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PROCEEDINGS HELD BEFORE THE STANDARDS COUNCIL MEMBERS
(Thereupon, the following proceedings were had:)

MR. PAULEY: Welcome everyone to the first hearing that we have for NFPA Standards Council.

For the record, we are working on agenda item 09-3-6-d, which is TIA Number 946, for NFPA 72.

I'm Jim Pauley, Chairman of the Standards Council.

In a moment, I'm going to ask the members of council, staff, and everyone to introduce themselves for the record.

I would like to remind everyone that during these hearings, as you speak, please indicate your name before you speak, so that our stenotypist will be able to make sure that they attribute those comments to the appropriate person out of this. So let's go ahead with the introductions. As I said I'm Jim Pauley, Chairman of the Council. Amy?

MS. SPENCER: Amy Beasley Spencer, Secretary for the Standards Council.

MR. GERDES: Ralph Gerdes, council member.

MR. CLARY: Shane M. Clary, member of the Council. I would like to note for the record that I am a member of the technical committee on the fundamentals of fire alarms. As a technical committee member I participated in consideration and voting on issues that appear to be related to
this appeal. I have, therefore, reviewed my
obligation under the Guide for Conduct of
Participants in the NFPA process, particularly
section 3.5(d) of the Guide, to consider whether
there is any reason for me to recuse myself from
consideration of this appeal.

I have concluded that I do not have any views
that are, or would appear to be, fixed concerning
the issues, and I am fully able to give open and
fair consideration to this appeal. For the record,
therefore, I have considered the matter, and I
believe that I can fully, fairly and impartially
fulfill my role as a Council member on this appeal.

MR. JARDIN: Joe Jardin, member of Council.

MR. HUGGINS: Ronald Huggins, Council member.

MR. BELL: Kerry Bell, member of Council. I
would like to note for the record that I am an
employee of Underwriters Laboratory, that I have
not been involved in any activities related to this
topic. I have, therefore, reviewed my obligation
under the Guide for Conduct of Participants in the
NFPA process, particularly section 3.5(d) of the
Guide, to consider whether there is any reason for
me to recuse myself from consideration of this
appeal.
I have concluded that I do not have any views that are, or would appear to be, fixed concerning the issues, and I am fully able to give open and fair consideration to this appeal. For the record, therefore, I have considered the matter, and I believe that I can fully, fairly and impartially fulfill my role as a Council member on this appeal.

MR. MILKE: Jim Milke, Council member.

MR. FARR: Ron Farr, member of Council.

MR. HARRINGTON: J.C. Harrington, member of Council.

MR. CARPENTER: James Carpenter, member of Council.

MR. MCDANIEL: Danny McDaniel, member of Council.

MR. NEWMAN: Michael Newman, member of Counsel.

MR. LEBER: Fred Leber, member of Council.

MS. BRODOFF: Maureen Brodoff, NFPA staff and legal counsel to the Standards Council.

MR. CROSSMAN: Paul Crossman, NFPA staff.

MR. DUBAY: Christian Dubay.

MR. ROBINSON: Wayne Robinson, TIA 936.

MR. CLARK: Rubin Clark, TIA 936.

MR. SAPORITA: Vince Saporita, Cooper Bustman.
I'm here for the next presentation.

MR. PIQUEIRA: Philip Piqueira with General Electric.

MR. SCOLINIK: Al Scolnik, with NEMA.

MR. PAULEY: If you gentlemen will move to the end for this particular hearing and announce your names for the record.

MR. BUSS: I'm Jeff Buss, with Sure Signal Products. I'm here for TIA 946.

MR. BOYD: Wayne Boyd, with US Safety and Engineering, 946 TIA.

MR. PAULEY: Very good. Thank you everyone. We will basically proceed. Gentlemen, you'll have ten minutes to essentially present what you would like to present to the Council. What we will then do is I will open it up to questions from the members of Council to you. Then give you an opportunity for any closing remarks that you may have after that. So the floor is yours.

MR. BUSS: Thank you very much. Again, my name is Jeff Buss. I'm the President of Sure Signal Products. I originated this TIA back in September. I wanted to come here to defend our position and also I brought the product. I don't know, this is kind of a unique product, and I don't
know if everyone here is familiar with it. If you
like I can just circulate it on down the table.
This is an empty box and this is the product. I've
also brought flyers if anybody wants to keep some
as a reference.

I want to thank everyone here for considering
our appeal. I know that your time is valuable so I
would just like to summarize what I've already
written in the document that was submitted to Amy a
couple of weeks back. The technical committee
passed our TIA with an overwhelming margin; eighty
percent for the merit and eight-five for the
emergency nature.

The correlation committee, I did fairly well
with them as well; on the merit I got fifty-eight
percent, but only thirty-seven percent for the
emergency nature. At this time, I basically would
like to address the foundation of my appeal which I
don't believe that the correlation committee fully
addressed all the facts of my TIA.

The majority of the reasons that were given
for the no votes on the TIA related back to the
technical merits of the product. There was not a
single correlation issue cited in any of the
negative votes. Two of the votes, in fact, I don't
believe that maybe the proper amount of time was spent reviewing the documents.

Two of the votes referred to UL Standard, UL217. My product is a heat alarm; 217 applies to smoke alarms. UL539 is the appropriate standard for us. There were four votes that were negative that stated that the TIA couldn't be granted because I didn't meet standard S3.41, which is the temporal pattern. My request is an exception from the temporal pattern. To use the fact that I don't have that pattern as the reason to not grant me the exception seems a little bit like a circular reference.

There was one vote that stated that acceptance of this TIA would be unethical. That one kind of astounded me. It's a supplemental residential fire alarm. I don't see how granting an exception could ever be interpreted as unethical. One vote simply stated that the product was not equivalent with no further information. But basically when I looked at it, I don't see anything that's citing conflicts within the codes or the standard anywhere else.

On the emergency nature aspect of the TIA, we didn't do as well there, but virtually all the no votes stated that, well this code has been in place
for some time. Now, NFPA has a very unique
definition of what constitutes an emergency nature.
Basically the one that I feel best fit our product,
one of them I think it's Section 5.2F states TIA is
meant to correct a circumstance in which a revised
doc has resulted in inverse impact on a product and
I felt like that landed pretty nicely on what I was
trying to do.

None of the NFPA definitions relate to the
time. Granted that code has been in place for some
time but that is not the definition that you guys
have selected for applying for a TIA. The actual
emergency nature that brought me into this in the
process of the TIA, and I'm not familiar with the
NFPA's code writing procedures, so I'm a complete
novice to this, is that UL has decided after twenty
years to make a major revision to Standard 539,
which has been titled in the past a mechanical heat
alarm. Well they're now kind of harmonizing it to
include electronic devises. So they're adopting
the T3 pattern, which my mechanical devise cannot
realistically achieve.

Additional reasons why I feel this TIA request
should be granted is that the only major study that
I've been able to locate which was done by Dr.
Janine Prolux (phonetic) out of Canada, her study shows that the mechanical alarm was actually eight times more recognized or more easily recognized as a fire alarm then the T3 pattern. The same study also cited that it was recognized to be four times more urgent than the T3 pattern.

I guess -- I believe that the section I'm requesting is very narrow in scope. No one is going to be adopting mechanical power strictly to take advantage of the fact that the NFP has granted a slight exception to the code to allow our ringtone to exist. In general it's not a practical way of doing things with today's modern circuitry. It can't be modern. This is a residential use product. It has no application outside of the home. You can see in our literature, this is designed to go in attics, kitchens, crawl spaces, utility closets, not in sleeping chambers, not in areas where people reside.

It's not a commercial use product. It can never be wired into an electronic system. So basically I believe there's no downside risk in the NFPA adopting this TIA request.

MR. PAULEY: Thank you. Mr. Boyd did you have anything?
MR. BOYD: Just a couple of quick points.
I've been a member of the technical committee,
chapter 11 on 72 for about forty years now. But at
any rate, a committee has studied the issue
extensively, discussed extensively among the
technical members. We have two members of UL that
do conduct tests on the products and they supported
this TIA, primarily because of the number of
kitchen fires where smoke alarms are not practical
because they create false alarms, without regular
service. Most consumers do not regularly service
smoke alarms.

And so consequently, by low maintenance the
seal mechanism works very effectively and our
committee used that in voting to approve the TIA
and I sincerely hope that you evaluate that in your
consideration.

MR. PAULEY: That being the case, we'll go
ahead and take questions from members of Council
right now. For the record, Mr. Boyd, I wanted to
clarify when you indicated you've been on the
technical committee for some --

MR. BOYD: Yeah.

MR. PAULEY: Are you speaking on behalf of the
technical committee today or speaking on --
MR. BOYD: On my own behalf. Yeah, nobody else from the technical committee was going to be here and I thought it might be appropriate to have someone that could answer questions for you.

MR. PAULEY: Okay. Again Jim Pauly, chairman of the Council. Also for the record, Mr. Buss, you indicated that you're representing the manufacturer of this particular device that we're talking about. Mr. Boyd is there any commercial interest that you have in this particular topic?

MR. BOYD: No, just as a member of the technical committee.

MR. PAULEY: Okay. I'll open it up to questions from the Council members now. Mr. Gerdes?

MR. GERDES: Ralph Gerdes, Council member. I have several questions. My first has to deal with NFPA process and did you guys participate in this? Why do we need a TIA? You indicated something about Underwriters Laboratory changing their standards. Was that as a result of the NFPA standard initiated?

MR. BUSS: No, it wasn't. Jeff Buss. I was actually struck out of the blue by the UL standard. I received some documentation that stated after a
long period of time the UL had determined it's time
to revise standard 539. I was told, or made aware
of this in September '08 and within weeks we
submitted the TIA request.

MR. GERDES: My second question. This chapter
11, I believe, deals with residential situations
and there's obviously extensive chapters dealing
with commercial. As I understand it, all the
commercial equipment requires this T3 and you're
basically getting an exception. But why make a
distinction between your situation and all the
other equipment and applications?

MR. BUSS: I really can't speak for the
commercial product. My expertise lies solely with
residential. But primarily I'm asking for this
request because do not believe I can adapt my
product to create a T3 pattern. The T3 pattern is
basically created through electronic controls and
electronic power, primarily with the residential
smoke alarms, it allows the electronics to control
it.

We are a flat spring that's wound up and when
the alarm is triggered, it unwinds, strikes a
two-stage gear process which rotates a centrifugal
hammer that clacks up against a bell in order to
create not just one pause, which is the half second off, in between the half second on, you would have to create a secondary one and a half second pause every, I think, three cycles.

First off, I don't believe that's possible. Secondly, my company is very small. We only have eight employees, only two of which are professional level people. Economically to even attempt to undergo such a complex engineering task would be financially unfeasible. But at the end of the day, I don't think we can do it. I think the complexity involved to add so many additional stages of gearing and have a mechanism that would actually move the centrifugal hammer in and out to allow it to clack the bell with the appropriate spacing would create such a mechanical monstrosity reliability would fall to the point where it would no longer be a viable product for the home.

MR. GERDES: My next question deals with the impact of the TIA. In your appeal letter, February 18th, you say that you're a supplemental device and I take it that you're just talking about heat detectors?

MR. BUSCH: Correct.

MR. GERDES: But the way I read the TIA, the
impact, it doesn't distinguish between heat or smoke detectors, is that true?

MR. BUS: You make an excellent point. Again I'm not very familiar with the code writing process. I'm a novice to this. It was pointed out in the technical committee with a gentleman, I think it was Steve Owaneke (phonetic), I did reference it. He felt that -- he did not vote in favor of the TIA but he said that he would fully support this TIA vote for technical merit and for the emergency nature if the word supplemental was add to my application -- supplemental heat alarm.

I'm fully in favor of that. However, when I brought that to the attention of the liaison at NFPA they felt that that would basically cause the process to go back to square one and so I don't know whether this Council has the ability to adopt changes in the code language to my request, but I would fully support that.

MR. GERDES: My last question has to do with correlation and what the technical correlating committee did and you believe there's no conflict, correlation conflict with other requirements and the standard but it kind of gets back to my earlier question about the fact that as I understand it,
all these other devices are required to meet this T3 requirement. So would you agree that maybe there is a correlation across the standard that needs to be done?

MR. BUSS: I believe if an exception is granted there is no correlation issue. This product would have been taken out of that cycle. There have already been two exceptions granted to allow the mechanical heat alarm. One was related to power and truthfully I can't recall off the top of my head what the other one was about. I did reference it in the initial submittal of the TIA, but no, I don't believe that's the case.

MR. PAULEY: Other questions, members of Council? Mr. Clary?

MR. CLARY: Yes, Shane Clary, member of Council. A question to Mr. Buss, or a couple of questions. Are there any other mechanical products on the market today or is your product the only mechanical product that's out there?

MR. BUSS: To the best of my knowledge, mine is the only product that exists.

MR. CLARY: So there's no other mechanical smoke defector or other mechanical --

MR. BUSS: I can't speak in absolutes but I
have never seen one.

MR. CLARY: The second question. Have you, after UL made the changes to UL539 or even during the process -- first of all are you on that UL STP?

MR. BUSS: No, I'm not.

MR. CLARY: Have you ever applied beyond that?

MR. BUSS: I met with John Parsoning (phonetic) to discuss the possibility of getting on, but that was after the fact.

MR. CLARY: After they made their changes to UL 539, have you had any correspondence or been in any dialog with UL, to see if there's an exception within their standard for your product?

MR. BUSS: After I was made aware of this, I approached UL to discuss the situation, requesting an exception from them. They felt that the only way that they could be consistent with the codes would be to first get an exception from the NFPA and then they could roll that into their own standard, UL 539.

MR. CLARY: So basically the TCC is saying get your exception first from UL and UL is saying get your exception first in 72?

MR. BUSS: That wasn't my take. I didn't fully understand what the TCC was trying to say in
the no votes. They were difficult to interrupt. Basically my take on the TCC was they felt that they did not like the technical merits of my request, virtually all the comments in the no votes related back to technical aspects of the request.

MR. CLARY: Can you describe, I guess, what is your interpretation of what supplemental is?

MR. BUSS: My interpretation of supplemental, and granted it is sort of a gray area within the codes, but my interpretation of supplemental for a residential device, not a commercial device, are products that are added to a home that were beyond the requirements of the code. So currently the smoke alarm requires smoke alarms wired together in construction, in every bedroom of the home and one on every floor and the other things, and that's where the code stops. But this is above and beyond the nature of the requirement of the code. So to me it's like, how could it possibly hurt? You're adding a product, where otherwise there would be none.

MR. CLARY: Now within, and I haven't read your installation instructions, but within your installation instructions does it clearly state to the homeowner that this is not to be used in lieu
of smoke alarms?

MR. BUSS: Absolutely.

MR. CLARY: So it's clear within your marketing and your instructions that --

MR. BUSS: -- you can see on this thing that we did it graphically in case there are any language issues, in fact, to show the appropriate spaces that this product should be installed.

MR. CLARY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. PAULEY: Dr. Milke?

MR. MILKE: Jim Milke, member of Council.

Could you give us just a brief history of your product here, when it was first developed, when it was first listed?

MR. BUSS: Well this product goes back significantly in time. I believe that it was introduced either in 1957 or 1959. I don't know who was the actual originator of the idea but I think he got it from the fire sprinkler heads at the time, the detecting metal link. The company changed hands a few times. I purchased the business from a company called Interstate Engineering. It was located in Anaheim California where I was employed as the director of engineering.
They were primarily a vacuum cleaner company. They were no longer interested in the heat alarm products and I wound up in charge of it during the strange transition and when they were willing to sell it, I was willing to buy it and at the time, relocated to Tennessee. I brought it back to California, hired some of the people that had been laid off and we've been building ever since, Garden Grove, California since the year 2000.

MR. PAULEY: Just to follow up. So it was listed --

MR. BUSS: -- oh, I believe it was listed in the '50s, but I've seen listing information that goes back to the early '70s. That's as far back as I can verify because we have the UL listing book in our -- it's this thick.

MR. PAULEY: Very good. Mr. Huggins?

MR. HUGGINS: Ronald Huggins, member Council. I have questions for Mr. Boyd. As a TC member are you both defining that you view this as a supplemental item?

MR. BOYD: Yes.

MR. HUGGINS: As a TC member do you see it really fitting 1135 which defines it's devices that are to initiate evacuation? I mean this is 11353,
it just seems an awkward fit putting a supplemental device in that chapter. So what are your thoughts on that?

MR. BOYD: My personal opinion is the committee needs to do some work on that and maybe relocate it. But it is a supplemental device. And of course the standard itself does recommend additional protection, but the location probably should be worked on.

MR. HUGGINS: Thank you.

MR. PAULEY: Mr. Jardin?

MR. JARDIN: Joe Jardin, member of Council and this is probably for Mr. Boyd as well. Relative to the TIA submittal, under the lists of reasons for it, it talks about precedent for the TIA and it gives some, I guess, some historical perspective concerning another TIA that was approved. It talks about section 11.61 allowing smoke and heat alarms powered by a spring wound mechanism such as you're here today to discuss. Also it talks about an exception that was introduced in the 2007 print, section 115211. I wonder if you can give us some context in terms of that TIA that was mentioned as being approved and the exception that was put in there. Is that -- were those specifically put in
place to permit what the appellant is here to argue for today?

MR. BOYD: Yes they were. The power supply issue, obviously was self contained so it had to be put in as an exception.

MR. PAULEY: Additional questions from members of the Council? Mr. Clary?

MR. CLARY: Shane Clary, member of the Council. Again a question to probably Mr. Boyd. As you knew of course 72 for a number of cycles has required the temporal 3 code, and a lot of the building codes it states that there shall be no dissimilar sounds to cause any confusion. Do you feel that if -- you know, you have a single family dwelling that's got the smoke alarms or smoke detection system that has a temporal 3, which has it's distinct cadence and then you have this device, that has -- I take it it's a solid ringing bell?

MR. BUSS: Yes, I can demonstrate if you want.

MR. CLARY: No need to, that will suffice. Do you think the occupants of the house or even a visitor of the house will recognize that in the middle of the night as an alarm going off and to basically, execute Edith?
MR. BOYD: Well to answer your question in the proper use, the most common usage of the product is to attract attention, not to evacuate. Like a cooking fire. Mostly cooking fires, if you look at NFPA data, is one of the leading causes of fires and are caused by inattention, where people -- the phone rings, a child has an issue. It's to call their attention to it and most of time, you turn off the heat and solve the problem.

So it's not to -- it's not really needed as an evacuation signal because the evacuation signal would be the smoke alarm, the primary required devices if in fact the house needed to be evacuated.

MR. CLARY: So my understanding of your testimony that it is not the intent of this device to cause an evacuation, but it's more of an alert of a possible incident occurring?

MR. BOYD: Yes.

MR. PAULEY: Other questions? Jim Pauly, chair of the Council. I guess one question that I have is, did I hear you right, Mr. Buss, that your device cannot, and I'm assuming from an engineering perspective, cannot be adapted to do the T3 signal, is that --
MR. BUSS: That is my opinion and my company's opinion. We would abide by this code if we could think of a way to do it. We can't.

MR. PAULEY: Additional questions? Amy?

MS. SPENCER: Amy Spencer, secretary of the Council. Mr. Boyd, in your submission to the Council you noted president, what is your company that you're president of?


MS. SPENCER: US Safety and Engineering?

MR. BOYD: Yes.

MR. PAULEY: Mr. Clary?

MR. CLARY: One last question for Mr. Buss. If the TIA, if the action that was taken by the TCC were to be upheld by the Council and thus the TIA would not be issued, what's the impact of that action in your company? What would the impact be?

MR. BUSS: This mechanical heat alarm is 99.9 percent of my company's revenue, in Garden Grove California. I think if I lose my ability to maintain a UL listing, I will lose my ability to sell the product and most likely I will have to declare bankruptcy.

MR. PAULEY: Jim Pauly, chair of the Council. I just wanted to follow up on Ms. Spencer's
question and make sure I have it for the record.  
Mr. Boyd, US Safety and Engineering, the company  
where you did the submittal, there's no affiliation  
to Sure Signal.  

MR. BOYD: No, that's correct.  

MR. PAULEY: Do you have another question?  

MS. SPENCER: When we were researching this  
there were some questions about possible linkages  
with two companies, with Masterguard. Can you,  
both of you comment on any kind of relationship  
with Masterguard.  

MR. BUSS: I'll go first, Jeff Buss.  
Masterguard is my largest customer. I private  
label the alarm and sell it to them, there in  
Dallas, actually in Coppell Texas outside of  
Dallas. That is my relationship to Masterguard. I  
have no relationship to Mr. Boyd other than he has  
been for many years in the same industry. In  
general we've been competitors.  

MS. SPENCER: Mr. Boyd?  

MR. BOYD: Same question.  

MS. SPENCER: Yes.  

MR. BOYD: Well basically I do not work for  
Masterguard. Is that your question?  

MS. SPENCER: What's your affiliation with
Masterguard? There was some question about if the two companies were related through Masterguard.

MR. BOYD: The answer is no.

MS. SPENCER: What is your affiliation with Masterguard?

MR. BOYD: The answer is no, no direct --

MS. SPENCER: No affiliation.

MR. BOYD: Me personally, no.

MS. SPENCER: But okay to follow up, your company has an affiliation with Masterguard?

MR. BOYD: My company has done some consulting work for them in the past, yes.

MR. PAULEY: Additional questions?

MR. NEWMAN: Mike Newman, member of Council. I just had a question. On one of the TC committee negatives they mention the fact that if the alarm were to go off when someone is not at home and the spring runs down, people might have a false sense of security that this thing is up there and it's operable when it's really not. I'm just curious, any comment on that? Is there any way to determine that or do you have any suggestions?

MR. BUSS: That was from the correlation committee and it was an interesting point brought up under the merits of correlation, but, yes, we
absolutely have an indicator; the RU technic metal
heat sensor which is the round disk. It's not in
place now that it's been circulated but obviously
it's the center picture. The center gets pushed
out by a spring loaded pin, whenever the
temperature reaches -- and below that cover is a
day-glow orange pin that says inoperable. Which is
interesting to me because the smoke alarm, to the
best of my knowledge, if it trips when no one is
home there is no indication whatsoever that its
gone off in the absence of people, so in that
regard, we're actually superior.

MR. PAULEY: Additional questions?
(No response from members of the Council)

MR. PAULEY: Very good. Any final closing
remarks that either of you have.

MR. BUSS: I'd like to say that I really do
appreciate you guys taking the time to listen to me
and I thought all your questions were excellent and
right on point. It was clear to me that you you've
been paying attention. Thank you very much.

MR. PAULEY: Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: Just one final comment and that is
based on the number of cooking or kitchen fires and
the need for detecting -- the NFPA publishes data
that says from first plane to deadly conditions in
two minutes is not uncommon. So to protect a fire
at the point of origin, in the kitchen is a very
important thing.

MR. PAULEY: Thank you and gentlemen let me --
the Council will deliberate this issue in executive
session. The decision of the Council will be
issued by Ms. Spencer. That will be the only
issuance that will come from the Council. No
member of the Council nor NFPA staff is permitted
to convey any information about this particular
topic. It will be completed by that decision.

So I do want to thank both of for your full
participation in the NFPA process and for going
through the process that you have. We appreciate
you being here today and we will certainly advise
you as to that decision as the Council renders it.
So thank you very much.

MR. BUSS: Could you give me maybe an
indication as to when a decision might be reached?

MR. PAULEY: We often get asked that question
and the answer is generally the same, that it's
hard to give you that. It really depends on what
our entire workload out of the meeting comes. We
will ultimately in a vast majority of the cases,
arrive at a decision today. That has to be
finished up, written up and then ultimately issued.
So it could range anywhere from a week to -- we've
had decisions that have taken months.

So, you know, I'm not going to try to pin it
down to tell you a week from now, you'll have a
decision. If I do, I'll be wrong out of it. So
you just kind of have to bear with us. I know both
Council and staff work as rapidly as we can to get
those out.

MR. BUSS: Thank you very much.

MR. PAULEY: With that, we are going to stay
on the record and we're going to move directly into
the second hearing. So gentlemen on TIA 936, if
you'd like to move to the end of the table. I am
going to take the opportunity to have anyone that
was not in the room at the time when we did the
introductions, if you would please introduce
yourself at this point.

MR. OKLEY: George Okley, Senior Consultant,
Bustman Division Cooper Industries.

MS. FULLER: Linda Fuller, NFPA staff.

MR. PAULEY: So we are now moving to agenda
item 09-3-5d. This is an appeal on the, or for the
issuance of TIA number 936, that is on NFPA 70.