



## National Fire Protection Association

1 Batterymarch Park, Quincy, MA 02169-7471  
Phone: 617-770-3000 • Fax: 617-770-0700 • [www.nfpa.org](http://www.nfpa.org)

### MEMORANDUM

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

**FROM:** Elena Carroll, Administrator, Technical Projects

**DATE:** February 17, 2015

**SUBJECT:** NFPA 25 FD TC Ballot Circulation (A2016 cycle)

---

The February 13, 2015 date for receipt of the NFPA 25 First Draft ballot has passed.

The preliminary First Draft ballot results are shown on the attached report.

**34 Members Eligible to Vote**

**5 Ballots Not Returned** (Andress, Dagenais, Mitchell, Petrus, Saidi)

In accordance with the NFPA *Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards*, attached are reasons for negative votes for review so you may change your ballot if you wish. Abstentions and affirmative comments are also included. Ballots received from alternate members are not included unless the ballot from the principal member was not received.

If you wish to change your vote, the change must be received at NFPA on or **February 24, 2015**. Members who have not returned a ballot may do so now. **Such changes should be submitted through the [NFPA Vote.net Ballot Site](http://NFPA.Vote.net).**

The return of ballots is required by the *Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards*.

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

Results by Revision

TRUE

[FR-10, Global Input, See FR-10](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Affirmative	28	
Affirmative with Comment	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Negative	0	
Abstain	0	

TRUE

[FR-109, Global Input, See FR-109](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Affirmative	28	
Affirmative with Comment	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Negative	0	
Abstain	0	

TRUE

[FR-126, Global Input, See FR-126](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Affirmative	28	
Affirmative with Comment	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Negative	0	
Abstain	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

TRUE

[FR-2, Global Input, See FR-2](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	2	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Richard M. Ray		In chapter 10, what is the strange table shown after the verbiage in section 10.5.3?
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

TRUE

[FR-99, Global Input, See FR-99](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	25	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	2	
Russell B. Leavitt		I agree that tagging guidance is a good addition to the standard but I do not agree with the suggested tags. My concerns can be addressed during the comment stage.
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	2	
David W. Frable		The committee statement states that “many” jurisdictions utilized a color-coded system status tagging program; however, no data regarding these “many” jurisdictions has been provided to the Technical Committee for review. In addition, the overall goal of the tagging program is questionable and not all jurisdictions adopt all the requirements within NFPA 25, therefore the purpose of this new Annex material may be moot. In addition, 5 different colors for tagging seems excessive. Also, an issue regarding having the same Contractor that issues a tag being responsible for correcting an identified problem needs to be addressed. Based on these reasons, it is believed that the current proposed text in Annex F for a System Tagging Program is not ready to be included in the 2017 edition of NFPA 25.
Richard M. Ray		I am opposed to tagging as it is my opinion that it has no positive effect on improving the performance of fire sprinkler systems. Hanging a piece of paper on a system riser will do absolutely nothing towards achieving the end goal of this entire standard: getting systems inspected & tested and getting deficiencies addressed and putting systems in good operational order. Who will see these tags? In most jurisdictions fire prevention bureaus’ staffing has been cut severely – the 5 person bureau of old is now the 1 part time person bureau of today. Many AHJs MIGHT get the opportunity to visit the buildings in their jurisdiction once per year, MAYBE. So when will they see these tags? Maybe not for 364 days after the tag was put in place. IF the intent of this revision is to somehow communicate to an AHJ the results of an inspection and/or test, the BETTER solution is to require that the reports of inspection & testing be forwarded to the authority having jurisdiction. When I read the proposed revision it makes me realize that the submitter has a desire to treat fire sprinkler systems like fire extinguishers: “just look for the tag & if it is there, it must be ok”. Nothing could be further from the truth.
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-1, Section No. 1.1.5, See FR-1</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	1	
		<p>NFPA 25 should not try to address NFPA 13D systems in Chapter 16 when those requirements are already specifically identified in other codes or standards. The NFPA 101 Board and Care Technical Committee selected the items that they wanted to use from NFPA 25 based on the edition of NFPA 25 that was in effect at the time that they made the changes to NFPA 101. The NFPA 25 paragraphs that are referenced by NFPA 101 in Chapter 16 are referenced to the PREVIOUS EDITION of NFPA 25. If the NFPA 25 committee changes the paragraphs that are referenced by the NFPA 101 technical committee (or by any other committee for that matter) then it is no longer the NFPA 101 technical committee that is establishing the requirements. Therefore, the information in NFPA 25 would no longer be "extracted". If Chapter 16 is to be used, the previous edition of NFPA 25 must be referenced in the applicable publications of Chapter 2 and a note must be made to state that the NFPA 25 requirements referenced in Chapter 16 of NFPA 25 are to the paragraphs in the previous edition of NFPA 25. This will allow those that are performing the ITM to have the correct edition of NFPA 25 so that they know the actual requirements intended by the NFPA 101 technical committee. The ITM folks will have to carry two editions of NFPA 25 as a minimum to know the requirements in Chapter 16.</p>
Peter A. Larrimer		
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-25, Section No. 1.3.1, See FR-25</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	26	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	2	
		<p>Strongly disagree with this concept. This code change circumvents the local jurisdiction's code adoption process as well as how local jurisdictions evaluate alternate means and methods and equivalencies. ITM Contractor's must be held accountable for all the requirements adopted by a jurisdiction just like Architects, Engineers, and other Contractors are held accountable performing work in a jurisdiction. NFPA Standards should not be addressing ITM Contractor liability protection issues as stated in the Committee Statement. The AHJ for the local jurisdiction is responsible for enforcement of the local jurisdiction's requirements, not the ITM Contractor or members of the NFPA 25 Technical Committee. It is not the prerogative of NFPA 25 to dictate which edition of NFPA 25 is to be used in any State or jurisdiction. Many (perhaps most or all) states have specific adoption processes. This proposal usurps the authority of State and local governments. NFPA 14 rejected a similar proposal in their First Revision as follows: "This is a deligation of legislative perogative and that legislative perogative cannot be deligated to an outside organization." (sic)</p>
David W. Frable		
<b>Abstain</b>	0	
James M. Feld		

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

TRUE

[FR-26, Section No. 2.1, See FR-26](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	26	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	3	
Russell B. Leavitt		The last sentence in 2.1.1.1 "this standard" is potentially confusing. My concern can be addressed during the comment stage.
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
William E. Koffel		The last sentence should be deleted from 2.1.1.1. The provisions of NFPA 25 typically apply to existing systems and as such, a statement should not be required stating what is required to apply to existing systems. Instead, and as done in the case of antifreeze, the standard can identify any provisions that apply either only for "new" systems or newly installed components or materials(such as antifreeze).
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

TRUE

[FR-133, Section No. 2.4, See FR-133](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

TRUE

[FR-69, Section No. 3.3.25, See FR-69](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	1	
Russell B. Leavitt		I see no clarification by restricting the definition. The title of the standard includes Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance. Maintaining a system includes correcting or repairing deficiencies and impairments.
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

TRUE

[FR-77, Section No. 3.6.2, See FR-77](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-96, Sections 4.1.6, 4.1.7, See FR-96</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	23	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	4	
J. William Sheppard		Still believe this section is beyond the scope of document.
Matthew G. Drysdale Darrell W. Underwood		If the changes to 4.1.6 are approved, the statements in 4.1.7 appear redundant and could be deleted. Acceptable text at this time.
William E. Koffel		The changes made to 4.1.6 seem to bring 4.1.6 and 4.1.7 together. During the Public Comment period the two sections should be reviewed and revised as deemed appropriate.
<b>Negative</b>	2	
		The proposed changes to this Section appear to be an attempt by the Technical Committee to expand the scope of NFPA 25. Having NFPA 25, Standard for the Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance of Water-based Fire Protection Systems become the trigger to mandate periodic inspections of the building by the property owner seems illogical. NFPA 25 is a Standard, not a Code or for that matter, a Building and/or Fire Code. In addition, the proposed text for the so-called "simple" questionnaires appears to be focused primarily on warehouse type facilities and storage occupancies and not on business, health care, educational, etc. occupancies; however, all of these occupancies must comply. Also, no guidance has been provided to address what happens to the completed questionnaire? Lastly, the proposed new text states "Where the evaluation required by 4.1.6 reveals that the installed system is inadequate to protect the building or hazard in question, the property owner or designated representative shall make the required corrections." However, the new text does not address who or whom conducts the review of the questionnaire to determine if any corrective actions are necessary.
David W. Frable		
		The proposed changes need to be refined to make it clear that the evaluation in 4.1.6 is to be performed before the change is made and the evaluation in 4.1.7 is to be made after a change is discovered that wasn't previously evaluated. The new language in 4.1.6 doesn't make it clear that this evaluation is being performed before any changes have been made. In fact it implies the opposite.
Terry L. Victor		
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-74, New Section after 4.1.9.2, See FR-74</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	26	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	2	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
		The revision should be re-stated as follows: An antifreeze information sign shall be placed NEAR the antifreeze system main valve, which indicates the manufacture type and brand of the antifreeze solution, the concentration by volume of the antifreeze solution used, and the volume of the antifreeze solution used in the system. There is no need for the sign to be actually located ON the valve.
Richard M. Ray		
<b>Negative</b>	1	
		Agree with concept. However, the information that is mandated to be on the antifreeze information sign needs to be addressed by NFPA 13 and not NFPA 25.
David W. Frable		
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	2	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
William E. Koffel		The language in 4.6.6.6.1 seems to imply that visible annunciation of the supervisory condition is not required.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

**TRUE**

[FR-97, Section No. 4.7, See FR-97](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

**TRUE**

[FR-70, Section No. 4.8, See FR-70](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	1	
Russell B. Leavitt		See comments for negative vote on FR-69
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

**TRUE**

[FR-62, Section No. 5.1.1.2, See FR-62](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-56, Section No. 5.1.2, See FR-56</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-72, Sections 5.2.1.1.1, 5.2.1.1.2, See FR-72</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	26	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	2	
Russell B. Leavitt		The phrase "detrimental to sprinkler performance" is unenforceable. The revised annex language provides the necessary guidance.
Richard M. Ray		The revisions to 5.2.1.1.1 should be struck. Regarding the wording "corrosion detrimental to sprinkler performance", until NICET or their equivalent begins to successfully test an inspector's knowledge of this AND until a sprinkler head manufacturer will clearly state "some corrosion on our heads is A-OK with us", I cannot support this revision. Inspections & tests should be very BLACK and WHITE – not gray. The flow switch either worked or it didn't; the main drain test results either dropped 10% or they didn't; the sprinkler either has corrosion on it, or it doesn't. The angle that the committee seems to rely on is "let UL test them and if they test ok, then leave the heads" – BUT who determines which heads are sent to UL to test?? Inspectors are simply not trained to make these judgment calls (and determine "worst case condition") and I have yet to hear a head manufacturer say "some corrosion on our heads is OK". The same goes for "loading".
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-4, New Section after 5.2.1.1.2, See FR-4</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	1	
Russell B. Leavitt		Adding specific language regarding replacement criteria will create a undesirable precedence. Specific criteria is the domain of the appropriate installation standard. Also so comment for negative vote on FR-6.
<b>Abstain</b>	0	



## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-6, Section No. 5.2.1.1.6, See FR-6</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	26	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	2	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Richard M. Ray		The revision should be re-written as follows: Escutcheons and coverplates for recessed, flush, and concealed sprinklers shall be REQUIRED TO BE replaced with their listed escutcheon or coverplate if found missing during the inspection.
<b>Negative</b>	1	
		FR-6 is an example of the concerns expressed by my comments regarding my negative vote on FR-4.
Russell B. Leavitt		Why not state that damaged control valves must be replaced with listed valves or that painted sprinklers must be replaced with the same RTI or temperature rating, and so forth.
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-100, Section No. 5.2.2.1, See FR-100</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-101, Section No. 5.2.4.1, See FR-101</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	2	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
		During an inspection activity, how does one verify that a gauge is operable? Note that the language in FR-102 (Chapter 6) does not contain the phrase. Is the inspection activity to be different for sprinkler systems as compared to standpipe systems?
William E. Koffel		
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

### TRUE

[FR-7, Section No. 5.2.4.3, See FR-7](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	2	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.

The submitter has offered no technical data to support this change other than that he feels that it “seems excessive”. There is NO DOUBT that failure of the air supply on a dry system will result in the flooding of the system and a flow alarm. I wonder if the fire service would embrace potentially increasing the amount of unwanted alarms. Also, flooding of the system may be no big deal in July, but what if it is February and the temperature in the attic is -5F (not unusual in many parts of the world including in the US). The water might freeze if not drained almost immediately. If allowed to freeze, now what have we got on our hands? A giant mess and an impaired system. As to the submitter’s last question asking “that’s how we treat wet systems; why not treat dry systems the same way?”, the industry has recognized for YEARS that dry systems need more care and attention than wet systems – that’s a basic fact. Equating the two is a HUGE mistake. Ignoring for a moment the flawed substantiation the revision has merit in that it may incent owners to supervise the air pressure on dry pipe systems.

Richard M. Ray		
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

### TRUE

[FR-75, New Section after 5.2.9, See FR-75](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	2	
Russell B. Leavitt		The word "present" should be replaced with "provided" to match the text for hydraulic information signs and system information signs.
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

### TRUE

[FR-16, Section No. 5.3.3.5, See FR-16](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	2	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Roland J. Huggins		The entire section 5.3.3 was deleted verses just 5.3.3.5
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-76, Section No. 5.3.4, See FR-76</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	2	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Roland J. Huggins		Wrong reference in 5.3.4(1)(b), 5.3.4(4), and 5.3.4(5). They reference 5.3.4.6 that has been deleted. It should be the renumbered 5.3.4.4
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-45, Section No. 5.4.2.4, See FR-45</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	26	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	1	
Russell B. Leavitt		See comments for my negative vote on FR-44.
<b>Abstain</b>	1	
Matthew G. Drysdale		See addition to Ch 13

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-9, Section No. 5.5.1, See FR-9</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-27, Section No. 6.1.1.2, See FR-27</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-64, Sections 6.1.2, 6.1.3, See FR-64</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-57, Section No. 6.1.4, See FR-57</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-102, Section No. 6.2.2.1, See FR-102</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-65, New Section after 6.2.3.2, See FR-65</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	25	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	4	
Russell B. Leavitt		For consistency, I believe that the requirements for hose connections should be located only in Chapter 13.
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
William E. Koffel		Paragraph 6.2.4.2 seems out of place and is addressed elsewhere in the standard.
Terry L. Victor		I agree with removing the tables and putting the requirements in text form, but the language as written is confusing and doesn't identify what the correct condition is or what a deficiency is. During the 2nd draft the language should be changed to describe an acceptable condition, and anything else is a deficiency. For instance the charging requirement should read: "Hose connections shall be inspected annually for the following conditions: (1)Valve cap(s) AREN'T missing or damaged"
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-28, Section No. 6.3.1, See FR-28</a>		

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

**Vote Selection**

**Affirmative**  
**Affirmative with Comment**  
 Darrell W. Underwood  
**Negative**

**Votes   Comments**

27  
 1  
 Acceptable text at this time.  
 1

The issue of testing standpipe systems was debated during the last cycle culminating in a NITMAM intended to not test standpipes which end in a NFPA Membership vote of 15 to 107 against the motion. Clearly the NFPA Membership wants standpipe systems tested. NFPA 25 requires flow testing of hydrants, pumps, water spray, foam water, backflows, PRV's to ensure operability. NFPA 25 considers a water spray system protecting a transformer more important than a standpipe which a fire fighter relies upon to fight a fire. This is absolutely incredulous! Automatic standpipe systems are required in highrise buildings. Therefore, NFPA 25 will ensure the reliability of a standpipe for a firefighter fighting a fire on the 3rd floor of a high rise but not for the firefighter fighting a fire on the 7th floor of a non-highrise building. A statement at the 1st Draft meeting indicated that NFPA 14 was going to delete the testing requirement for standpipes. This statement was incorrect. The PI would leave acceptance testing up to the AHJ. 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 other modification, 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 and capable of supplying the proper flow at the proper pressure in order for firefighters to effectively fight a fire to save lives and property and protect the firefighters themselves. Only manual standpipes that are not a part of a combined system will be hydrostatically tested. Other manual standpipe systems will not be hydrostatically tested. Therefore, these systems will never undergo a test of any kind. My experience with acceptance testing of standpipe systems is that most exceed the calculated required pressure at the FDC by 5 to 20 psi. They typically do not get better with age. Corrosion or other obstructions will require greater pressures at the FDC. Fire departments need to know what pressure is needed to properly supply the system. It should not be a trial and error endeavor. Standpipe systems deserve better respect from NFPA standards.

James M. Feld  
**Abstain**

0

**TRUE**

[FR-58, Section No. 7.1.2, See FR-58](#)

**Vote Selection**

**Affirmative**  
**Affirmative with Comment**  
 Darrell W. Underwood  
**Negative**  
**Abstain**

**Votes   Comments**  
 28  
 1  
 Acceptable text at this time.  
 0  
 0

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

### TRUE

[FR-66, Sections 7.2.2.1.1, 7.2.2.1.2, See FR-66](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	26	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	3	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Terry L. Victor		I agree with removing the tables and putting the requirements in text form, but the language as written is confusing and doesn't identify what the correct condition is or what a deficiency is. During the 2nd draft the language should be changed to describe an acceptable condition, and anything else is a deficiency. For instance the charging requirement should read: "Piping shall be inspected for the following conditions: (1)FREE OF Leaks"
William E. Koffel		Paragraph 7.2.2.1.2.1 seems out of place and is addressed elsewhere in the standard.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

### TRUE

[FR-67, Section No. 7.2.2.3, See FR-67](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	26	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	3	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Terry L. Victor		I agree with removing the tables and putting the requirements in text form, but the language as written is confusing and doesn't identify what the correct condition is or what a deficiency is. During the 2nd draft the language should be changed to describe an acceptable condition, and anything else is a deficiency. For instance the charging requirement should read: "Mainline strainers shall be removed and inspected annually AND BE FREE OF EXCESSIVE plugging, fouling, and damaged and corroded parts."
William E. Koffel		Paragraph 7.2.2.3.3 seems out of place and is addressed elsewhere in the standard.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

### TRUE

[FR-29, Section No. 7.2.2.4, See FR-29](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	26	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	3	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Terry L. Victor		I agree with removing the tables and putting the requirements in text form, but the language as written is confusing and doesn't identify what the correct condition is or what a deficiency is. During the 2nd draft the language should be changed to describe an acceptable condition, and anything else is a deficiency. For instance the charging requirement should read: "Dry barrel and wall hydrants shall be inspected annually for the following conditions: (1) Accessible (2)* NO Presence of water or ice in the barrel" Also, move the following text to the annex: A.7.2.2.4(2) THE PRESENCE OF WATER OR ICE IN THE BARREL could indicate a faulty drain, a leaky hydrant valve, or high groundwater table"
William E. Koffel		Paragraph 7.2.2.4.1 seems out of place and is addressed elsewhere in the standard.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

### TRUE

[FR-30, Section No. 7.2.2.5, See FR-30](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	26	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	3	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Terry L. Victor		I agree with removing the tables and putting the requirements in text form, but the language as written is confusing and doesn't identify what the correct condition is or what a deficiency is. During the 2nd draft the language should be changed to describe an acceptable condition, and anything else is a deficiency. For instance the charging requirement should read: "Wet barrel hydrants shall be inspected annually and after each operation for the following conditions: (1) Accessible"
William E. Koffel		Paragraph 7.2.2.5.1 seems out of place and is addressed elsewhere in the standard.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

### TRUE

[FR-68, Sections 7.2.2.6, 7.2.2.7, See FR-68](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	26	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	3	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Terry L. Victor		I agree with removing the tables and putting the requirements in text form, but the language as written is confusing and doesn't identify what the correct condition is or what a deficiency is. During the 2nd draft the language should be changed to describe an acceptable condition, and anything else is a deficiency. For instance the charging requirement should read: "Monitor nozzles shall be inspected semiannually for the following conditions: (1) NO Leakage"
William E. Koffel		Paragraphs 7.2.2.6.1 and 7.2.2.7.1 seem out of place and are addressed elsewhere in the standard.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

### TRUE

[FR-78, Section No. 8.1.1.2, See FR-78](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	2	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
William E. Koffel		The Committee should use a consistent rationale for sequencing the activities in the table. Some of the revised tables are alphabetical by component and some, like this one, are not.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-79, Section No. 8.1.2, See FR-79</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	26	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
William E. Koffel		Table A.8.1.1.2 uses the phrase "visual inspection" and "inspect." The term "inspection" is a defined term. Many of the activities identified in the "inspect" column do not appear to be inspection activities.
<b>Negative</b>	2	
J. William Sheppard		Table in question is just as important as those left in the standard, especially as relates to fire pumps and water supply. If Table 8.1.2 is moved to Annex A, then it would render it totally useless and peoples lives would be endangered. All manufacturers (i.e. Cummins, Clarke, and Caterpillar) feel that the experts in fire protection should know how to take care of the critical equipment. As they do not publish the maintenance items for their engines.
Darrell W. Underwood		
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-59, Section No. 8.1.3, See FR-59</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-80, Section No. 8.2.2, See FR-80</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	25	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	3	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Terry L. Victor		I agree with removing the tables and putting the requirements in text form, but the language as written is confusing and doesn't identify what the correct condition is or what a deficiency is. During the 2nd draft the language should be changed to describe an acceptable condition, and anything else is a deficiency. For instance the charging requirement should read: "INSPECTIONS SHALL BE PERFORMED WEEKLY FOR THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: (1) Pump house conditions:"
William E. Koffel		The phrase "are determined" could be replaced with "are" or "are determined to be".
<b>Negative</b>	1	
Russell B. Leavitt		The addition of the phrase "are determined" are incorrect grammatically and can create confusion. The only revision should have been to add "electric motor fire pumps."
<b>Abstain</b>	0	



## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-85, Sections 8.3.1.1, 8.3.1.2, See FR-85</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	25	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	3	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Terry L. Victor		While I agree with most of the changes to this section as shown, the correction to 8.3.1.2 failed to remove the words "without recirculating water back to the pump suction". This needs to be corrected during the second draft. This section should read: "8.3.1.2* A no-flow test shall be conducted for electric motor-driven fire pumps on a test frequency in accordance with 8.3.1.2.1, 8.3.1.2.2, 8.3.1.2.3, or 8.3.1.2.4."
David B. Fuller		I believe it was the committee's intent to delete "without recirculating water back to pump suction" in 8.3.1.2
<b>Negative</b>	1	
Richard M. Ray		Regarding the revision to 8.3.1.2.1, how would the inspecting company know if the systems are beyond the pumping capacity of the fire dept; as currently written in the 2014 edition of 25, at least we are given a qualifier of the building being a "high rise" defined by NFPA as being 75' or over.
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-82, Section No. 8.3.2, See FR-82</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	26	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	2	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Richard M. Ray		In section 8.3.2.1.1 & 8.3.2.1.2, what in the heck does "weep" mean; also, in 8.3.2.1.1 how much water is "a significant quantity" and does the allowable quantity vary if we are looking at a 250gpm rated pump versus a 2500gpm rated pump?
<b>Negative</b>	1	
Russell B. Leavitt		Section 8.3.2.1.2 incorporates a design or installation review into the test. If a relief valve is present it is assumed that it was approved regardless of what standard was in effect at the time of the original installation. 8.3.2.1.2.1 is confusing and needs to be simplified if left in the standard.
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-86, Section No. 8.3.3, See FR-86</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	25	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	3	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Richard M. Ray		I feel that a note should be added to section 8.3.3.6.1.2 to the effect of requiring that the owner or owner's rep be consulted prior to commencement of the flow test to discuss the site drainage and condition of drainage receptacles. We have done annual flow tests and when we asked the owner's rep about drainage, they ask "Can't you see that giant trench drain? Let's get this test started." Upon conducting the test it was discovered that the trench drains were blocked with debris and a portion of the building took water.
Terry L. Victor		This is one of those cases where there should have been multiple first draft changes recorded rather than to lump all of these changes together. One sentence in particular was added that has huge implications and should have been separated out from the rest of the changes: "8.3.3.6(2)When a fire pump has multiple water supplies, each supply shall be tested independently at a minimum frequency of every third year." This is an unreasonable and unnecessary new requirement. In most situations there are multiple water supplies because they're needed to meet the system demand. It's very probable that when a single water supply is tested the pump won't pass. In addition, there isn't an established baseline for these multiple tests since NFPA 20 doesn't require testing of each single water supply. I was going to vote negative on this FR because of this new language, but don't want throw out all of the other positive changes made. This needs to be fixed in the second draft.
<b>Negative</b>	1	
Matthew G. Drysdale		My negative vote only applies to the sections commented on below: 8.3.3.6.2 should include fire water tanks in addition to reservoirs and drains. 8.3.3.6.3.3 should include the option of retesting through a flow meter. There was no evidence included in the committee statement indicating that flow meters were inferior to hoses and pitot tubes. Either measuring device can provide inaccurate results if they are not calibrated.
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-88, Section No. 8.3.4.3.3, See FR-88</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-89, Section No. 8.3.6.1, See FR-89</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	2	
Russell B. Leavitt		The only revision was the deletion of the title of NFPA 110. The submitter's public input was resolved so the committee substantiation does not address the actual revision made.
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-90, Section No. 8.3.7, See FR-90</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	1	
Russell B. Leavitt		It is unnecessary to have curves prepared. Recording and evaluation of the pump performance at no-flow, rated capacity, and 150 percent capacity is all that is needed.
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-91, Section No. 8.4, See FR-91</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	25	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	3	
J. William Sheppard		What is the Committee Statement?
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	1	
William E. Koffel		The form is not metric friendly. Probably the easiest way to do that would be a separate metric form.
Richard M. Ray		In 8.4.1.1, two items should be struck from 5): "Manufacturer's performance data" and "available pump discharge curves". The concern is how would the inspecting company have access to this data? Wouldn't the owner be the party in possession of this information?
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-92, Section No. 8.5.1, See FR-92</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	0	
<b>Negative</b>	2	
J. William Sheppard		See comment for FR-79 If Table 8.1.2 is moved to Annex A, then it would render it totally useless and peoples lives would be endangered. All manufacturers (i.e. Cummins, Clarke, and Caterpillar) feel that the experts in fire protection should know how to take care of the critical equipment. As they do not publish the maintenance items for their engines.
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-94, Section No. 8.6.1, See FR-94</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Affirmative	28	
Affirmative with Comment	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Negative	0	
Abstain	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-31, Section No. 9.1.1.2, See FR-31</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Affirmative	28	
Affirmative with Comment	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Negative	0	
Abstain	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-60, Section No. 9.1.2, See FR-60</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Affirmative	28	
Affirmative with Comment	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Negative	0	
Abstain	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-32, Section No. 9.2.3.1, See FR-32</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Affirmative	28	
Affirmative with Comment	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Negative	0	
Abstain	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-33, Section No. 9.3.3, See FR-33</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Affirmative	28	
Affirmative with Comment	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Negative	0	
Abstain	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-34, Section No. 9.3.4, See FR-34</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	1	
		If accepted, this revision will reduce the number of times that the high water temperature limit switch on a tank heating system is tested from 4 or 5 times per year to 1 time per year and with NO technical data to support such a reduction. The submitter's reason is flawed. We are all familiar with the myriad of "trade offs" that the building codes offer for installing a fire sprinkler system; until someone can produce a list of tradeoffs given for a fire alarm system, I see no need to "be consistent" with NFPA 72. Why do we want to jeopardize the great history of success that we have all enjoyed in regards to fire sprinkler systems just to be consistent with the testing requirements of systems that do little if anything about actually DOING SOMETHING about the fire? Considering the decades of success that fire sprinklers have exhibited, perhaps the better idea is to align 72 with 25 – not vice versa.....
Richard M. Ray		
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-35, Section No. 9.3.5, See FR-35</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	1	
		Again, the submitter's reason is flawed and no technical data has been provided to support cutting in half the number of times per year that we test these devices. Again, we are all familiar with the myriad of "trade offs" that the building codes offer for installing a fire sprinkler system; until someone can produce a list of tradeoffs given for a fire alarm system, I see no need to "be consistent" with NFPA 72. Why do we want to jeopardize the great history of success that we have all enjoyed in regards to fire sprinkler systems just to be consistent with the testing requirements of systems that do little if anything about actually DOING SOMETHING about the fire? Considering the decades of success that fire sprinklers have exhibited, perhaps the better idea is to align 72 with 25 – not vice versa.....
Richard M. Ray		
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-36, Section No. 9.5.1.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections], See FR-36</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-121, Section No. 9.6.1, See FR-121</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-21, Section No. 10.1.1.2, See FR-21</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-22, Section No. 10.1.5, See FR-22</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-23, Section No. 10.2.4.1, See FR-23</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	2	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time. I agree with removing the tables and putting the requirements in text form, but the language as written is confusing and doesn't identify what the correct condition is or what a deficiency is. During the 2nd draft the language should be changed to describe an acceptable condition, and anything else is a deficiency. For instance the charging requirement should read: "10.2.4.1* Piping and Fittings. System piping and fittings shall be inspected for the following CONDITIONS: (1) NO Mechanical damage (e.g., broken piping or cracked fittings)"
Terry L. Victor		
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

TRUE

[FR-24, Section No. 10.2.4.2, See FR-24](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Affirmative	27	
Affirmative with Comment	2	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Roland J. Huggins		This should say - SEISMIC braces verses just braces as discussed in the committee statement. This also correlates with action taken in the other chapters (such as FR-11).
Negative	0	
Abstain	0	

TRUE

[FR-13, Section No. 11.1.1.2, See FR-13](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Affirmative	28	
Affirmative with Comment	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Negative	0	
Abstain	0	

TRUE

[FR-61, Section No. 11.1.2, See FR-61](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Affirmative	28	
Affirmative with Comment	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Negative	0	
Abstain	0	

TRUE

[FR-130, Section No. 11.1.4.1 \[Excluding any Sub-Sections\], See FR-130](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Affirmative	28	
Affirmative with Comment	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Negative	0	
Abstain	0	

TRUE

[FR-14, Sections 11.1.4.1.1, 11.1.4.1.2, 11.1.4.1.3, See FR-14](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Affirmative	28	
Affirmative with Comment	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Negative	0	
Abstain	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-131, Section No. 11.1.4.2, See FR-131</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	0	
<b>Negative</b>	2	
J. William Sheppard		How does the Substantiation correlate with 4.1.1.2? How does this corrolate with 4.1.1.2? Do the people working on the fire protection inspections and testing have to be qualified or not? By allowing this we would be giving two different impressions on qualification requirements.
Darrell W. Underwood		
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-11, Sections 11.2.2, 11.2.3, 11.2.4, 11.2.5, 11.2.6, 11.2.7, 11..., See FR-11</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-15, Sections 11.3.1.1, 11.3.1.2, 11.3.1.3, See FR-15</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-18, New Section after 11.3.2.3, See FR-18</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	2	
Russell B. Leavitt		The change does not show up on the ballot so I am voting affirmative assuming that the change is the same as was submitted on the public input.
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	



## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

TRUE

[FR-17, Section No. 11.3.5.1, See FR-17](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Affirmative	28	
Affirmative with Comment	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Negative	0	
Abstain	0	

TRUE

[FR-20, New Section after 12.1.1.2, See FR-20](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Affirmative	28	
Affirmative with Comment	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Negative	0	
Abstain	0	

TRUE

[FR-19, Sections 12.2.1.1.1, 12.2.1.1.2, 12.2.1.1.3, See FR-19](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Affirmative	28	
Affirmative with Comment	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Negative	0	
Abstain	0	

TRUE

[FR-54, Chapter 13 \[Title Only\], See FR-54](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Affirmative	28	
Affirmative with Comment	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Negative	0	
Abstain	0	

TRUE

[FR-55, Section No. 13.1.1.1, See FR-55](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Affirmative	28	
Affirmative with Comment	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Negative	0	
Abstain	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-37, Section No. 13.1.1.2, See FR-37</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	1	
		This revision needs to be rejected. Considering the well known fact that when a fire sprinkler system “fails”, 2 out of 3 times the reason is that the system control valves were shut. Reducing the frequency of testing tamper switches in HALF seems completely inconsistent with what we have learned as an industry. Once again, no technical data has been offered to support this change. And, the submitter’s reason is flawed for a second reason: REPEATING MYSELF I KNOW BUT I FEEL STRONGLY ABOUT THIS: We are all familiar with the myriad of “trade offs” that the building codes offer for installing a fire sprinkler system; until someone can produce a list of tradeoffs given for a fire alarm system, I see no need to “be consistent” with NFPA 72. Why do we want to jeopardize the great history of success that we have all enjoyed in regards to fire sprinkler systems just to be consistent with the testing requirements of systems that do little if anything about actually DOING SOMETHING about the fire? Considering the decades of success that fire sprinklers have exhibited, perhaps the better idea is to align 72 with 25 – not vice versa.....A revision that would result in better fire protection would be to change this frequency from semi annual to quarterly.
Richard M. Ray		
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-38, Section No. 13.2.4, See FR-38</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	26	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	2	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
		I feel that a note should be added to section 13.2.4 to the effect of requiring that the owner or owner’s rep be consulted prior to commencement of the test to discuss the site drainage and condition of drainage receptacles. We have done drain tests and when we asked the owner’s rep about drainage, they ask “Can’t you see that giant trench drain? Let’s get this test started.” Upon conducting the test it was discovered that the trench drains were blocked with debris and a portion of the building took water. And how many times have we all watched the newly planted landscaping float away? I think the owner or his rep should at least be consulted.
Richard M. Ray		
<b>Negative</b>	1	
		I believe the current wording is sufficient and more direct to the point. It is the owner's responsibility to assure adequate drainage is provided.
Russell B. Leavitt		
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

TRUE

[FR-12, Section No. 13.2.6, See FR-12](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

TRUE

[FR-103, Section No. 13.2.7.1 \[Excluding any Sub-Sections\], See FR-103](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

TRUE

[FR-39, Section No. 13.3.3.4, See FR-39](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

TRUE

[FR-40, Section No. 13.3.3.5.1, See FR-40](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	1	

This revision needs to be rejected. Considering the well known fact that when a fire sprinkler system “fails”, 2 out of 3 times the reason is that the system control valves were shut. Reducing the frequency of testing tamper switches in HALF seems completely inconsistent with what we have learned as an industry. Once again, no technical data has been offered to support this change. And, the submitter’s reason is flawed for a second reason: REPEATING MYSELF I KNOW BUT I FEEL STRONGLY ABOUT THIS: We are all familiar with the myriad of “trade offs” that the building codes offer for installing a fire sprinkler system; until someone can produce a list of tradeoffs given for a fire alarm system, I see no need to “be consistent” with NFPA 72. Why do we want to jeopardize the great history of success that we have all enjoyed in regards to fire sprinkler systems just to be consistent with the testing requirements of systems that do little if anything about actually DOING SOMETHING about the fire? Considering the decades of success that fire sprinklers have exhibited, perhaps the better idea is to align 72 with 25 – not vice versa.....A revision that would result in better fire protection would be to change this frequency from semi annual to quarterly.

Richard M. Ray  
**Abstain**

0

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

TRUE

[FR-104, Section No. 13.4.2.1, See FR-104](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

TRUE

[FR-110, Section No. 13.4.3, See FR-110](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	2	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
		The word "test" should be replaced with "inspect" in sections 13.4.4.1.4 and 13.4.3.1.5. Also, in section 13.4.4.2.6, how would someone be able to do an air leakage test on a deluge system - are we proposing that the nozzles be removed and plugged? Also, section 13.4.4.2.13 should be struck as deluge systems don't have air pressure in the piping to monitor; same issue with sections 13.4.4.2.15 and 13.4.4.3.1
Richard M. Ray		
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

TRUE

[FR-112, Section No. 13.4.4.1.3, See FR-112](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

TRUE

[FR-41, Section No. 13.4.4.2.5.2, See FR-41](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-42, Section No. 13.4.4.2.6, See FR-42</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	1	
		Here we go again...No technical data has been offered to support this reduction in frequency of testing low air alarms. The submitter’s reasoning is flawed. We are all familiar with the myriad of “trade offs” that the building codes offer for installing a fire sprinkler system; until someone can produce a list of tradeoffs given for a fire alarm system, I see no need to “be consistent” with NFPA 72. Why do we want to jeopardize the great history of success that we have all enjoyed in regards to fire sprinkler systems just to be consistent with the testing requirements of systems that do little if anything about actually DOING SOMETHING about the fire? Considering the decades of success that fire sprinklers have exhibited, perhaps the better idea is to align 72 with 25 – not vice versa.....
Richard M. Ray		
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-105, Section No. 13.5.1.1, See FR-105</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-106, Section No. 13.5.4.1, See FR-106</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-43, Section No. 13.7.1, See FR-43</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-44, New Section after 13.8, See FR-44</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	1	
		Requiring a monthly inspection is not consistent with the move away from monthly inspections. Specific requirement for an annual test is unneeded. Everything that it is intended to reveal is accomplished with the annual trip test and can be added to the steps outlined in the full and partial trip tests procedures as outlined in the annex.
Russell B. Leavitt		
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-46, Section No. 14.4, See FR-46</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	26	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	2	
		The use of the term "operate" is confusing and subject to misinterpretation. More detailed description of "inspected" needs to be provided.
Russell B. Leavitt		
Matthew G. Drysdale		The requirement in section 14.4.3 is redundant with the requirement in section 14.4.
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-95, Section No. 15.4.2, See FR-95</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-47, New Section after 16.2.1.1.15, See FR-47</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	24	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	3	
Matthew G. Drysdale Darrell W. Underwood		The distinction between an operational and functional tests are not clear. The definition for testing in NFPA 25 describes it as “a procedure used to determine the operational status....” NFPA 25 does not include the term “functional test” in the definitions or requirements. Acceptable text at this time.
William E. Koffel		Paragraph 16.3.2 (extracted text) needs to be revised to stay within the scope of NFPA 25. NFPA 25 cannot require inspection, testing, and maintenance in accordance with NFPA 70, NFPA 72 and NFPA 80. Items outside the scope of NFPA 25 should be deleted from the Table.
<b>Negative</b>	2	
Russell B. Leavitt		While I understand what this revision is trying to accomplish, I have great concern about the unintended consequences. I cannot vote for this revision without a thorough vetting of a better way to address other standards (or codes) that undertake their own ITM requirements.
Peter A. Larrimer		Reject this and delete Chapter 16. NFPA 409 establishes ITM requirements and those requirements are established for each edition of 409. Chapter 2 on NFPA 25 shows the reference for NFPA 409 changing to the 2016 edition. This is wrong. The extract information cannot be taken from a future edition since the NFPA 409 committee might change the requirements. The 409 requirements are based on the existing NFPA 25 edition (2014) and not the new edition Chapter 16 should be deleted in its entirety or reference must be made to the previous edition of NFPA 25 since that is what the NFPA 409 technical committee used when they referenced NFPA 25. See my comment on FR 1 also.
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-125, Section No. A.1.1.3.1, See FR-125</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-122, Section No. A.3.3.7, See FR-122</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-48, Section No. A.3.3.24, See FR-48</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-49, Section No. A.3.6.4, See FR-49</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-127, Section No. A.4.1.1, See FR-127</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	1	
Russell B. Leavitt		this explanatory information can be misleading. Where an inspection and/or test is contracted between an owner and service provide, the scope should be simply as it is defined by the contract. An stated in other annex material, the owner can contract all or any portion of ITM.
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-128, Section No. A.4.1.2, See FR-128</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	



## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-71, Section No. A.4.8, See FR-71</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	26	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	0	
<b>Negative</b>	3	I do not agree that a change to the definition of maintenance or the annex material is needed. See comments for my negative vote on FR-69.
Russell B. Leavitt		This PI is a contract issue, not a 25 issue.
J. William Sheppard		
Darrell W. Underwood		This is a contract problem, not a code problem. NFPA 25 is not written to resolve contractors problems.
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-5, Section No. A.5.2.1.1.4, See FR-5</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-73, Section No. A.5.3.1.1, See FR-73</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	0	
<b>Negative</b>	2	
J. William Sheppard		Current language is acceptable.
Darrell W. Underwood		The current language is correct and should remain in the code.
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-8, Section No. A.5.3.1.1.2, See FR-8</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-83, Section No. A.8.3.1.1, See FR-83</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Affirmative	27	
Affirmative with Comment	0	
Negative	2	Regardless of previous dated editions, you do not test without installing the stated valve. Remove the text referring to 1999, etc.
J. William Sheppard		
Darrell W. Underwood		Forget 1999 and previous editions of NFPA 25, and don't test without a circulation relief valve.
Abstain	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-87, Section No. A.8.3.1.2, See FR-87</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Affirmative	28	
Affirmative with Comment	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Negative	0	
Abstain	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-93, Section No. A.8.5.1, See FR-93</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Affirmative	28	
Affirmative with Comment	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Negative	0	
Abstain	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-107, Section No. A.10.2.4, See FR-107</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Affirmative	28	
Affirmative with Comment	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Negative	0	
Abstain	0	

<u>TRUE</u>		
<a href="#">FR-50, Section No. A.13.4.4.2.2.3, See FR-50</a>		
<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Affirmative	28	
Affirmative with Comment	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
Negative	0	
Abstain	0	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

TRUE  
[FR-51, Section No. A.13.5.1.2, See FR-51](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

TRUE  
[FR-52, Section No. A.13.5.4.1, See FR-52](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	0	
<b>Negative</b>	2	
J. William Sheppard		Existing systems need guidance as well.
		There are still existing systems that have pressure regulating valves installed in them that must be tested.
Darrell W. Underwood		
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

TRUE  
[FR-53, Section No. A.13.5.4.3, See FR-53](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	27	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	0	
<b>Negative</b>	2	
J. William Sheppard		See comment for FR-52
		There are still existing systems that have pressure regulating valves installed in them that must be tested.
Darrell W. Underwood		
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

TRUE  
[FR-123, Section No. A.14.2.1, See FR-123](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	
<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1	
Darrell W. Underwood		Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0	
<b>Abstain</b>	0	

TRUE  
[FR-108, Chapter B, See FR-108](#)

<u>Vote Selection</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<b>Affirmative</b>	28	

## NFPA 25 (A2016) INM-AAA First Draft Ballot Circulation Report

<b>Affirmative with Comment</b>	1
Darrell W. Underwood	Acceptable text at this time.
<b>Negative</b>	0
<b>Abstain</b>	0