	Permanent or One Time Move	Revision Cycle For Each Document	10	2013	F2015	F2015 to F2016	Permanent Move	3 to 4 year cycle	31	2011	F2014	F2014 to F2015	One Time Move	4 to 5 year cycle	37	2010	F2013	F2017 to F2016	Permanent Move	4 to 3 year cycle	96	2014	A2016	A2016 to F2016	One Time Move	3 to 3 ½ year cycle
Doc No.	Current Edition	Next Rev Cycle	Cycle Change	Permanent or One Time Move	Revision Cycle For Each Document																										
10	2013	F2015	F2015 to F2016	Permanent Move	3 to 4 year cycle																										
31	2011	F2014	F2014 to F2015	One Time Move	4 to 5 year cycle																										
37	2010	F2013	F2017 to F2016	Permanent Move	4 to 3 year cycle																										
96	2014	A2016	A2016 to F2016	One Time Move	3 to 3 ½ year cycle																										
13-8-32	The Council heard a report of the Membership Task Group.																														
13-8-32-a	The Council considered the Membership Task Group's recommendations on pending applications for committee membership and took appropriate action on each. Changes in committee membership approved by the Council can be found in Minutes Attachment 13-8-32-a.																														

13-8-32-b	The Council voted to approve the request of the Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting Technical Committee to establish a Guideline for Additional Clarification of Interest Classifications for NFPA Technical Committee Members.
13-8-32-c	<p><b>DECISION/D#13-20:</b> The Council considered the appeal of Edward Bonifas, Alarm Detection Systems, Inc., concerning the membership of the Technical Committee on Supervising Station Fire Alarm and Signaling Systems (the “Technical Committee” or “Committee”). Specifically, Mr. Bonifas has requested the Council to: remove the Chair of the Technical Committee, Warren Olsen; remove two members of the Committee, Larry Coveny and David Blanken; and reject the applicant, Steve Rauter for membership on the Committee. As grounds, Mr. Bonifas cites various reasons, including assertions that these individuals have a “conflict of interest” and have expressed views or taken positions that, he asserts, are “inconsistent with NFPA goals.”</p> <p>Having reviewed the appeal and all the information available to it, the Council has found no basis to take any action based on the grounds or allegations set forth in the appeal. Accordingly, the Council has denied the appeal and declines to remove Messrs. Olsen, Coveny, and Blanken from the Technical Committee. Similarly, the Council has found no basis in the appeal to deny committee membership to Mr. Rauter. For reasons unrelated to this appeal, the Council has “held” the application of Mr. Rauter. As explained below the decision to hold the application neither implies that the Council has credited any allegations in the appeal nor implies any negative conclusions concerning Mr. Rauter’s individual qualifications or integrity.</p> <p>Without attempting to respond to each and every allegation or assertion in the appeal, the Council makes the following general observations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To the extent that the appellant’s allegations of “conflicts of interest” imply that Technical Committee members may not have business or economic interests relating to the work of the Committee, the allegations misperceive the nature of NFPA’s standards development process. NFPA Technical Committees must include members with a variety of interests, including relevant business or economic interests. Indeed, it is a fundamental premise of ANSI-accredited voluntary consensus standards development that consensus bodies such as NFPA Technical Committees will include a balanced membership of relevant interests. As long as members are correctly categorized according to their interests and otherwise conduct themselves in accordance with NFPA rules and guidelines, the fact that they have a business or economic interest is no bar to prevent service on a Technical Committee.</li> <li>• It may well be that some Technical Committee members, including those challenged by Mr. Bonifas, hold strong views on issues that may be considered by the Committee. Whether such views are “inconsistent with NFPA goals” is not for</li> </ul>



the Council to decide. Rather, it is for the Technical Committee, after debate, discussion and review of the issues presented and the technical and other supporting information provided, to determine the content of NFPA standards in keeping with the their committee and document scopes as well as the safety mission of the NFPA. Mr. Bonifas, by participating in the process and presenting and providing support for his views and for his critiques of the positions with which he disagrees, will greatly assist the Technical Committee in evaluating the issues before them.

- Mr. Bonifas has submitted documentation concerning an ongoing lawsuit. It is not for the Council to assess the intricacies or merits of a lawsuit, and the Council has not attempted to do so. Suffice it to say that nothing in the papers Mr. Bonifas has submitted have persuaded the Council to take any of the actions that he requests.
- Some general reminders to Technical Committee members going forward. Committee members should disclose their relevant business or other interests, not merely to ensure their correct interest classification by the Council for committee balance purposes, but also to assist the Technical Committee in weighing and evaluating the members' positions and points of view. Participants, therefore, should try to inform the Committee of business or other interests, not already evident, that may be relevant to assessing their advocacy on particular issues before the committee, and should be responsive to reasonable inquiries about their relevant interests and associations. And as a further reminder, Committee Chairs, like other members of a Committee, may have business interests and are categorized for committee balance according to those interests. In the performance of their duties as Chair, however, the Chair should disclose all known or potential interests or other circumstances that could influence their impartiality on a particular matter and should not preside on that matter. If there is any question as to their ability serve as chair on any issue, or if a Chair wishes to assert a position during the discussion of that issue, he or she should relinquish the chair for purposes of that discussion, in accordance with Section 3.4 of the *Guide for the Conduct of Participants in the NFPA Standards Development Process*. This *Guide*, moreover, should be consulted by all Committee members and chairs for a fuller understanding of the guidance discussed here as well as for other guidelines relating to the conduct of standards development participants.
- The Council's role with respect the processing of the next edition of NFPA 72 does not end with this appeal. While the Council is generally reluctant to intervene in the standards development process prior to its completion, issues can be raised, as appropriate, through appeals to the Council at any time. See *Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards* at 1.6.1. More importantly, the Council generally considers properly filed appeals at the end of the process when a new or revised standard is presented to it for issuance. If Mr. Bonifas is not

	<p>satisfied with the outcome of the process, and believes he has grounds to complain, he may appeal at that time. Of course, in order to ensure that any appeal receives full consideration, he should submit relevant Public Comments and he should notice and present appropriate Amending Motions at the Technical Meeting at which the standard is presented to the NFPA membership.</p> <p>Finally, returning to the application of Mr. Rauter, the Council emphasizes that its action to hold the application is not based on this appeal and bears no negative implications concerning Mr. Rauter. The Council has broad discretion in determining the appropriate makeup and membership of NFPA Technical Committees. The Council's exercise of this discretion requires a balancing of many factors, including the size and balance of the Technical Committee as a whole as well as other factors unrelated to the personal or professional qualifications of any individual member or applicant. The Council's membership decisions, therefore, should not be viewed as individual assessments of the many fine members and applicants that it must review each year.</p> <p>Council Member James Golinveaux recused himself during the deliberation and vote on this issue.</p>
13-8-33	The Council heard a Report of the Policy and Procedures Task Group.
13-8-34	The Council heard a report from the Recording Secretary on the status of the March 2013 Minutes which were approved with two editorial corrections.
13-3-35	<p>The Council approved the dates and locations of upcoming Council Meetings, as follows:</p> <p>October 22-23, 2013 (REVISED) San Diego, CA</p> <p>March 3-4, 2014 San Juan, Puerto Rico</p> <p>August 11-14, 2014 Quincy, MA</p> <p>October 28-29, 2014 TBD</p>
13-8-36	The Council reviewed the request of Barry Badders, Chair of the Fire Test Committee that NFPA consider the establishment of a new test method to evaluate fire/ignition resistance of upholstered furniture subject to a flaming ignition source. After review of all the material before it, the Council voted to publish a notice to solicit public comments on the need for the project, information on resources on the subject matter, those interested in participating, if established, and other organizations actively involved with the subject.

13-8-37	<p>The Council approved the request of the Confined Space Safe Work Practices Committee to enter a new document NFPA 350, <i>Guide for Safe Confined Space Entry and Work</i> into the Fall 2015 revision cycle. The Council approved the establishment of this proposed document at the March 2007 Council Meeting.</p> <p><b>Approved Document Scope:</b> This guide is intended to protect workers who enter into confined spaces for inspection or testing or to perform associated work from death and from life-threatening and other injuries or illnesses and to protect facilities, equipment, non-confined space personnel, and the public from injuries associated with confined space incidents.</p>
13-8-38	<p>The Council directed NFPA Staff to revise the schedule for the 2016 edition of the National Electrical Code®.</p>

Respectfully submitted,



Linda J. Fuller  
Recording Secretary  
NFPA Standards Council