



**DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION
OFFICE OF THE STATE FIRE MARSHAL
FIRE ENGINEERING DIVISION**

P.O. Box 944246
SACRAMENTO, CA 94244-2460
(916) 445-8200
Website: www.fire.ca.gov



**OFFICE OF THE STATE FIRE MARSHAL
Fire Alarm Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
April 25, 2017**

COMMITTEE GOAL

To advise the State Fire Marshal on proposed regulations and technical issues by providing views and comments from members of industry, the public, and the fire services.

STAFF

David Castillo, Senior Mechanical Engineer, Chair
Vikkie Raby, Staff Services Analyst

MEMBERS PRESENT

*Nanci Timmins, Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development
*David Myers, City of Los Angeles
*Sagiv Weiss-Ishai, San Francisco Fire Department
Shane Clary, Bay Alarm Company
Rick Cortina, Apple Valley Communications
Wendy Gifford, Nest Laboratories
John Guhl, NoFireOne
Rick Lewis, Sabah International
*Jay Levy, Saf-Com Supply
Richard Roberts, Honeywell Security & Fire
*Andrew Thul, tk1sc Collaborative

**Via Conference Call*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Howard Hopper, Underwriters Laboratories, LLC

GUESTS PRESENT

I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order by Chairperson David Castillo at 10:16 AM on April 25, 2017.

II. ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS

Vikkie Raby conducted a roll call and it was determined that there was a quorum of members present.

III. NEW BUSINESS

Committee Goals: David Castillo opened the meeting by revisiting the committee goals and the responsibilities of the committee chairperson. He also shared that the member roster has been updated to reflect the new membership, but it has not yet been posted to the web. Wendy Gifford requested that the roster be sent via email to the members.

David has requested that if you are submitting an email to James Parsegian of the OSFM, copy David as well. This will ensure that someone is able to respond to your inquiry, even if one or the other is not immediately available.

BML Program Submittal Requirements: David Castillo outlined some of the submittal requirements the OSFM is looking for with BML listing applications. Those are briefly outlined as follows:

- New Listing—must include the check, completed and signed application form, full test report (summaries are not accepted), a copy of the drawings (electronically is preferred), and manufacturer installation directions/manual (electronically is preferred).
- CSFM Category—please be sure to include the category you wish the product to be listed in. This cuts down on confusion and the risk of a component/item being listed incorrectly.
- Technical Revision—these submittals require the same items as a New Listing.
- Cross Listing—please be sure to provide the BML listing information for the parent listing. Please note, ~~that~~ the model numbers MUST may not always match the parent listing. Please include copy of the testing lab correlation sheet.
- Non-Technical Revision—this includes name change, contact person/information change.

David also reminded the group that if the OSFM must contact them for additional information (i.e. missing or incomplete test report) the application now moves back to the bottom of the stack for processing, even if the information is provided immediately. An incomplete application will delay the listing process.

Rick Cortina inquired as to whether a product specification sheet from the manufacturer can be submitted in place of the manufacturer installation manual. David stated that a UL specification sheet may be submitted along with the test report, however, it will not take the place of the installation manual requirement. David mentioned that there are times when UL will list a product which California may not agree with because of an interpretation of the code. Wendy Gifford stated that she does not believe it is the role of the OSFM to argue with the testing labs regarding what they certify. David stated that it is our role when it concerns the public safety of the citizens of California. John Guhl and Rick Cortina both offered examples of a product being “listed” by a laboratory, but having the listing pulled in California because the lab was not certified for California, or because an approved product no longer met California requirements. They both stated that these examples show that California does have the authority to reject a product even it is accepted in other states and is listed by an approved laboratory. Wendy asked for the code section that gives OSFM that authority. David referred her to the California Health & Safety Code (HSC), Section 13144, which establishes the OSFM authority.

First Alert P1000: David asked if there were any issues that anyone wished to discuss any further regarding this product. There were no comments at this time.

NFPA Conference: David asked if anyone would be attending. Shane Clary stated he will be attending. Sagiv Weiss-Ishai stated that he is attending as well as speaking. David stated that he plans to attend as well, and was just curious as to who else would be.

Silent Knight: Richard Roberts provided an update regarding the Silent Knight Fire Alarm/Co2 combos. Several FPOs had concerns regarding the testing of the Silent Knight multi-criteria detector. The issue was that a single discharge of canned smoke will not immediately activate the device. The FPOs requested a letter from Honeywell outlining the explanation for the delayed activation of the device. Richard has drafted the letter and provided to Bill Hopple and James Carver on March 9, 2017, for review/input. Richard stated that Mr. Hopple's only suggestion was to update the user manual with additional information regarding testing with canned smoke. He has not yet received any response from Mr. Carver. He has stated he will follow-up with them, and will then share the letter with the committee.

IV. OPEN FORUM

Shane Clary stated that the Governor's Office has announced that the drought is over. He inquired as to what this means for the water-based systems testing restrictions that have been in place. David responded that as far as he is aware, the emergency regulations for water restriction are still in place at this time. He stated he will confirm that once he returns to the office. It was suggested that an Informational Bulletin be developed and issued to clarify the current expectations or restrictions.

Shane Clary inquired as to the Automatic Extinguishing Systems Sprinkler Pipe Fitters regulations schedule. David stated that he was unable to comment, as he is not involved in that program, but that he will speak with James Parsegian when he returns to the office. Once he has an answer, he will distribute the answer to the group via email.

Sagiv Weiss-Ishai had a question regarding 2016 Edition of NFPA 72, Section 18.5.3.2, Visible Characteristics for Toxic Mold, which went into effect January 1, 2017. This section states the duration of the strobe needs to be 20 milliseconds. This is a change from the previous edition which was 200 milliseconds. How is this going to be enforced? If someone submits plans today, and the strobe is a 200-millisecond strobe, should I be rejecting it based on this Section? He stated he is not referring to corridors, as there is an exception written for corridors. Sagiv stated that as far as he can discern, Chapter 35 has not been amended to reflect the change. David stated that as the AHJ, Sagiv does have the authority to reject the plans if the strobes are not up to current code. Wendy stated that the BML listings should be more detailed to include the milliseconds on the strobes. This would make it easier to determine if the plans include strobes that are up to code. David stated that he will consider adding more detail to the listings.

Sagiv Weiss-Ishai stated he feels the Class A requirement in the 2016 Edition of NFPA 72 is too restrictive and he would like to see this revisited. John Guhl states he has spoken with Greg Anderson of the OSFM and amendment language is being considered. Rick Lewis states that he feels California could get rid of the Class A requirements altogether, and only have the requirement apply to Risers (Class B on the floors, Class A on the risers). All present agreed this should be a design decision based on risk analysis for the construction type. John Guhl stated he will discuss this further with Greg Anderson.

Rick Cortina shared a code interpretation request with the group (the application is being sent to the OSFM for a formal interpretation) regarding stadium use. He stated that the code specifies that stadiums are not high-rise. Most stadiums now have large A-2 occupancy areas. Some are on the roof, some on lower floors. The question is that if they entertain on the top floor (the entertainment areas), and the area is not enclosed (it is open-air) does it change the occupancy from an A-5 to an A-2? Everyone agreed that original design intent comes into play. The portion that is being used as a nightclub should be classified as an A-2, but the outdoor seating and other open-air areas would be an A-5, generally speaking. The recommendation was made that the formal code interpretation should include language that clarifies that they are referring to an open-air concession concourse area.

Rick Cortina brought up the subject of commercial vs. residential smoke alarms. He stated that up to 12 smoke detectors can be interconnected, but more than 14 must be connected to a system. Rick asked whether most folks are using a residential system or a commercial system. The group stated that for a system that large in a residence, they typically install a commercial system. Once installed, does the system have to be monitored? Richard Roberts responded that household systems are not required to be monitored per the residential code, so long as the system is owned by the homeowner.

Richard Roberts brought up the California Residential Code current edition, Sections 29.7.3 and 29.8.3, which states smoke alarms and smoke detectors shall be listed for common nuisance sources from cooking, with an effective date of 2019. He found the CRC online still references the 2016 edition. So essentially, there is no product listed for a cooking resistant listing since this was just added. He feels that needs to be updated in the CRC. Rick Lewis stated that Chapter 35 amends NFPA 72. John Guhl suggested that the OSFM draft an amendment to correct the conflict.

V. NEXT MEETING

August 23, 2017 from 10:00 AM to 1:00 PM (Pacific Daylight Time) at the Office of the State Fire Marshal, 1131 "S" Street, Sacramento. A telephone conference line will be available.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned by Chairperson David Castillo at 1:08 PM.

Meeting Minutes developed by:
Vikkie Raby, Staff Services Analyst
Vikkie.Raby@fire.ca.gov