



National Fire Protection Association

1 Batterymarch Park, Quincy, MA 02169-7471
Phone: 617-770-3000 • Fax: 617-770-0700 • www.nfpa.org

MEMORANDUM

To: NFPA Technical Committee on Inspection, Testing and Maintenance of Water-Based Systems

From: Elena Carroll, Administrator, Technical Projects

Date: March 30, 2012

Subject: NFPA 25 ROP TC FINAL Ballot Results (A2013 Cycle)

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

33 Members Eligible to Vote
0 Not Returned
15 Affirmative on All
18 Negatives on one or more proposal: (Adams, Drysdale, Elvove, Fantauzzi, Feld, Field, Fleming, Fuller, Larrimer, Leavitt, Myers, Ray, Saidi, Sheppard, Underwood, Victor, Whitney, and Osburn)
1 Abstentions on one or more proposal: (Elvove)

The attached report shows the number of affirmative, negative, and abstaining votes as well as the explanation of the vote for each proposal.

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

- (1) Example for Simple Majority: Assuming there are 20 vote eligible committee members, 11 affirmative votes are required to pass ballot. (Sample calculation: $20 \text{ members eligible to vote} \div 2 = 10 + 1 = 11$)
- (2) Example for Affirmative $\frac{2}{3}$: Assuming there are 20 vote eligible committee members and 1 member did not return their ballot and 2 members abstained, the number of affirmative votes required would be 12. (Sample calculation: $20 \text{ members eligible to vote} - 1 \text{ not returned} - 2 \text{ abstentions} = 17 \times 0.66 = 11.22 = 12$)

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

Document # 25

25-1 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Entire Document (Log # 1)

25-2 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Entire Document (Log # CP1)

25-3 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Entire Document (Log # 242)

Affirmative with Comment

Larrimer, P. I disagree with the committee statement on the appropriateness of using the inspectors test connection to perform a valve status test. In many cases, the main drain will only be 1/4 inch larger than the ITC valve (3/4 inch vs. 1/2 inch) and there is no "sufficient amount" of water that needs to be flowed to conduct this test. The committee proposal (25-244) does allow the use of the ITC as indicated in the new annex material for that proposal.

25-4 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Entire Document (Log # CP8)

25-5 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Entire Document (Log # CP11)

25-6 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Entire Document (Log # CP18)

Negative

Fantauzzi, J. I have some reservation about the use of "equivalent component". Equivalent should be replace with reconditioned since it is allowed by NFPA 13 for new systems.

25-7 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 27 Negative: 6 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

1.1 (Log # CP13)

Negative

Drysdale, M. The existing scope statement should be retained and Sections 4.1.5 and 4.1.6 should be removed. This document should focus on the physical inspection, testing and maintenance of systems.

Elvoe, J. I don't agree that the scope of NFPA 25 should extend beyond the requirements of inspection, testing and maintenance, however, since the majority of the committee continues to reject proposals to remove existing non-ITM language such as sections 4.1.5 and 4.1.6, which pertain to changes in occupancy, use, processes, materials, hazards or water supplies, it's becoming fruitless to object. But if 4.1.5 and 4.1.6 are to remain, the document scope needs to go further and specifically include language stating that the intent of the document is to assure that water based fire protection systems will perform as intended (i.e., as designed and installed); without this language and without additional revisions that continually get rejected, there's no guarantee a water based fire protection system will either extinguish or control a fire and thus there's really no point in using this standard. A few additional comments. The revised text contained in this proposal does not delineate what changes were made actually made to paragraph 1.1 (i.e., it wasn't written in legislative text so the public can clearly see both new and deleted text). In addition, the substantiation does not state why text addressing "land based and marine applications" was purposely deleted. But more importantly, the committee's substantiation stating: "are not part of typical inspection, testing and maintenance activities" is NOT why a task group of the committee rewrote the document scope. The reason for adding the new text to the document scope was only to give provide scope language that gives reason for keeping the language contained in 4.1.5 and 4.1.6 within the document and not to delineate what is or isn't part of a typical ITM activities.

Larrimer, P. I disagree with the change to the scope of the document. The new scope item "actions to undertake when changes in occupancy, use, process, materials, hazard, or water supply that potentially impact the performance of the water based system are planned or identified" is outside the scope of this document. Those actions are covered in other documents such as the building code or fire code. Considering that NFPA 25 does not establish any criteria that the ITM inspector is to follow to determine when there are changes in occupancy, use, process, materials etc. etc., there is no reason to add a scope item to address actions to undertake when these changes are found. Nobody goes to "NFPA 25 Inspection Testing and Maintenance of Water Based Systems" to determine what is necessary when they make a change such as an occupancy or use change. The permitting process should take them to the appropriate codes and standards to address the appropriate design of the modified system including the design of the water based systems. Nobody is going to a maintenance document like NFPA 25 to determine design criteria.

Saidi, J. A simpler way of dealing with the Standards Council is to revise sections 4.1.5 and 4.1.6 to eliminate the non-ITM language, rather than expand the scope of this standard.

Sheppard, J. Existing scope statement should be retained, and Sections 4.1.5 and 4.1.6 should be removed. From the beginning of this document, it was never about design, occupancy issues; only the physical inspection, testing and maintenance of systems. To have expanded this document is unnecessary.

Underwood, D. The standard was never meant to require an engineering evaluation to find out how the building is being used now.

25-8 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 30 Negative: 3 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

1.1.3.1 and A.1.1.3.1 (Log # 252)

Negative

Elvoe, J. Given the action taken by the committee in CP13 and the continued presence of language contained in 4.1.5 and 4.1.6, the standard DOES include actions to undertake to verify whether existing conditions have the potential to impact system design or performance. Therefore, the existing text in 1.1.3.1 should be deleted and the revisions that were proposed for the annex should be accepted. Current language mandates that the standard not require the "inspector" to verify the adequacy of the design, yet an "inspector" can do this if so desired. The document scope should not be defining roles and responsibilities (i.e., assigning what an "inspector" should or should not do); to my knowledge, no other NFPA standard does this. Instead, the document should establish qualifications for doing any or all of the ITM activities, including evaluations associated with NFPA 25 and the scope of actual work should be left to the owner or owner's representative to decide.

Document # 25

Larrimer, P. NFPA 25 should not identify who is responsible for what. To write that the inspector is not required to do something that is outside the scope of the document doesn't make much sense to me. It should merely say that "This standard does not require the adequacy of the design to be verified." Nothing in this standard requires anyone to verify the adequacy of a design. Chapter four only requires the owner to address adequacy when there are changes, but the inspector who is doing the inspection is not required to identify the changes. So when would the owner or anyone else for that matter, use this document to determine adequacy of the design?

Saidi, J. As previously stated, NFPA 25 should be the standard for inspection, testing and maintenance of the water based systems without getting into the minefield of evaluating design and verifying consistency with occupancy.

25-9 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

1.1.4 (Log # 35)

Affirmative with Comment

Sheppard, J. Accept submitter's proposal; see comments on 25-42.

Underwood, D. See comments on 25-42.

25-10 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

1.1.5 and Chapter 16 (New) (Log # 274)

Negative

Osburn, M. I agree with the proponent that the inspection, testing and maintenance guidelines for NFPA 13D Systems installed in a Board and Care Facility should be located in NFPA 25.

Ray, R. This proposal should have been accepted as submitted. Though it is clear that NFPA 25 does not apply to NFPA 13D systems installed in (typical) 1 and 2 family dwellings, the nature of the occupants of Board & Care facilities may render them incapable of reacting to a fire in the same way that the occupants of a typical 1 and 2 family home would.

25-11 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 28 Negative: 5 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

1.2.1 and A.1.2.1 (Log # 326)

Negative

Drysdale, M. This standard provides minimum inspection, test and maintenance requirements.

Document # 25

Elvoe, J. This proposal should have been accepted for a number of reasons. First, the scope and purpose of the document IS to establish minimum requirements; that's how other NFPA codes and standards are written. Second, "a reasonable degree..." is unenforceable language. Third, no where in the standard is there language outside of this section that addresses "life safety" (pay attention to paragraph 4.1.6.2 which used to address life safety, but text related to life safety was deleted last cycle; as such, 4.1.6.2 only addresses protection of the building and contents). Therefore, the revised text proposed for 1.2.1 should incorporated as the new purpose statement. Regarding changes proposed to the annex (A.1.2), first, enforcement has nothing to do with reliability. Due diligence by building owners to maintain their systems, regardless of any mandate is sufficient means to ensure their systems will perform as designed and installed. Therefore, the first sentence should be revised as proposed. Second, annex material for the purpose statement now needs to align itself with the revised scope and thus include language related to system performance. Hence, the committee statement making reference to sections 4.1.5 and 4.1.6 is no longer appropriate. Though that means the new text proposing "nor are the requirements written to address the performance of a system" should not be incorporated into the annex, existing language within the annex that only addresses the "inspector" making good judgments should be stricken, since similar judgments should also be made to those who perform evaluations in accordance with 4.1.5 and 4.1.6. Finally, the proponent adds language that most committee members crave, absolving the "inspector" from having to note any design issues. One would think such language would be welcome.

Larrimer, P. ITM per NFPA 25 does not ensure a reasonable degree of protection as it does not address adequacy of the design. Section 4.1.5 and 4.1.6 are not part of the inspection process and does not come into play unless there are changes that are identified, yet NFPA 25 does not have criteria where anyone would identify them.

The change should be accepted since some people actually think that after an inspection per NFPA 25, they are getting assurance that their system will protect a hazard when that assurance is not part of the scope of this document.

How can the committee state that a "reasonable degree of protection" should be provided when a visit by a contractor to a property where ITM has be accomplished in compliance with the requirements of NFPA 25 could leave the owner with a rack storage system protected by a light hazard sprinkler system.

Saidi, J. The proposal had merit and should have accepted by the committee. Basically the current language leaves the owner with unrealistic expectations from this standard based on the current scope, format, qualifications, etc.

Sheppard, J. Agree with submitter's substantiation.

25-12 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

1.2.2 (Log # 108)

Negative

Leavitt, R. The existing language "distinct hazard to life or property" is unclear. I believe the submitter is correct in aligning the language with that used in other standards such as NFPA 13 regarding retroactivity.

25-13 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Chapter 3 Definitions (Log # 2)

25-14 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

3.3.x Automatic Transfer Switch (New) (Log # 112)

Affirmative with Comment

Bell, K. I understand this will noted as Extract text.

Document # 25

25-15 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**3.3.x Hydrostatic Test (New)** (Log # 114)

Affirmative with Comment**Bell, K.** See my Comment on Affirmative on Proposal 25-14 (Log #112).

25-16 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**3.3.x Recommendation and A.3.3.x (New)** (Log # 33)

25-17 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**3.3.x Waterflor Alarm Device (New)** (Log # 113)

Affirmative with Comment**Bell, K.** See my Comment on Affirmative on Proposal 25-14 (Log #112).**Elvove, J.** The committee substantiation should recognize the incorrect reference to NFPA 13. It should be NFPA 13, 2010, 3.5.1.3.

25-18 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**3.3.1 Alarm Receiving Facility, 3.3.x Supervising Station (New), 5.1.5, 6.1.8, 8.1.11, 9.1.5, 10.3.2.1, 11.1.7, and 12.x (New)** (Log #

25-19 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 28 Negative: 5 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**3.3.4 Deficiency and A.3.3.4** (Log # 253)

Negative**Fleming, R.** The definitions of "critical deficiency" and "noncritical deficiency" should be retained within the standard. The distinction between these states is an important and can be used by the AHJ to establish different allowed times for correction. These terms have already been codified in places like New York City, where they result in systems being "orange tagged" vs. "yellow tagged." The fire department, if called upon to respond to a system, can recognize that a yellow tagged system can be supported in the normal manner, while the orange tagged systems may require special attention, such as the need to take special measures to avoid water hammer effects.**Leavitt, R.** The current language is needed for use in jurisdictions where system tagging or rating is in effect. Deficiencies are NOT all created equal and the current definitions are needed. In addition, not all the inspections apply to components of a system such as signs and have no "adverse" impact on the operation of a system.**Myers, T.** It is obvious from committee discussion and working with state of Florida tagging fire sprinkler systems law that there needs to be better understanding of how to characterize deficiencies. To eliminate the distinction between critical and non-critical will only increase confusion.**Ray, R.** This proposal should have been rejected. The distinction between critical and noncritical deficiencies is essential in aiding AHJ's in making determinations on the urgency of needed actions & the time frames for repairs to address the deficiency at hand. This would help building owners when an over zealous AHJ wants to "red tag" a building because of a missing escutcheon (for example).

Document # 25

Victor, T. The terms "critical deficiency" and "non-critical deficiency" introduced in the 2011 edition are relevant and necessary as the document moves toward differentiating between different types of findings from an inspection or test. Many states have adopted tagging requirements and are establishing prescribed periods of times to take the necessary corrective action when a deficiency or impairment is found. To only have one broad term "deficiency" doesn't allow the user to differentiate between a missing sign and a non-functioning water flow switch. Annex E is in the document and uses both of these terms in the text as well as in the table. Per NFPA guidelines a term does not need to be used in the body of a standard to be included as a definition. A task group has been established to further study the classification of findings in Annex E and to clarify them where needed. Without having these terms defined and able to be used in this effort will lead to more confusion about the severity of deficiencies.

25-20 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
3.3.4.2 Noncritical Deficiency (Log # 311)

25-21 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
3.3.11 Foam Discharge Device and A.3.3.11 (New) (Log # 57)

25-22 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 29 Negative: 4 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
3.3.17.1 Emergency Impairment (Log # 36)

Negative

Elvove, J. The existing definition already addresses a condition that might be noted while performing ITM activities. This change could potentially lead to unintended consequences and as thus such, should not be accepted.

Larrimer, P. Just because an impairment is found during routine ITM activities doesn't make it an emergency impairment as is now the case the way this is written. The added language "or the impairment is found while performing inspection testing or maintenance activities" should be deleted.

Sheppard, J. Existing text is sufficient.

Underwood, D. Existing text is correct.

25-23 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
3.3.19 Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance Service and A.3.3.19 (New) (Log # 58)

25-24 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
3.3.29 Reduced-Pressure Principle Backflow Prevention Assembly (RPBA) (Log # 307)

Affirmative with Comment

Elvove, J. By combining two sentences, the new definition is awkward and possibly ambiguous. Suggest this be revised during ROC

Document # 25

25-25 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
3.3.29 Reduced-Pressure Principle Backflow Prevention Assembly (RPBA) and A.3.3.29 (New) (Log # 59)

25-26 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
3.3.30.x Concealed Sprinkler, Flush Sprinkler, Sidewall Sprinkler, Institutional Sprinkler, Intermediate Level Sprinkler/Rack

25-27 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
3.3.30.x Installation Orientation (New) (Log # 37)

25-28 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
3.3.30.1 Automatic Sprinkler, 3.3.30.8 Open Sprinkler, and A.3.3.30.x (New) (Log # 14)

25-29 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
3.3.31.5 Semiautomatic Dry Standpipe System (New) (Log # 109)

25-30 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
3.3.34.1 Supervisory Alarm Device (New) (Log # 111)

25-31 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
3.3.35.1 Performance-Based Testing (New) (Log # 147)

25-32 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
3.5.6 Pressure Relief Valve (New) (Log # 115)

Affirmative with Comment
Bell, K. See my Comment on Affirmative on Proposal 25-14 (Log #112).

25-33 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
3.5.6.1 Circulation Relief Valve (New) (Log # 116)

Affirmative with Comment
Bell, K. See my Comment on Affirmative on Proposal 25-14 (Log #112).

25-34 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
3.6 Water Mist System (New) (Log # 70)

Negative
Elvoe, J. Concur with Mr. Leavitt. Can't introduce the four sub-definitions since they are used in the standard.

Document # 25

Leavitt, R. The names of the various types of water-mist systems are not included in the standard. The committee has stated on other rejections regarding definitions that if the term(s) is not used in the standard, it is not appropriate to include a definition.

25-35 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

3.6.4.x Marine System (New) (Log # 117)

Affirmative with Comment

Bell, K. See my Comment on Affirmative on Proposal 25-14 (Log #112).

25-36 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

3.6.4 Sprinkler System (Log # 263)

Affirmative with Comment

Larrimer, P. We should be careful as to how the new definition of a sprinkler system will affect the ITM requirements in NFPA 25 for "systems". The committee accepted a new definition from NFPA 13 that was not yet published.

25-37 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

3.6.4.1.1 Premixed Antifreeze Solution (Log # 19)

25-38 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

3.6.4.1.1 Premixed Antifreeze Solution (New), 5.3.4, and A.5.3.4 (Log # 22)

Affirmative with Comment

Bell, K. The TC needs to review and carefully consider these requirements in light of the recent FPRF research report on antifreeze solutions discharged from standard spray sprinklers.

Fantauzzi, J. This proposal will need further review after the FPRF report on the testing of antifreeze solutions with spray sprinklers is released and correlated with NFPA 13 committee.

25-39 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

3.6.5 Water Mist System (New) (Log # 118)

25-40 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

3.6.5.1 Ultra High-Speed Water Spray System (New) (Log # 119)

Affirmative with Comment

Bell, K. See my Comment on Affirmative on Proposal 25-14 (Log #112).

25-41 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

3.6.7 Water Mist System (New) (Log # 331)

25-42 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 27 Negative: 6 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

4.1.x through 4.1.x.4, and A.4.1.x, A.4.1.x.2, and A.4.x.4 (New) (Log # 154)

Negative

Drysdale, M. Requiring that the design information be available is consistent with NFPA 13 and is reasonable. It should be acceptable to have the information on a hydraulic design information sign on the riser or in available design documents. Over time, information signs can become illegible or lost. The current systems for maintaining electronic data make that option equally secure.

Elvove, J. The proposed new text for A.4.1.X states that when original system installation records are not available, “the owner needs to obtain this information or have the system evaluated for the purposes of providing the information required on the sign.” Though this is annex material, if this language were to be enforced, it places a tremendous cost upon an owner to have his/her system re-evaluated when an “inspector” simply notices a missing sign. Moreover, there’s no requirement for the “inspector” to evaluate whether the information on the sign is correct so it’s possible that a system without a sign is more reliable than a system with a sign with incorrect information, yet only the former would potentially facilitate a system evaluation. No justification has been provided to substantiate this retroactive requirement. Also for what it’s worth, the name given for the sample sign shown in the annex is inconsistent with the title of this section as it omits “Design.”

Larrimer, P. The scope of NFPA 25 does not address the adequacy of the design of a system. The information on this sign is focused on the design of the system. Requiring a costly hydraulic evaluation to be performed to provide design information on a sign that is not used for any of the ITM activities that are required by NFPA 25 is absolutely ridiculous.

In addition, when the new definition of a “system” is incorporated (see 25-36), this will likely require multiple signs.

See also the committee statement on 25-102 which reads as follows: The intent of NFPA 25 is to address wear and tear and not design/installation issues.

Saidi, J. Owner's cost burden for obtaining this information or have the system evaluated for the purposes of providing the information required on the sign when original system installation records are not available, is unsubstantiated and should be removed.

Sheppard, J. In this digital age, signs mean less when the data is kept elsewhere on the site in record form. AHJ had original data on file at the time of installation. Waste of time and energy, and costs to keep up with this sign requirement throughout the premissis.

Underwood, D. This is a digital world. Sign get destroyed and illegible.

25-43 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

4.1.1.1, 4.1.1.1.1, and A.4.1.1.1.1 (Log # 149)

25-44 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

4.1.1.1, 4.1.2.1, and 4.1.2.2 (New) (Log # 95)

Negative

Sheppard, J. 4.1.2 should refer to bldg. temperature, not water. 4.1.2.1 refers to bldg. temperature, not water. Proponent's substantiation refers to building temperature, not water. Paragraphs should be in sync.

Underwood, D. 4.1.2 should refer to bldg. temp. not water 4.1.2.1 should refer to water not bldg. lets try to be consistent.

Document # 25

25-45 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

4.1.1.1.1 (Log # 99)

25-46 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

4.1.1.1.1 (Log # 148)

25-47 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

4.1.1.1.2, 4.1.4.1, and A.4.1.4.1.1 (New) (Log # 34)

25-48 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

4.1.1.2 (Log # 73)

25-49 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

4.1.1.2 (Log # 150)

Negative

Elvove, J. By adding the term “qualified” in paragraph 4.1.1.2, there should have been multiple companion proposals to remove the term “qualified” everywhere else it appears in the standard. In addition, text should have been proposed to delineate where “qualifications” as outlined by 4.1.1.2 weren’t necessarily meant to apply. This is a “one-size-fits-all” approach that bolsters all ITM requirements needlessly and without any justification (and has unintended consequences). It muddies how the term has traditionally been applied in the standard in the past (e.g., why qualified personnel were specifically singled out to perform tasks outlined in 4.1.4.2, 4.5.4, 5.3.3.4, 8.3.2.7, 8.3.3.1, 8.3.5.2, 9.5.2.1, 14.3.3, A3.3.17, A.4.1.5, A.10.2.4, A15.5 and C.3.1, and as proposed in 13.6.3.1 per ROP 25-276 and in A15.7 per ROP 25-342) and may now eliminate owners from being permitted to conduct simple tasks such as weekly inspection of gages, water or fuel tank conditions, and valves that traditionally have been done quite adequately by in house staff in the past.

25-50 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

4.1.1.2 (New) (Log # CP17)

25-51 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

4.1.1.2.1 (New) (Log # 96)

25-52 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

4.1.1.3 (Log # 151)

25-53 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

4.1.1.3 (New) (Log # 315)

25-54 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

4.1.1.4 (Log # 152)

Document # 25

25-55 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.1.3** (Log # 10)

25-56 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.1.3** (Log # 316)

Affirmative with Comment**Sheppard, J.** Committee Statement: "proponent", not "proposer".**Underwood, D.** Proponent not proposer.

25-57 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.1.3** (Log # CP2)

25-58 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.1.3.2** (Log # 129)

25-59 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.1.3.2** (Log # 317)

25-60 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.1.4.1, 4.1.4.2, and A.4.1.4.2** (Log # 297)

25-61 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.1.4.1.3 and A.4.1.4.1.3 (New)** (Log # 28)

Negative

Osburn, M. I believe the proponent has raised a valid point regarding repairing deficiencies in a timely manner. In jurisdictions that do not have a mandatory reporting system, many owners choose not to make these repairs until they are forced by the local AHJ. By adding the proposed language, the building owner will now have a defined time frame to comply and make the appropriate repairs.

25-62 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.1.4.1.4 and A.4.1.4.1.4 (New)** (Log # 29)

Negative

Osburn, M. See my Explanation of Negative on Proposal 25-61 (Log #28).

25-63 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.1.4.3 (New)** (Log # 318)

Document # 25

25-64 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.1.4.3 and A.4.1.4.3 (New)** (Log # 30)

25-65 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.1.5** (Log # 319)

Negative**Sheppard, J.** See my comments for 25-7 (Log #CP13).**Underwood, D.** See comment on 25-7 (Log #CP13).

25-66 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 27 Negative: 6 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.1.5 and 4.1.6** (Log # 254)

Negative**Drysdale, M.** There are two broad topics this standard can address, the capability of the installed equipment to function as designed and the capability of the design to control a fire. The first is thoroughly addressed in NFPA 25. The capability of the design options are addressed in the design standards. Local building and fire codes, and decisions by the AHJ identify the acceptable design standards.**Elvove, J.** This continues to be a divisive issue where most owners and the balance of committee members can't form consensus. I stand by my original substantiation and statements made previously on the floor and in similar proposals and comments. Note: I could potentially concede on this point if proposals ROP 25-8, 11, 67 and 308 were accepted and the document scope was revised per my comment on ROP 25-7.**Larrimer, P.** See my negative comments on 25-7 and 25-42.**Saidi, J.** The term "Normal" needs to be revised and better defined. Owner must have the prerogative to do the evaluations as of the 25 ITM scope.**Sheppard, J.** Agree with submitter's substantiation and see my comments on 25-7 (Log #CP13). Further, outside scope of Technical Committee.**Underwood, D.** Agree with submitter. See comment on 25-7 (Log #CP13).

25-67 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 30 Negative: 3 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.1.5.1 and A.4.1.5.1** (Log # 255)

Negative**Elvove, J.** NFPA 25 should not specify who does what, or what constitutes a "normal" inspection when the scope of NFPA 25 includes evaluations to assess system performance. Current text states that the evaluation as prescribed by 4.1.5 shall not be considered part of the normal inspection. Such prohibitive language is inappropriate as the scope of NFPA 25 "inspection" should be anything within the document scope that an owner decides to do with in-house staff or as contracted with outside personnel which can include a hazard evaluation.**Larrimer, P.** The standard restricts the evaluation from being part of the normal inspection testing and maintenance of water-based systems. This rewrite simply allows one to make the evaluation in 4.1.5 part of a normal inspection testing and maintenance contract without having to write language into a contract to override the existing restriction in 4.1.5.1.**Saidi, J.** The submitter's proposal should have been accepted.

Document # 25

25-68 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.1.7** (Log # 153)

25-69 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.1.7 and 4.1.8** (Log # 11)

25-70 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.1.7 and A.4.1.7 (New)** (Log # 238)

25-71 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.1.7.1 (New)** (Log # 320)

25-72 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.1.8, 4.1.8.1, 4.1.8.2, 4.1.8.3 (New) and A.4.1.8 (New)** (Log # 31)

Negative**Fleming, R.** The general information sign should be mandated, since omission of this type of sign can lead to failures of the system due to freeze-ups, closed sectional valves, etc.**Ray, R.** This proposal should have been accepted in part in principal as follows: a new 4.1.8.3 should be added: "The general information sign required by NFPA 13 shall be replaced if found missing". If the system is installed in accordance with NFPA 13, then this sign should be in place. If it goes missing for some reason, the expense incurred by an owner should be insignificant as the standard requires that as-built drawings and calculations be in the owner's possession - the sign can be recreated based on these records for little to no cost.**25-73** Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.1.8.1 and A.4.1.8.1** (Log # 16)

25-74 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 30 Negative: 3 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.1.9.1** (Log # 38)

Negative**Elvove, J.** The existing language already addresses a condition that might be noted while performing ITM activities. This change could potentially lead to unintended consequences and as thus such, should not be accepted.**Sheppard, J.** Original wording of paragraph is sufficient.**Underwood, D.** Original is ok.**25-75** Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.1.9.2** (Log # 100)

Document # 25

25-76 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 30 Negative: 3 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.1.10** (Log # 271)

Negative

Fleming, R. Injection systems are not listed and must be maintained by owners. NFPA 13 will now be requiring that the fluid added by these devices be listed. Since NFPA 25 does not address the features of these systems or the means to address their maintenance, this should be flagged as an owner responsibility.

Myers, T. There is an ever increasing number of additives for fire sprinkler systems being offered the public by various companies that are injected with no formal UL listing or instructions. In many of these cases the fire sprinkler contractor was not involved and has no idea how to inspect or what to inspect for.

Ray, R. This proposal should have been accepted. These injection systems are causing more and more problems with fire sprinkler systems. Case in point is the new disclaimers placed on the cut sheet of a certain manufacturer's corrosion inhibitor regarding the use of the product on "combination systems" (i.e systems containing both steel and CPVC piping). This product had NO such disclaimers since its release sometime prior to 2008, yet the disclaimer now suddenly appears on the cut sheets and requires written permission from the manufacturer prior to its use. Also, there have been incidences of responding fire fighters being affected negatively by the discharge of water and these chemicals when responding to a fire. Too often, after a system is approved and installed and the building occupied, a third party "sells" an owner on installing one of these injection systems - sometimes for good reasons, sometimes not. These systems need to be maintained. Too often, many committee members want to leave an issue "gray" by rejecting proposals and claiming "its already implied in the standard" - but when it comes to contractor liability, they want that in "black & white". These injection systems are becoming more commonplace and the standard needs to be clear that they need to be maintained by the owner.

Affirmative with Comment

Feld, J. I agree with the Committee's action to reject the proposal because the ITM requirements for injection systems should be handled by the contractor. Most owners do not possess the skills to conduct a proper ITM of this equipment. The owner has the option to have a separate contractor conduct ITM procedures of injection systems. The contractor may choose to exclude such systems in the contract. If the proposal is accepted as written, some owners may not even know that there is a requirement to inspect these systems, or will assume the contractor is inspecting it, or will ignore the requirement. In either case the system is at risk of premature failure.

25-77 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.2** (Log # CP16)

25-78 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.3.1.1 (New)** (Log # 321)

25-79 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.3.2** (Log # 234)

Document # 25

25-80 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 30 Negative: 3 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.3.4.1 (New)** (Log # 23)

Negative**Elvoe, J.** See my negative comment on ROP 25-42.**Larrimer, P.** See my Explanation of Negative Vote on Proposal 25-42.**Underwood, D.** See comments on 25-42.

25-81 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.3.6 (New)** (Log # 39)

Negative**Drysdale, M.** It is not practical to suggest that the slope of sprinkler piping can be determined within ¼” to ½” over a 10' run of pipe by observations from the ground. No evidence was presented that the existing approach of providing drains, where needed, should be replaced with greater attention to pipe pitch.

25-82 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 30 Negative: 3 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.3.6 (New)** (Log # 291)

Negative**Fleming, R.** It is common sense to require the 5-year test if there are no records of how long it has been since the 5-year tests were conducted. Without this requirement, owners would be encouraged to continually switch inspection firms, and never hit the 5-year interval.**Osburn, M.** I agree with the proponent, there are instances where the five year inspection, test and maintenance requirements are not being conducted due to improper record keeping. This proposed language would ensure that the five year inspection, test and maintenance requirements will be conducted regardless if the building owner has proper record keeping of previous inspections.**Ray, R.** This proposal should have been accepted to require whatever inspection activities should have been performed on a system (based on its age) when no records of inspection & testing exist for that system. Example: if the system is 3 years old, then the "first" inspection should include all activities required up to & through the 3 year inspection & testing requirements.

25-83 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.5.4** (Log # 298)

25-84 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.5.6** (Log # 101)

25-85 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.5.6 and A.4.5.6** (Log # 155)

Document # 25

25-86 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.5.8** (Log # 264)

Negative

Ray, R. This proposal should have been accepted. In many locations, NFPA 25 requires that the results of a test activity be compared to the "system demand". If this information is unknown, how can the inspecting company adequately perform their duties on behalf of the building owner? What is the point of performing certain testing activities if all the contractor can do after the test is hand the owner the results and tell them "here's your test results, but we have no idea how these results relate to your system"?

25-87 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.6** (Log # 156)

25-88 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.7** (Log # 24)

25-89 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**4.7** (Log # 157)

25-90 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**Table 5.1.1.2** (Log # 296)

25-91 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**5.1.1.3(New)** (Log # 127)

25-92 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**5.1.5** (Log # 322)

25-93 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**5.2.1.1.x(New)** (Log # 60)

Affirmative with Comment

Bell, K. It is not clear as to what part of this proposal is being accepted. I assume that the only text intended to be included in the standard is described in the TC action on Proposal 25-100.

Ray, R. See my comment on 25-100 (Log #272).

25-94 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**5.2.1.1.2, 5.2.1.1.3, 5.2.1.1.3.1, A.5.2.1.1.2(2), and A.5.2.1.1.2(5)** (Log # 102)

Document # 25

25-95 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**5.2.1.1.2(2) and A.5.2.1.1.2(2) (New)** (Log # 306)

Negative**Elvove, J.** Concur with Mr. Leavitt.**Leavitt, R.** This proposal (or something similar) needs to be included in the annex. Guidance regarding corrosion is sorely needed in addition to that provided in A.5.2.1.1. Requiring a "sample" test every year is not a practical solution for all situations.

25-96 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**5.2.1.1.3** (Log # 74)

25-97 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**5.2.1.1.4** (Log # 75)

25-98 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**5.2.1.1.4 and 5.2.1.1.5** (Log # 159)

25-99 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**5.2.1.1.5** (Log # 76)

25-100 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**5.2.1.1.8 and 5.2.1.1.9 (New)** (Log # 272)

Negative**Fleming, R.** Loss of a cover plate on a concealed sprinkler may not simply be an aesthetic problem, but may indicate ceiling sag of related problem of sprinkler positioning.**Ray, R.** This proposal should have been accepted. The cover plate for a concealed sprinkler is a part of that sprinkler head's listing and thus need to be replaced when found missing (the same way that those for recessed and flush sprinklers were addressed by the committee). Also, the outer ring of a recessed sprinkler head and the cover plate assembly of a concealed sprinkler head are of a specific dimension to insure that the sprinkler deflector is at the proper distance below the ceiling. The missing trim may be due to the ceiling sagging thus affecting the spray distribution of the sprinkler.

25-101 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 29 Negative: 4 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**5.2.1.1.8 and A.5.2.1.1.8** (Log # 256)

Negative

Document # 25

Elvoe, J. The committee statement is clearly incorrect, given the scope of NFPA 25 says nothing about the document not addressing design and the continued existence of sections 4.1.5 and 4.1.6 (paragraph 1.1.3.1 only states that it's not the "inspector's" responsibility to verify the system design). If a sprinkler is not installed where it's supposed to be, or worse, it's been removed for some reason, how can this condition not be noted by an "inspector" when this condition could lead to the complete failure of a sprinkler system. The language proposed in the body of the standard was very benign as all it asked was for an inspector to identify areas in a building lacking sprinkler protection. The additional annex material made it clear that areas where sprinklers were noted to be missing were not necessarily deficiencies. To me, it's downright egregious that this committee will permit this condition to go unreported on an ITM report.

Feld, J. The submitter is correct that missing sprinklers need to be identified. The proposal needs to go further in requiring the owner to evaluate the missing sprinkler and be REQUIRED to remedy the deficiency if the room/area was or is required to be protected. If an inspecting contractor cannot determine if a sprinkler is missing from a room, then he/she needs to find another job.

Larrimer, P. The reason for rejection identified in the committee statement is addressed by the proposed annex note. The proposal would help ensure that missing sprinklers are identified without holding the inspector responsible for any design issues.

Saidi, J. Identifying an area in a building with missing sprinkler protection is simple, easy to do and does not require a great deal of expertise, it is simply an observation by the service provider which could be useful to the owner. As an owner, I would want to be informed so I can follow-up with this observation. The proposal should be accepted, at least in principle. Owners, would want to know if there are areas lacking protection in their property and decide whether further action is necessary.

25-102 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
5.2.1.2 and 5.2.1.3 (New) (Log # 240)

25-103 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
5.2.1.4, 5.2.1.5, A.5.2.1.4, and A.5.2.1.5 (New) (Log # 239)

Negative

Elvoe, J. Obstructions should be noted by the inspector as these clearly impact the performance of the sprinkler system as designed. Then, we can focus on including a number of other "grey areas" that impact performance which also should be included as part of ITM activities (e.g., missing sprinklers, missing hangers, etc.)

Ray, R. This proposal should have been accepted. NFPA 13 has been very clear for many years regarding obstructions (whether temporary or permanent). This proposal would have given clear direction to building owners regarding the placement of signs, banners, etc. that are installed following the system installation and hence perhaps not addressed in the original system layout and initial occupancy inspections performed by AHJs. Do we want an owner to be allowed to place signs and banners that would defeat a sprinkler head's performance 15 minutes after they receive their initial certificate of occupancy? I would hope not, yet the committee's action seems to indicate that this WOULD be acceptable.

25-104 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 30 Negative: 3 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
5.2.1.4(3) (New) (Log # 131)

Negative

Fantauzzi, J. The requirement of NFPA 25 to identify recalled material should be a function between the individual manufacturer and the owner of the recalled material and should not be the liability of the ITM inspector. Article 4.1.4 and A4.1.4 is sufficient and the addition of 5.2.1.6 is not necessary.

Document # 25

Fleming, R. The word “observed” is too general, since it could be considered part of a distant visual observation of a recalled sprinkler, introducing an impractical obligation on the inspector. The intent is adequately covered within the current annex section.

Leavitt, R. This new language can be interpreted that "recalled" sprinklers are a part of the inspection scope. I do not believe any recalled products should be a part of NFPA 25 inspection scope as there are specific enforcement procedures set forth in any (not just fire systems) recall effort.

25-105 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 30 Negative: 3 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

5.2.1.8 and A.5.2.1.8 (Log # 327)

Negative

Elvove, J. The committee statement indicates that the intent of NFPA 25 is to address wear and tear issues and not design/installation issues. If this is the case, why are there requirements in 5.2.1.2 and 5.2.1.3 to note areas where the minimum clearance distance to sprinklers is not maintained? Clearly, the intent of NFPA 25 is to do more than recognize wear and tear issues. So why limit this effort to only clearance issues when other obvious conditions also have the potential to adversely impact the performance of a sprinkler. This proposal rightfully aims to add that “obvious obstructions to sprinkler spray patterns” be included as part of ITM. Regarding identifying missing sprinklers, if as-built drawings are required, why can't an “inspector” compare his/her observations with the drawings to determine whether a sprinkler is required to be present? Also see my negative comment on 25-101.

Larrimer, P. There are many design issues that are addressed by this document, in spite of the committee statement. There is no reason that an inspector can't identify obvious obstructions to sprinklers when provided with the as-built drawings. Why can the document ensure the system design is met for pump testing but not for sprinkler placement? See 25-145.

Saidi, J. Identifying an area in a building with missing sprinkler protection or obstructed sprinklers is relatively simple, easy to do and does not require a great deal of expertise. These are observations by the service provider which could be useful to the owner. As an owner, I would want to be informed so I can follow-up with this observation and decide whether further action is necessary. The proposal should be accepted, at least in principle.

25-106 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

5.2.2.1 and A.5.2.2.1 (New) (Log # 305)

Negative

Elvove, J. See my comment on 25-95.

Leavitt, R. This proposal should be accepted. Some guidance in the annex is needed for pipe corrosion since the corrective action for corroded pipe is replacement.

25-107 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

5.2.2.3.1 (New) (Log # 132)

25-108 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 30 Negative: 3 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

5.2.3 (Log # 98)

Negative

Drysdale, M. It is not practical to suggest that the slope of sprinkler piping can be determined within ¼” to ½” over a 10' run of pipe by observations from the ground. No evidence was presented that the existing approach of providing drains, where needed, should be replaced with greater attention to pipe pitch.

Document # 25

Fantauzzi, J. The physical checking of the pitch of piping presents significant amount of liability and cost to the inspection process. The corrective actions are NFPA 13 requirements and any and all repairs or modifications are the function of NFPA 13.

The addition of this material to NFPA 25, even to the Annex, can only cause a greater liability exposure to the ITM Inspector from a implied warranty point of view.

Leavitt, R. Although I understand the concern regarding freezing, the pitch of piping should not be a part of the inspection process and should not be addressed in the annex. This new language regardless of where it is located will cause more issues than it solves. For example, single interlock and non-interlock preaction systems not subject to freezing had no requirement for pitch prior to the 2007 edition of NFPA 13.

Affirmative with Comment

Elvove, J. Given the committee rejected the proponent's language pertaining to a 5 year inspection frequency, the final action of this proposal should have been Accept in Part in Principle. But more importantly, it's not completely clear from the committee meeting action how the proposed text will actually read. Therefore, for the benefit of the public and committee members, it is requested that staff rewrite the proposal as accepted in principle by the committee.

25-109 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
5.2.3.1 and 5.2.3.2 (Log # 103)

Negative

Leavitt, R. I agree with the proposal except the addition of "missing component." A missing component moves the inspection into the realm of design and/or installation.

25-110 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
5.2.4.1 (Log # 323)

25-111 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
5.2.4.1 and 5.2.4.2 (Log # 304)

25-112 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
5.2.4.2 (Log # 61)

Negative

Adams, C. Placing definitions that are already in other existing standards is superfluous and could result in conflicts if the installation standard revises the original definition. NFPA 25 is not a stand alone standard and does require the individual performing the ITM to be "qualified" which means they should be familiar with the basic designs and operations of the systems. Definitions should only be added when they are specific to NFPA 25 and not for convenience otherwise every definition should be carried over from the installation standards. This is also applicable to 25-14 (Log #112), 25-17 (Log #113), 25-340 (Log #144), etc.

25-113 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
5.2.5 (Log # 303)

Document # 25

25-114 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 29 Negative: 4 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

5.2.6 (Log # 104)

Negative

Drysdale, M. Requiring that the design information be available is consistent with NFPA 13 and is reasonable. It should be acceptable to have the information on a hydraulic design information sign on the riser or in available design documents. Over time, information signs can become illegible or lost. The current systems for maintaining electronic data make that option equally secure.

Larrimer, P. The hydraulic design information sign has nothing to do with inspection testing and maintenance of a system. It doesn't matter if the system is a pipe schedule system or a hydraulically calculated system with respect to the requirements in NFPA 25. Inspecting for a sign that has nothing to do with the ITM of the system and which will not affect the operation of the system even if it is missing is questionable, yet this new language retroactively requires a missing sign to be replaced or installed, by the owner of course.

There is no justification for requiring a sign.

See my negative comment on 25-42.

Ray, R. This proposal should have been accepted. The proposed 5.2.6.3 (struck by the committee) would have made the standard clear in requiring the owner to provide this information - either from original as built drawings and hydraulic calculations or from a study performed on the system to determine the level of protection that it can provide.

Underwood, D. See comments on 25-42.

25-115 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**5.2.6.1 (New)** (Log # 17)

Negative

Ray, R. This proposal should have been accepted as submitted: a new 4.1.8.3 should be added: If the system is installed in accordance with NFPA 13, then this sign should be in place. If it goes missing for some reason, the expense incurred by an owner should be insignificant as the standard requires that as-built drawings and calculations be in the owner's possession - the sign can be recreated based on these records for little to no cost.

25-116 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**5.2.7** (Log # 25)

25-117 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**5.2.8** (Log # 105)

Negative

Field, G. I am voting negative because of the use of the word "General." "Information Sign" matches the wording in 4.1.8. Proposal 25-72 (Log #31) which would have matched the information supplied/requested in the current NFPA 13 "General Information Sign" was rejected by the Committee. Information requested in NFPA 25 4.1.8 is far different in scope and intent than the NFPA 13 sign. Thus, the use of "Information Sign" wording will not be confused with "General Information Sign" wording.

Document # 25

25-118 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 29 Negative: 4 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**5.2.9 and A.5.2.9** (Log # 128)

Negative**Fantauzzi, J.** Although this material is of value, the annex material is not addressed by 25-117.**Leavitt, R.** While I agree with the action regarding the relationship to 25-35 (Log #117), it does not incorporate the annex material proposed by the submitter. I believe the annex material should be included.**Sheppard, J.** See my comments for 25-42.**Underwood, D.** See comments on 25-42.

25-119 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**5.3.2** (Log # 9)

25-120 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**5.3.2.3 (New)** (Log # 160)

Negative**Sheppard, J.** Agree with submitter's substantiation.**Underwood, D.** Agree with submitters proposal as written.

25-121 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**5.3.3, 5.3.3.1, 5.3.3.2** (Log # 93)

Negative**Fuller, D.** I agree with the submitters substantiation and support quarterly testing of sprinkler water flow alarms. Water flow alarms are the most critical supervisory switch in the sprinkler system, yet it does not have the most frequent inspection interval even though there is no appreciable difference in design or reliability levels between water flow switches and other supervisory switches in the system. This is inconstant with best fire protection practice.

25-122 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**5.3.3.1, 5.3.3.1.1, and 5.3.3.1.2 (New)** (Log # 261)

25-123 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0**5.3.3.3** (Log # 328)

Negative**Fuller, D.** I believe that this proposal to specify an ITC flow equal to the smallest sprinkler orifice size adds clarity to the document and is constant with the installation requirements. I disagree with the committee statement that this can be "assumed" and moreover does not take into consideration modification to the ITC post installation. The addition of this text will improve clarity and eliminate the need for any "assumptions".

Document # 25

25-124 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
5.3.3.4 (Log # 302)

25-125 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
5.3.4.2 (Log # 13)

25-126 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
5.3.4.2(6) (New) (Log # 15)

25-127 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
5.4.1.1 (Log # 134)

Negative

Elvove, J. Concur with Mr. Larrimer. Added cost without technical justification for the change.

Larrimer, P. No substantiation was provided to the committee to justify this new requirement.

25-128 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
5.4.1.1, 5.4.1.1.1, and 5.4.1.4.1 (Log # 161)

25-129 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
5.4.1.4 (Log # 12)

25-130 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
5.4.1.4 (Log # 20)

25-131 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
5.4.1.4.2 (Log # 301)

25-132 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
5.4.1.4.3 (New) (Log # 314)

Negative

Document # 25

Ray, R. This proposal should have been accepted. The spare heads are provided to allow the system to be placed back in service following an activation. If the location of these spare heads is unknown, the result may be a system being left OUT of service simply because no one knew that the spare heads were located in the maintenance office (for example). Recall the fires that were set in LA during the "Rodney King riots". There are documented cases of systems in a single building activating and controlling fires set by rioters as many as 3 times during those riots - had the responders been unable to locate the spare heads, these systems would have had to have been left out of service and the subsequent arson fires would have destroyed the buildings and/or caused death or injuries to fire fighters or citizens. Fire sprinkler systems can ONLY work if they are in service.

25-133 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
5.4.1.7 (Log # 176)

25-134 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
5.4.3 (Log # 107)

25-135 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
5.4.3 and A.5.4.3 (Log # 162)

25-136 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
Table 5.5.1 (Log # 40)

25-137 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
Table 5.5.1 (Log # 146)

Negative

Sheppard, J. See my comments for 25-42.

25-138 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
5.5.2 (Log # 71)

25-139 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
Table 6.1.1.2 (Log # 18)

25-140 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
Table 6.1.1.2 (Log # 295)

25-141 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
Table 6.1.1.2 (Log # 309)

25-142 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
6.1.2, Table 6.1.2, and 6.1.3 (Log # 310)

25-143 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
6.2.2.1 and 6.2.2.2 (Log # 300)

25-144 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 27 Negative: 6 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
6.2.3 (Log # 137)

Negative

Drysdale, M. Requiring that the design information be available is consistent with NFPA 13 and is reasonable. It should be acceptable to have the information on a hydraulic design information sign on the riser or in available design documents. Over time, information signs can become illegible or lost. The current systems for maintaining electronic data make that option equally secure.

Elvove, J. This proposal should have been treated the same as a similar proposal on hydraulic design information signs for 52.6 (ROP 25-114); i.e., 6.2.3.3 should have been deleted, just like 5.2.6.3 was deleted by the committee action on ROP 25-114.

Larrimer, P. See negative comment on 25-114.

Saidi, J. This new requirement puts undue burden on the owners, and should be moved to the annex.

Sheppard, J. See my comments for 25-42.

Underwood, D. See comments on 25-42.

25-145 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 30 Negative: 3 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
6.3.1.1, 6.3.1.2, and 6.3.1.3 (Log # 231)

Negative

Feld, J. Firefighters rely on standpipe systems to fight fires:

1. when the building is not protected with a fire sprinkler system, or
2. when the fire sprinkler system is out of service as occurs during a tenant improvement, or
3. when the fire overwhelms the fire sprinkler system, or
4. to complete extinguishment of a fire that is controlled by a fire sprinkler system.

In any case, the reliance the fire fighter places on a standpipe system must be without question. Firefighters train on supplying standpipe systems assuming the FDC is inoperable by supplying the standpipe using the first floor hose valve (unless it is a PRV) because experience has taught them that systems deteriorate over time and things break (nothing lasts forever - or even the life of a building). It is very important that a standpipe system is operable in order for firefighters to effectively fight a fire to save lives and property and protect the firefighters themselves.

The first edition of NFPA 25 recognized the value of having a reliable standpipe system by requiring ALL standpipe systems to be tested for flow and pressure. The 2002 edition changed flow testing of all standpipe systems to flow testing of only automatic standpipe systems. The Committee's Substantiation was:

“Manual wet and dry standpipe systems have no automatic water supply requirements. Some building owners and AHJ's are conducting flow tests on manual wet systems but are asking for pass/fail criteria for these tests. There are none, unless one considers 500 gpm @ 65 psi as the test criteria, but then a manual pump must be brought in and it will simply pump elevated volumes and pressures until the standpipe passes the 65 psi criteria.”

The Committee's Substantiation was misguided as NFPA 25 had requirements for flow testing standpipes.

From the 1998 edition of NFPA 25: Section 3-3.1.1:

“A flow test shall be conducted at the hydraulically most remote hose connection of each zone of a standpipe system to verify the water supply still adequately provides the design pressure at the required flow.”

And also in Section 3.3.1.3:

“All systems shall be flow tested and pressure tested at the requirements in effect at the time of the installation.”

Therefore, the Committee was in error as NFPA 25 did provide test criteria.

NFPA 14 requires an acceptance test of standpipe systems. If it is done at the beginning of the life of a standpipe system, then it should also be conducted at 5 year intervals to ensure it is operable during a crisis.

NFPA 25 currently requires a flow test for all automatic standpipe systems. This includes Class II standpipe systems. Class II systems are for occupant use. Many occupants are directed to not use such standpipes as they are not trained. Hose for Class II standpipe systems is not required in buildings protected with a fire sprinkler system and yet NFPA 25 requires the Class II standpipe system to be flow tested. REALLY!!

The committee statement for the current proposal was based solely on a requirement in NFPA 25 that manual standpipe systems are required to be hydrostatically tested. Only manual standpipes that are NOT a part of a combined sprinkler/standpipe system are required to be hydrostatically tested. A great majority of standpipe systems that are installed today are combined systems and therefore, will NOT be hydrostatically tested.

These systems will never be tested hydrostatically or tested for flow and pressure. I find it very difficult to believe that a hydrostatic test is comparable to a flow test to ensure the proper flow and pressure at the remote standpipe hose valve.

NFPA 25 requires the following systems and devices to be flow tested:

Water spray systems

Foam-water systems

Backflow Preventers

Pressure reducing valves

Document # 25

Fire Pumps
Fire Hydrants

These are all good tests that are necessary to ensure the reliability of the system or device. However, if Proposal 25-145 is AIP, NFPA 25 will not require a flow and pressure test for manual standpipe systems meaning that NFPA 25 is more concerned about the reliability of a water spray system for a transformer at a power plant, that the reliability of a manual standpipe system to protect a building, its occupants, and the firefighters that will fight the fire.

To those who believe that this is outside the scope of NFPA 25, please consider that the title of the document includes the word "TESTING". The 2011 scope includes the word "TESTING". The newly proposed scope (Proposal 25-7) includes the word "TESTING". To establish pass/fail criteria for a test is necessary or the test is meaningless.

This is a very serious issue and the Committee must consider the ramifications of the consequences of this proposal.

Leavitt, R. I agree with the submitter that all standpipes be flow tested. Flow testing of manual standpipes was a part of the standard until 2002 and there was no compelling reason in my opinion for eliminating this test. The availability of unobstructed flow at the needed pressure necessary for manual fire fighting efforts should be verified on a regular basis.

Sheppard, J. Reject. See proposal 25-146. I believe we have actions taken on 25-145 and 25-146 in reverse.

Affirmative with Comment

Larrimer, P. Based upon the committee's prior statements, testing the standpipe to show that it is adequate to perform as it was designed is not within the scope of this standard? See my negative comments on 25-42 and 25-7.

Underwood, D. We must add required flow.

25-146 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
6.3.1.1 and 6.3.1.3 (Log # 277)

Negative

Fleming, R. The committee has in the past clarified that 500 gpm is suitable for the standpipe flow testing, and this proposal was simply trying to clean up the language accordingly.

Sheppard, J. See proposal 25-145. I believe we have actions taken on 25-145 and 25-146 in reverse.

25-147 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
6.3.2.2 and A.6.3.2.2 (Log # 163)

25-148 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
Table 6.5.1 (Log # 312)

25-149 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
6.5.3 (Log # 72)

25-150 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
7.2.2.1.2 (Log # 87)

25-151 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
Table 7.2.2.1.2, 7.2.2.3, 7.2.2.4, 7.2.2.5, 7.2.2.6, and 7.2.2.7 (Log # 80)

25-152 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
7.2.2.3 (Log # 82)

25-153 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
7.2.2.4 (Log # 83)

25-154 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 30 Negative: 3 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
Table 7.2.2.4 and 7.2.2.5 (Log # 294)

Negative

Elvove, J. Concur with Mr. Fantauzzi and Mr. Leavitt.

Fantauzzi, J. The number of Fire Brigades that would require the use of a hydrant wrench is small and they would most likely be stored on their mobile units. This should not drive a requirement for the majority of facilities.

Leavitt, R. This proposal should be accepted. It is not practical or reasonable to require an owner to keep a hydrant wrench in all instances. Fire hydrants (public or private) are to used by trained fire fighting personnel or tested by qualified individuals. If the owner has a fire brigade or self performs hydrant tests, then they should have a wrench. If the owner does not have a fire brigade or does not self perform tests, then there is no need for the owner to have a wrench.

25-155 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
7.2.2.5 (Log # 84)

25-156 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
7.2.2.6 (Log # 85)

25-157 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
7.2.2.7 (Log # 86)

25-158 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
7.3.1 (Log # 164)

25-159 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 30 Negative: 3 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

7.3.1 (Log # 269)

Negative

Fleming, R. We doubt that anyone is actually testing in conformance with current requirement of 7.3.1. Flow tests would be needed of such a character to be able to declare the condition of the underground piping, which appears impossible with fewer than three hydrants, and certainly not possible with systems having a simple lead-in.

Ray, R. This proposal should have been accepted. The reasons are perfectly outlined by the submitter and it is unnecessary to repeat them here. The committee's comment regarding uncovering deficiencies with municipal water supplies should not be a responsibility of a building owner, rather the municipality should be charged with testing and maintaining their own equipment. The balance of the committee statement is unwarranted (main drain tests will find problems with closed valves).

Victor, T. The committee should accept this proposal. When you read this section carefully as it exists in the standard it is virtually impossible to comply with the requirement unless there are a sufficient number of hydrants on the underground line to be able to flow sufficient water to record a pressure drop at both ends of a section of pipe. It can only be assumed that the "internal condition" should be determined by comparing C-factors from the original hydraulic calculations to the current condition based on the actual friction loss though the length of pipe. Again, this can only be accomplished if pressure readings can be taken at the beginning and at the end of the run of pipe, and a sufficient pressure loss achieved for the calculation. For any section of underground that doesn't have two places to record pressure this requirement can't be met, which would include most lead-ins to most buildings. While the annex explains how flow through the lead-in can be achieved by using FDCs, hose valves, etc., if there's no place for a gauge where the lead-in connects to the water supply the evaluation can't be performed. In addition, where there are sufficient hydrants available to perform this test, there's no pass/fail criteria provided in the requirement. If there is sufficient flow and sufficient pressure to meet system demand, but the C-factor used in the original calculations was 140 and the current calculated C-factor is 100, is that a deficiency? This entire section needs to be removed or totally reworked so all underground arrangements are considered, exceptions given, and pass/fail criteria provided.

25-160 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Table 7.5.1 (Log # 21)

25-161 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Table 7.5.1 (Log # 81)

25-162 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Table 7.5.1 (Log # 308)

25-163 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.1.2 (Log # 41)

Negative

Document # 25

Larrimer, P. The manufacturer's instruction should be followed first and this table should be used as alternative when those manufacturer's requirements are not available as proposed by the submitter.

25-164 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Table 8.1.2 (Log # 42)

Negative

Larrimer, P. See negative comment on 25-163.

25-165 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Table 8.1.2 (Log # 227)

25-166 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Table 8.1.2 (Log # 229)

25-167 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Table 8.1.2 (Log # 230)

25-168 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.2.2 (Log # CP3)

Negative

Ray, R. This proposal should have been rejected. The committee substantiation is incorrect: it has been a known fact for years that a diesel engine without a jacket heater may not "start" in cold weather (ie at 40F). Yes, one concern is the water in the piping freezing but the other concern (missed by the committee) is the fact that the engine may not start if not equipped with a jacket heater.

25-169 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.2.2(1) (Log # 197)

25-170 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.2.2(e) (Log # 43)

25-171 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.2.3.6 (Log # 165)

Negative

Leavitt, R. I believe the proposal should be accepted as originally submitted. We either eliminate the requirement for the pump test to be attended by qualified personnel when using the automatic test feature or we disallow the use of automatic testing.

Affirmative with Comment

Document # 25

Elvove, J. I want to keep the automatic timer feature, however, per my comment on 25-176, would only do so if there isn't a requirement for qualified operating personnel to be in attendance. But I concur with Mr. Leavitt that we shouldn't offer the option for using automatic timers if we're also requiring someone to be present.

25-172 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 30 Negative: 3 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.3.1.1 (Log # 244)

Negative

Larrimer, P. The data previously submitted substantiated the change from weekly to monthly.

Leavitt, R. I must look at this from a practical point of view since the standard deals with minimum requirements and I believe that a monthly test requirement will raise the level of compliance for some periodic testing of engine driven pump.

Saidi, J. The proposal to reduce the test frequency to monthly from weekly should be accepted. This cyclical monthly testing would be consistent with policy already in use by many large and institutional (Federal) owners and users this standard.

25-173 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.3.1.2 (Log # 44)

Affirmative with Comment

Ray, R. For now I can accept the committee's action pending receipt of the Research Foundation's report. Yet I reserve the right to continue this battle if the committee errs as it did in preparing the 2008 edition of this standard.

25-174 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.3.1.2 (Log # 325)

Affirmative with Comment

Ray, R. For now I can accept the committee's action pending receipt of the Research Foundation's report. Yet I reserve the right to continue this battle if the committee errs as it did in preparing the 2008 edition of this standard. We are collecting data in the Chicago metropolitan area: so far we have data that shows that 64% of the motors that one contractor replaced were split case pumps with motors 30HP or less, 100% of the motors they were called to "free-up" as they were seized were split case pumps with motors 30HP or less. Another contractor has reported that 50% of the motors they replaced were split case pumps with 30HP or less motors.

25-175 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.3.2.1 (Log # 247)

Negative

Fleming, R. The change to prohibit the design of fire pumps from discharging through the pump circulation relief valve is fairly recent, and this change would present difficulties for many older existing systems.

Document # 25

25-176 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.3.2.7.1 (New) (Log # 248)

Negative

Elvoe, J. What's the point of having a timer automatically start the fire pump if there's no permission to start the pump unattended? I recognize that even with rejecting this proposal, that 8.3.2.7 will continue to require "qualified operating personnel" to be in attendance whenever the pump is running, which is the real issue that needs more discussion. Still, there's no need to add this language as it merely restates what's already required.

Affirmative with Comment

Bell, K. Editorially, the word "does" should be deleted.

Leavitt, R. At least this tries to address the issue but in the end we still have a requirement for attendance that is not logical when associated with an automatic test feature.

25-177 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.3.3.x (New) (Log # 88)

25-178 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.3.3.1 (Log # 45)

Affirmative with Comment

Underwood, D. Should read: An annual test of

25-179 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.3.3.1.1 (Log # 46)

25-180 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.3.3.1.1 (Log # 278)

Negative

Elvoe, J. "As provided by the owner" should have been deleted to be consistent with actions taken on other proposals where similar language was proposed (e.g., ROP 25-86, 232, 233, 254, 270, 274). Also note that the purpose of this test is actually to verify the adequacy of a design; this is just one of many requirements within NFPA 25 that go beyond "wear and tear" and set an expectation that equipment will perform as intended (also see ROP 25-188), yet some still purport that NFPA 25 is not a standard that aims to verify design adequacy.

Affirmative with Comment

Larrimer, P. Based upon the committee's prior statements, testing the fire pump to show that it is adequate to meet system demand is not within the scope of this standard? See my negative comments on 25-42 and 25-7, especially the committee statement on 25-42.

25-181 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.3.3.1.2.3 (Log # 198)

25-182 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.3.3.1.3 (Log # 199)

Negative

Document # 25

Adams, C. See comments on 25-192 (Log #50).

25-183 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
8.3.3.2(3) and A.8.3.3.2(3) (New) (Log # 47)

Affirmative with Comment

Elvove, J. Show the actual text that is being proposed to be added to the annex. Without it, the public (as well as this committee) can not view (and properly ballot) the proposed change.

25-184 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
8.3.3.2(4) and A.8.3.3.2(4) (New) (Log # 48)

25-185 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
8.3.3.3.2.1 (New) (Log # 49)

25-186 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
8.3.3.3.3 (New) (Log # CP7)

25-187 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
8.3.3.4(3) (New) (Log # 249)

25-188 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 30 Negative: 3 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
8.3.5, 8.4 (Log # CP5)

Negative

Adams, C. See comments on 25-192 (Log #50).

Larrimer, P. Section 8.3.5.1.1 states

“The interpretation of the flow test results and performance relative to system demand requirements shall be the basis for determining acceptable performance of the fire pump assembly.”

Why is the pass/fail determination of the fire pump, which is based on the pumps ability to meet system design criteria, allowed to be within the scope of NFPA 25? Other design criteria such as sprinkler spacing and obstructions are not within the scope of the standard. These are both design issues.

The statistics published by NFPA seem to show that system ineffectiveness (See substantiation on Proposal 25 -11) can be attributed to sprinklers design issues such as obstructions or improper spacing just as much if not more than a pump's failure to meet system a system demand, but the committee claims that addressing sprinkler issues are outside the scope of the standard, yet testing the pump to meet design criteria is within the scope of the standard.

Based upon the committee's prior statements, testing the fire pump to show that it is adequate to meet system demand is not within the scope of this standard? See my negative comments on 25-42 and 25-7, especially the committee statement on 25-42.

Lastly, if a fire pump has degraded more that 5% say, to 90% of the original certified test performance, but it still meets the largest system demand for which it supplies, it should be acceptable. The arbitrary 5% degradation in pump performance should not be used as pass/fail criteria.

Ray, R. This proposal should have been accepted in part: all references to including "velocity head" should have been struck. Velocity head, though useful in interpreting acceptance test results, it is totally unnecessary in regards to annual test results.

Affirmative with Comment

Elvove, J. The changes made by the committee may improve the existing intent of the modified sections, however, as Mr. Larrimer points out, the existing intent needs to be revisited as it's not critical for a fire pump to meet all points along its curve, if it still can meet the worse case system demand, which may be far less than the 150% point on the curve. Hence, this section really needs to be revised accordingly.

25-189 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
8.3.5 and A.8.3.5.1 (Log # 292)

25-190 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
8.3.5.1.1 (Log # 138)

25-191 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
8.3.5.1.2 (Log # 200)

25-192 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
8.3.5.2.1 (Log # 50)

Negative

Document # 25

Adams, C. I agree with the the proposal to delete the requirement for the use of theoretical factors. Small differences in speed have negligible affect on the discharge of the pump and correction factors are also negligible. If there are significant differences in speed, this will be reflected in the discharge and appropriate action is already required. The use of theoretical ("mathematical") factors create needless calculations and can be prone to mathematical errors resulting in pumps being rated deficient when they are not. Once the pump is acceptance tested, there should no longer be a need to apply theoretical factors.

25-193 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.3.5.2.1 (Log # 201)

25-194 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.3.5.2.1 and A.8.3.5.2.1 (Log # 232)

25-195 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.3.5.3 (Log # 139)

25-196 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.3.5.3 and 8.3.5.7 (Log # 233)

25-197 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.3.5.3(1) (Log # 51)

25-198 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.3.5.6 (Log # 203)

25-199 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.5.1 (Log # 204)

25-200 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.5.4 and A.8.5.4.1 (New) (Log # 250)

Affirmative with Comment

Field, G. I believe all on the Committee recognize the importance of the reliability of diesel fire pumps. I encourage the submitter to provide additional supporting data for this problem. I question if fuel problems would be found in the weekly test?

Document # 25

Fuller, D. The need to monitor and maintain the quality of stored diesel fuel is critical to the reliability of the diesel engine. Degradation of fuel can cause starting, running, and performance problems. The submitters intent is valid and should be supported at the ROC. I believe requiring the installation of a fuel maintenance system was the issue that made this unacceptable to the committee. I would support the remaining language that requires periodic testing and the needed to maintain the fuel.

25-201 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
8.6.1 (Log # 3)

25-202 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
8.6.1 (Log # 205)

Negative

Sheppard, J. Agree with submitter's proposal.

Underwood, D. Agree with submitter. The cooling loop has pressure regulating valve switch must under full engine horsepower load.

25-203 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
8.6.1 (Log # 206)

Negative

Sheppard, J. Agree with submitter's proposal.

Underwood, D. Agree with submitter. To check the engine rpm you must check at varying loads, the fuel pump can cause major problems.

25-204 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
8.6.1 (Log # 207)

25-205 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
8.6.1 (Log # 208)

25-206 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
8.6.1 (Log # 209)

25-207 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
8.6.1 (Log # 210)

25-208 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
8.6.1 (Log # 211)

25-209 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.6.1 (Log # 212)

25-210 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.6.1 (Log # 213)

25-211 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.6.1 (Log # 214)

25-212 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.6.1 (Log # 215)

25-213 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.6.1 (Log # 216)

25-214 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.6.1 (Log # 217)

Negative

Sheppard, J. Agree with submitter's proposal.

Underwood, D. Agree with submitter. When using jack and crowbars to move the piping there can be a lot of strain put on the pump.

25-215 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.6.1 (Log # 218)

Negative

Sheppard, J. Agree with submitter's proposal.

Underwood, D. Agree with submitter. See comment on 25-214.

25-216 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.6.1 (Log # 219)

Negative

Underwood, D. Agree with submitter. See comment on 25-214.

25-217 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.6.1 (Log # 220)

Negative

Document # 25

Sheppard, J. Agree with submitter's proposal.

Underwood, D. Agree with submitter. When replacing a base you have a new installation and if we go to NFPA 20 an acceptance test would be required.

25-218 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.6.1 (Log # 222)

Negative

Sheppard, J. Agree with submitter's proposal.

25-219 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.6.1 (Log # 228)

Negative

Underwood, D. Agree with submitter.

25-220 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.6.1 (Log # CP6)

Negative

Sheppard, J. Agree with submitter's proposal.

25-221 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.6.2 (Log # 223)

25-222 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.6.3 (Log # 224)

25-223 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.6.4 (Log # 225)

25-224 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

8.6.5 (Log # 226)

25-225 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

9.2.1.1 and 9.2.1.2 (Log # 279)

25-226 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

9.2.2.1 (Log # 280)

Document # 25

25-227 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
9.2.4 (Log # 4)

25-228 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
9.2.4.1 (Log # CP9)

25-229 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
9.3.3 and 9.3.5 (Log # 282)

25-230 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
9.5.1.1 and Table 9.5.1.1 (Log # 281)

25-231 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
10.2.5.1 (Log # 90)

25-232 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
10.3.4.4.3 (Log # 265)

25-233 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
11.3.5.3 (Log # 56)

25-234 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
Chapter 12 (Log # CP10)

25-235 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
Table 12.1.2 and 12.2.4 (Log # 89)

25-236 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
Table 12.1.2 - (Pump) (Log # 334)

Negative
Drysdale, M. No technical data was provided to substantiate increasing the frequency from quarterly to monthly.

Elvove, J. Changes in frequency, especially when increased, need to be substantiated.

25-237 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
Table 12.1.2 - (Tanks) (Log # 333)

Negative

Document # 25

Drysdale, M. No technical data was provided to substantiate changing the frequency from weekly to monthly.

Elvove, J. See my comment on 25-236.

25-238 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Table 12.1.2 - (Valve) (Log # 332)

Negative

Drysdale, M. No technical data was provided to substantiate increasing the frequency from annually to semi-annually.

Elvove, J. See my comment on 25-236.

25-239 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Table 13.1.1.2 (Log # 69)

25-240 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Table 13.1.1.2 (Log # 125)

25-241 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Table 13.1.1.2 (Log # 195)

25-242 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Table 13.1.1.2 (Log # 196)

25-243 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.2.5 (Log # 135)

25-244 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.2.5 (Log # CP12)

25-245 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.2.5 and A.13.2.5 (Log # 91)

25-246 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.2.5.1 (Log # 26)

25-247 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.3.2.1.1 (Log # 324)

25-248 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.3.2.1.2 (Log # 177)

Affirmative with Comment

Field, G. Per 25-113 (Log #303) verify "supervisory alarm devices" will change to "supervisory signal initiating device."

25-249 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.3.2.2(4) (Log # 178)

25-250 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.3.3 and 13.3.3.1 (Log # 92)

Negative

Whitney, J. The quality of diesel fuels are changing. Today's fuels are less stable than in the past and this trend is going to continue to get worsen. We have the opportunity to address this problem before it becomes the reason for a loss. This proposal only adds the requirement of annual testing of the fuel to verify its quality. Only where a problem is identified with the fuel are additional requirements then necessary. With all that we require to be done to insure these systems are reliable, I cannot see that this simple test should not be required. I ask this committee to remember this standard is used around the world where fuels are less predictable and less reliable than here in the US.

25-251 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.3.3.2 (Log # 179)

Affirmative with Comment

Bell, K. It is not completely clear to me what text will be included in the body and Annex of the standard as a result of this TC action.

25-252 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.4.3.1.1 (Log # 268)

25-253 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 30 Negative: 3 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.4.3.2.2.1 and A.13.4.3.2.2.1 (New) (Log # 192)

Negative

Elvoe, J. Moving text from the annex into the standard now mandates that full flow tests involve a fire alarm contractor because of the new requirement to test automatic and manual activation devices. This is outside the scope of NFPA 25 and therefore can't be mandated. This type of language is perfectly suited in the annex and needs to return there. The Standards Council should take notice of this proposed change, should it not be overturned during ROC.

Document # 25

Larrimer, P. There is no reason to require that the detection devices be tested as part of the flow test for many pre-action and deluge systems. Many times you can test the detection equipment without flowing water and then complete the required flow test at another time. Requiring the testing detection equipment is outside the scope of this standard. That interface is already covered in Sections 1.1.1.1 and 1.1.1.2.

Saidi, J. It appears that this new requirement would necessitate having a Fire Alarm contractor/technician, which is outside the scope of 25.

Affirmative with Comment

Feld, J. The ITM contractor can ensure the preaction valve will trip and the fire alarm contractor can ensure the detection devices will operate but that does not ensure the preaction system will function properly when a fire occurs.

25-254 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.4.3.2.2 (Log # 180)

25-255 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.4.3.2.5 and 13.4.4.2.4 (New) (Log # 262)

25-256 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 30 Negative: 3 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.4.3.2.6 (Log # 166)

Negative

Elvove, J. Though I would prefer to remove this entire section as proposed by 25-257, given 25-257 was rejected, accepting this proposal which limits the 3 year trip test to only double-interlocking systems would be a small compromise.

Fantauzzi, J. This amendment will impose air pressure leakage tests on existing systems that are not required on the initial test of new systems per NFPA 13.

Leavitt, R. The original proposal should be accepted. This requirement is, in my opinion, a test looking for a problem in which there is no evidence that one exists. I reiterate my argument that we are requiring a test for non-interlock and single interlock preaction systems that is not required during the original system acceptance and I am not aware of any problems with these systems exhibiting problems with integrity.

Affirmative with Comment

Feld, J. 1) Non-interlocked preaction systems operate upon activation of a detector or sprinkler. For the system to sense the activation of a sprinkler the system piping must be under air pressure.

2) Single interlocked preaction systems having more than 20 sprinklers require supervision of the piping - air supervision.

3) Double interlocked systems require air supervision of piping

Therefore only single interlocked systems with 20 or fewer sprinklers are not required to have air supervision. Some of these systems have air supervision giving the owner some added assurance of pipe integrity. Those they do not have any air supervision will not be equipped with a compressor and thus will not be capable of an air test (at least not easily so). Therefore, testing for air supervision is reasonable. The NFPA 25 test is either a 2 hour or 4 hour test every 3 years. This is far less than the acceptance test of 24 hours. Owners who desire a preaction system believe that these systems will prevent an accidental discharge from a spurious activation of a sprinkler or a leaking pipe. A periodic air test is a cheap way of maintaining the system to this end.

The low air alarm is of value only where there is a fire alarm system which is connected to a supervising station which is not always provided. A failed low pressure alarm may result in the compressor running until it also fails.

Detection devices can be pneumatic

The Committee Statement is misleading. A 40 psi/2 Hour test is one option that is required by NFPA 25.

Field, G. I agree with the Committee's action to reject the proposal and continue to require air testing on preaction systems. We have found small unsupervised preaction systems covering sensitive electronic equipment with damaged piping causing water damage upon a false system trip. An air test would have discovered damaged piping and eliminated water damage. This comment also applies to 25-258 (Log #329).

25-257 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 28 Negative: 5 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.4.3.2.6 (Log # 245)

Negative

Drysdale, M. The low air pressure alarm is adequate.

Elvove, J. This should be accepted as there's no reason to subject all pre-action systems to the 3 year trip test. It's not a one-size-fits-all.

Larrimer, P. There is no reason for this test. It was never justified.

Leavitt, R. I agree with the submitter in principle. I would rather see no preaction air test requirement (including double-interlock systems) rather than all preaction systems subjected to it.

Saidi, J. We should not subject all pre-action systems to this requirement. The submitters' proposal should have been accepted.

Affirmative with Comment

Feld, J. See my Comment on Affirmative on Proposal 25-256 (Log #166).

25-258 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 29 Negative: 4 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.4.3.2.6 (Log # 329)

Document # 25

Negative

Drysdale, M. The low air pressure alarm is adequate.

Elvove, J. See my comment on 25-257.

Larrimer, P. There is no reason for this test. It was never justified.

Leavitt, R. See my Explanation of Negative on Proposal 25-257 (Log #245).

Affirmative with Comment

Feld, J. See my Comment on Affirmative on Proposal 25-256 (Log #166).

25-259 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.4.3.2.7 (Log # 181)

25-260 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.4.4.1.1 (Log # 267)

25-261 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.4.4.1.2 (Log # 287)

25-262 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.4.4.2.2.4 (New) (Log # 182)

25-263 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.4.4.2.9 (Log # 270)

25-264 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.5.2 (Log # 5)

25-265 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.5.6.2 and 13.5.6.2.1 (Log # 94)

25-266 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.5.7.1 (Log # 183)

Negative

Underwood, D. Have submitter resubmit at ROC as this does not with code of monthly pump testing.

25-267 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.5.7.2 (Log # 184)

Document # 25

Negative

Sheppard, J. Does not track for monthly electrical testing. Should resubmit for ROC stage.

Underwood, D. See 25-266.

25-268 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
13.6.1.2, 13.6.1.2.1, and 13.6.1.2.2 (Log # 283)

25-269 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
13.6.1.3 (New) (Log # 185)

Negative

Elvoe, J. This is a new requirement that increases the cost of ITM. There should be data substantiating a need for this requirement rather than having it based upon inspection frequencies of other devices. This committee can't keep adding new inspection and testing requirements with specific frequencies without technical substantiation.

Larrimer, P. Testing the backflow preventer is outside the scope of this standard. The forward flow tests already required ensure that the backflow preventer does not prevent the water based system from working. Whether it prevents backflow or not is not a issue with respect to NFPA 25 systems and this requirement should be left others who are responsible for preventing backflow into the potable water system.

Affirmative with Comment

Field, G. Add the requirement of a 5 year internal inspection to Table 13.1.1.2 under Backflow Prevention Assemblies Inspection.

Backflow Prevention Assemblies

Backflow Prevention Assemblies	5 years	13.6.1.3
--------------------------------	---------	----------

25-270 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
13.6.2.1 (Log # 266)

Affirmative with Comment

Field, G. Change the reference under Committee Statement from 25-44 (Log #CP15) to 25-271 (Log #CP15).

25-271 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
13.6.2.1, 13.6.2.2 (New) (Log # CP15)

Negative

Ray, R. This proposal should have been accepted in principle: the wording "at a minimum flow rate" is confusing and should be reworded.

25-272 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
13.6.2.1.1 (Log # 121)

25-273 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.6.2.1.3 (Log # 122)

25-274 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.6.2.1.4 (Log # 285)

25-275 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.6.2.2 (Log # 284)

25-276 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.6.3.1 (Log # 167)

25-277 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.6.3.2 (Log # 168)

25-278 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.7.1 (Log # 8)

25-279 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 30 Negative: 3 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

13.7.5 (New) (Log # 276)

Negative

Drysdale, M. No substantiation was provided to support this as being an issue in practice or to support the 5 yr. test frequency.

Elvove, J. Yet another new requirement. See my comment on 25-269.

Larrimer, P. The justification is not adequate for mandating this test.

Affirmative with Comment

Field, G. Add the requirement for Testing of Fire Department Piping every 5 years per new section 13.7.5 to Table 13.1.1.2.

25-280 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Chapter 14 (Log # 288)

Negative

Ray, R. This proposal should have been accepted. The submitter is 100% correct in his substantiation - chapter 14 includes more than just "Obstruction Investigations" and hence the title needs to be revised.

25-281 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 29 Negative: 4 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Chapter 14 (Log # 330)

Negative**Fleming, R.** We believe the 5-year random internal inspection is useful and should be retained.**Myers, T.** Internal exam should not be removed. There has been sufficient evidence of sufficient evidence of internal issues from pipe condition, blockage etc. to keep this as requirement. An internal pipe blockage etc. could act just as a close valve making system not operate. Insurance Services Office rates a building as non-sprinklered if it does not have internal pipe exams on dry systems. They have over 600,000 commercial buildings in their system so must know something about these potential problems.**Ray, R.** This proposal should have been rejected. Verbage regarding performing inspections looking for obstructions in piping have been in the standard since its inception in 1992 (though in chapter 2 at the time, and worded slightly differently in some editions). The basic subject at hand and the potential ramifications to the proper operation of a fire sprinkler system has been clearly known and understood by the fire protection community for many many years. I am in possession of the March 1959 edition of "Internal Cleaning of Sprinkler Pipe" published by the National Board of Fire Underwriters (first published in 1941). The committee erred greatly in accepting removal of this required inspection at 5 year intervals. At my firm we have found numerous times that systems are loaded with debris (from whatever source); this debris has ranged from pipe coupons, sludge, scale, and work gloves to chunks of asphalt, none of which were preceded by any of the 14 "triggers" contained in Chapter 14. We are currently investigating a building that contains 6000 pendent ESFR sprinklers on 3" branchlines where we found pieces of asphalt as large as my fist and rocks in the piping.**Victor, T.** The committee should reject this proposal and consider accepting during the comment phase the other proposals submitted to further clarify the requirements of this chapter. Internal pipe inspections that have been performed since the requirement was first introduced in the 2002 edition have uncovered numerous hidden problems in systems from MIC, to rust and scale, to sludge, to other obstructing materials that could lead to clogged sprinklers or pipes and system failures or partial system failures. These problems were not identified by one of the triggers that require an obstruction investigation, but were only revealed by an internal pipe inspection.

The submitters claim that the cost to perform this inspection is onerous is not creditable. First, every system in a building doesn't need to be inspected as the submitter claims. The provision was added in the 2011 edition that every other system is required to be inspected every 5 years as long as there aren't any problems found. Second, the cost of performing the 5 year internal pipe inspection on a system is not as high as the submitter claims, if the other 5 year inspection requirements of NFPA 25 were being performed at the same time. Did the submitter get two proposals, one to perform the 5 year internal inspection of all check valves, strainers, filters and restricting orifices, and an additional proposal to perform the internal pipe inspection at the same time? I would assume no, since the submitter's cost estimates were not presented by breaking out these two costs separately. The requirement to internally inspect all check valves, alarm valves, strainers, filters, and orifices every 5 years has been in the standard since the first edition in 1992, and is not being deleted, and should be considered when performing a differential cost estimate.

The 5 year internal pipe inspection is needed to pro actively determine the internal condition of system piping to comply with the purpose of NFPA 25 to "ensure a reasonable degree of protection for life and property from fire", and must remain in the standard.

Document # 25

25-282 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Chapter 14, Title (Log # 145)

25-283 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

14.2 (Log # 140)

25-284 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

14.2.1 (Log # 141)

Negative

Ray, R. This proposal should have been accepted. The committee statement relying on these inspections being deleted by incorrectly accepting a previous proposal 25-281 (Log #330) is invalid; the submitter is correct in allowing an alternative means of performing the inspection.

25-285 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

14.2.1 (Log # 260)

25-286 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

14.2.1, 14.2.1.4, 14.2.2, and A.14.2.1 (Log # 257)

25-287 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

14.2.1.2 (Log # 235)

25-288 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

14.2.1.2 (Log # 236)

25-289 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

14.2.1.5 (Log # 142)

Negative

Ray, R. This proposal should have been accepted. The committee statement relying on these inspections being deleted by incorrectly accepting a previous proposal 25-281 (Log #330) is invalid; the submitter is correct in defining the location of the branch line that should be inspected - the branch line equipped with the inspector's test connection is periodically flushed clean by other inspection and testing activities.

25-290 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

14.2.1.6 (New) (Log # 173)

25-291 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

14.2.1.7 (New) (Log # 273)

Document # 25

Negative

Ray, R. This proposal should have been accepted. The committee statement relying on these inspections being deleted by incorrectly accepting a previous proposal (log 330) is invalid; the submitter is correct in allowing an alternative means of performing the inspection.

25-292 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

14.2.2.1 (Log # 243)

Negative

Ray, R. This proposal should have been rejected. Verbage regarding performing inspections looking for obstructions in piping have been in the standard since its inception in 1992 (though in chapter 2 at the time, and worded slightly differently in some editions). The basic subject at hand and the potential ramifications to the proper operation of a fire sprinkler system is has been clearly known and understood by the fire protection community for many many years. I am in possession of the March 1959 edition of "Internal Cleaning of Sprinkler Pipe" published by the National Board of Fire Underwriters (first published in 1941). The committee erred greatly in accepting removal of this required inspection at 5 year intervals. At my firm we have found numerous times that systems are loaded with debris (from whatever source); this debris has ranged from pipe coupons, sludge, scale, and work gloves to chunks of asphalt, none of which were preceded by any of the 14 "triggers" contained in Chapter 14. We are currently investigating a building that contains 6000 pendent ESFR sprinklers on 3" branchlines where we found pieces of asphalt as large as my fist and rocks in the piping.

25-293 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

14.3(13) (Log # 237)

25-294 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

14.3.1 (Log # CP14)

25-295 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

14.3.1(1) (Log # 136)

25-296 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 26 Negative: 7 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

14.3.2.2 (Log # 143)

Negative

Drysdale, M. The requirement to examine each cross main and 10% of the branch lines are arbitrary quantities that were not supported by any substantiation.

Elvoe, J. This change adds a significant cost to an obstruction investigation without any technical justification. This is supposed to be a minimum standard; if an obstruction investigation is warranted, the four existing requirements are a good start. Should further examination be warranted as a result of examining the aforementioned four points, then more locations can be examined.

Field, G. I am voting negative because I believe 10% of branch lines is excessive. One branch line per cross main would be more than adequate.

Document # 25

Larrimer, P. I don't think the list of four items is necessary. If there is a trigger that identifies a need to investigate, the triggers will lead a "qualified" person to look for the obstructed material in the appropriate locations. The arbitrary "ten percent" of branch lines and "each" cross main is not justified as mandatory language. It may be more but likely less.

In addition, the new language is confusing. It appears to suggest that an internal examination be done on the branch lines of the yard mains.

If this remains, I suggest that it be changed to read. Internal examination shall be performed in the yard main piping or at the following ~~four~~ points in the affected system:

Saidi, J. This change increases cost significantly without adequate substantiation. Alternative approaches should be explored.

Sheppard, J. Where are statistics to support proposed change?

Underwood, D. Where are the statistics to show this code change is required. There were only 18 total votes cast on this change.

25-297 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
15.4.2 (Log # 289)

25-298 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
15.5.2 (Log # 6)

Affirmative with Comment

Elvove, J. Editorial. The committee meeting action is incorrect. The word "required" was dropped, not "request".

25-299 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
15.5.2(3) (Log # 290)

Negative

Sheppard, J. Issues in proposal already covered in preceding paragraph (2).

Underwood, D. Covered in 15.5.2(2).

Affirmative with Comment

Elvove, J. The committee meeting action is incorrect. This proposal was accepted in principle, given the change made to the original proposal.

Larrimer, P. This should be recorded as ACCEPT IN PRINCIPLE. I assume that the modified language that the committee provided was accepted and not the original proposal.

25-300 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
15.6.1 (Log # 32)

Negative

Elvove, J. The purpose of the annex note is to give examples of what constitutes an emergency impairment. Additional language is open-ended and makes the existing text less clear.

Document # 25

25-301 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.1.1.3.1 (Log # 186)

25-302 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.4.1.1 (Log # 187)

25-303 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.4.1.1 and A.4.1.2 (Log # 169)

25-304 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.4.1.1.1.1 (Log # 188)

25-305 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.4.1.2 (Log # 189)

25-306 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.4.1.2 (Log # 299)

25-307 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.4.1.2 (Log # 313)

25-308 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.4.1.4 (Log # 258)

Negative

Elvove, J. Given the scope of NFPA 25 does include hazard evaluations, the proposed text is NOT in excess of the standard. Hence, there's really no reason for this fairly benign change to be rejected. The annex note simply proposes to make it clear that it's permitted for inspections to note design and installation deficiencies but if so noted, to do so separately from ITM deficiencies.

Saidi, J. The submitter's proposal was in line with intent of 25 and should be accepted.

25-309 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 30 Negative: 3 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Figure A.4.3.1 (Log # 251)

Negative

Elvove, J. The first sentence in A.4.3.1 that references Figure A.4.3.1 has nothing to do with paragraph 4.3.1 in the body of the standard, as 4.3.1 pertains to ITM records while this form asks questions pertaining to the hazard that the owner is mandated to fill out. But more importantly, who's supposed to review this form and what actions are supposed to be taken as a result of a "yes" or "no" answer? If this is supposed to be a form for owners, why have most owners on the committee rejected this in the past?

Larrimer, P. Agree with submitter. The annex form should be deleted as there is no requirement for its use. It serves no purpose in the standard.

Document # 25

Saidi, J. Figure A.4.3.1 should be deleted. No value to the owners such as myself.

25-310 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
Figure A.4.3.1 B. (Log # 194)

25-311 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
A.5.2.1.1.x (New) (Log # 62)

25-312 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
A.5.2.1.1.6 (Log # 79)

25-313 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
A.5.2.2.x (New) (Log # 63)

25-314 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
A.5.2.3.x (New) (Log # 64)

25-315 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
A.5.2.4.1 (Log # 65)

25-316 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
A.5.2.6 (Log # 106)

25-317 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
A.5.3.1.2 (Log # 123)

25-318 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
A.5.3.2.2 (New) (Log # 66)

25-319 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
A.5.5.2 (New) (Log # 77)

25-320 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0
A.6.3.4.2 (New) (Log # 67)

Document # 25

25-321 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.6.5.3 (New) (Log # 78)

25-322 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.8.3.3.1 (Log # CP4)

25-323 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.8.3.3.5 (Log # 53)

Negative

Elvoe, J. NFPA 20 doesn't say that loss of phase and phase reversal need to be transmitted as individual signals to a remote location in all cases; it only requires that these signals be individually distinguished remotely when the controller isn't constantly attended.

Larrimer, P. The proposal should be accepted. The alarms for loss of phase and phase reversal, while required, are permitted to be sent remotely as a common alarm and are not required to be sent remotely as individually annunciated points when they are individually annunciated at the controller. This proposal just adds a loss of phase and phase reversal to the list that is already provided.

25-324 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.8.3.5.1 (Log # 133)

25-325 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Figure A.8.3.5.3(1)(a) and (b) (Log # 54)

25-326 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.8.4.2 (Log # 55)

25-327 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.8.8.4.2.1 (New) (Log # 52)

Affirmative with Comment

Elvoe, J. I believe this proposal suggested adding language to paragraph 8.4.2, even though it incorrectly references 8.8.4.2.1. Therefore, the proposal should be sequenced after 25-198, and not in the annex.

25-328 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.9.2.6.1.2 (New) (Log # 130)

25-329 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.9.3.6 (New) (Log # 126)

Document # 25

25-330 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.13.2.5 (Log # 27)

25-331 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.13.2.5(6) (Log # 190)

25-332 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.13.2.7.3 (New) (Log # 68)

25-333 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.13.3.3.2 (Log # 191)

25-334 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.13.6.2.1 (Log # 124)

25-335 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.13.6.2.1 (Log # 193)

25-336 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.13.6.2.1 (Log # 286)

25-337 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.13.7.2 (New) (Log # 170)

25-338 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 1 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.14.2.1.4 (Log # 172)

Negative

Larrimer, P. The action on this proposal should have been accept in principle. The change made to chapter 14 will require plastic pipe to be investigated when a trigger in 14.3.1 indicates that there may be obstructions. See item (e) of the substantiation to 25-281.

25-339 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.14.2.1.6 (Log # 174)

25-340 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 31 Negative: 2 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.14.3.1(4) (Log # 144)

Negative

Document # 25

Sheppard, J. Why reverse committee action? Existing 14.3.1(4) is adequate.

Underwood, D. Why are reversing ourselves from the last printing. What is written is adequate.

25-341 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.15.6.1 (New) (Log # 97)

Affirmative with Comment

Elvoe, J. Include the exhibit proposed for A.15.6.1 in the ROP (and ballot) so the public (and committee) knows what this change involves

25-342 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

A.15.7 (New) (Log # 275)

Affirmative with Comment

Elvoe, J. The first paragraph in A.15.7 recommends that a knowledgeable contractor perform work when anyone who's qualified can do this. Even though this is annex material, language must be clear to permit owners the option of using in-house personnel who are appropriately qualified.

Underwood, D. Responsible and knowledgeable contractor should be (qualified person) as shown elsewhere in the code.

25-343 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Annex D (Log # 7)

25-344 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 30 Negative: 3 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

D.4.1 (Log # 175)

Negative

Elvoe, J. No substantiation was provided for removing the option of using galvanized piping.

Sheppard, J. To which studies is the submitter referring?

Underwood, D. What studies. What happened to stainless steel.

25-345 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 29 Negative: 4 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Annex E (Log # 171)

Negative

Drysdale, M. The list is subject to much misinterpretation.

Elvoe, J. Remove the list since there no longer are critical or non-critical deficiencies defined in the body of the standard. Moreover, the distinction is arbitrary and could thus be misinterpreted by those trying to use the table.

Sheppard, J. I believe we omitted the terms "critical" and "non critical" from the standard text.

Underwood, D. Weren't critical and non-critical eliminated.

Document # 25

25-346 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Table E.1 (Log # 293)

25-347 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 32 Negative: 0 Abstain: 1 Not Returned: 0

E.1 and Table A.4.1.4 (Log # 241)

Abstain

Elvoe, J. I am unable to vote on this issue as I cannot ascertain the changes that were made to Annex E, since they are not specifically indicated in the ballot package. Moreover, the table makes reference to the 2008 edition of NFPA 25.

25-348 Eligible To Vote:33 Affirmative: 33 Negative: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Returned: 0

Annex X (New) (Log # 246)

Affirmative with Comment

Feld, J. The Committee Statement needs to add that the proposal does not include specific language for adoption in NFPA 25. The language provided is for NFPA 70B. Values for the variables used in the proposal must be verified. For example, the MTBF of a dry pipe valve, or a deluge valve, or a diesel driven fire pump, etc. must be provided and must be verifiable. Verifiable values for all fire protection system components must be provided.