

## Paul L. Cooke

---

**From:** Lowrey, David [LOWREYD@bouldercolorado.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 31, 2011 9:41 AM  
**To:** "Steve Pischke"; paul@colofirechiefs.org  
**Subject:** NFPA 72 information

Just FYI for you guys on what the events where in the actual meeting. Warren is the chair of that committee and the one that alerted me to these proposals.

David L.

---

**From:** Warren Olsen [<mailto:wolsen@firesafetyfsci.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 31, 2011 9:17 AM  
**To:** Lowrey, David  
**Cc:** [gmichehl@sbcglobal.net](mailto:gmichehl@sbcglobal.net)  
**Subject:** RE:

David,

Here is the update on how the SIG-SSS addressed the IAFC proposals.

The committee allowed testimony from the IAFC through Chief Parow. I allowed the testimony to be 10 minutes which Chief Parow indicated would be more than adequate to state the IAFC's rational for their proposals. Chief Parow's presentation was followed by 10 minutes from George Michehl, Executive Director of the Illinois Fire Inspector's Association who was speaking on behalf of the IFIA and the Illinois Fire Chief's Association. I also allowed Steve Forster to make a further presentation on behalf of the IAFC. Following the presentations Lee Richardson read letters received on the proposals to the TC members from several state organizations including the Northern Illinois Fire Inspectors Association, Colorado's Fire Marshal/Fire Chief's Associations, as well as a couple of other state organizations which I believe included Texas and Kansas (but don't quote me on these states). I then allowed TC members to question Chief Parow, Chief Michehl and Chief Forster until they exhausted their questions. Following these presentations we went to break.

Upon returning from break the TC dealt with the three proposals (72-460, 72-474, 72-476) related to the supervising station receiving alarm signals by point identification. The accepted motion was made Accept in Principle for all three proposals. In effect the TC decided to allow for the receipt of a specific "addressable device" signal at the supervising station **where required** by local laws, codes, ordinances (the standard "where required wording was used"). This would allow a local jurisdiction to pass a regulation locally which would trigger this requirement, but it would not be an across the board requirement for everyone. This may become a TCC issue as I believe Fundamentals rejected the Chief's proposal to require all fire alarm systems to be addressable and you are likely going to have to use an addressable FACU to send "addressable device" signals to the supervising station.

Regarding the seven proposals related to the 90 second delay in retransmitting alarm signals to the fire department, a motion was made to Accept in Principle proposal 72-463 with a few caveats. One of which was that fire chiefs had to opt-into the 90 delay (rather than the opt-out wording). In effect, the intent would be that written authorization would have to be obtained from the fire chief before the 90 second retransmission delay could be employed. Additionally, Art Black proposed that whenever the 90 second delay was used and the fire department was not contacted about an alarm, the supervising station would have to notify the fire department for each occurrence in whatever written format was acceptable to the fire department (e-mail, fax, etc). The logic here was that the fire department would have no knowledge of a false alarm problem within their town if they didn't know they were occurring. This requirement would seem to fit the IAFC goals of reducing false alarms by having the supervising station notify a fire department on a daily basis which alarms were occurring in their towns so they could send their FPB out to the site to work with the business to fix recurring nuisance alarm problems.

72-463 and its Accept in Principle went for a vote and there were 9 votes for and 9 votes against. I had stepped down as the chair during this issue assigning Steve Schmit from UL as the Chairman Pro-Tem. I did not vote on the issue and

neither did Steve so the tie was not broke and the motion failed for not receiving 51% of the TC vote. The next motion was to Reject the proposal and this vote passed by about a 12 – 6 vote. All other proposals also were rejected.

Geoff Aus and Don Pannell, both fire service reps, were strongly against the 90 second proposals. Many in the TC received the impression that many in the fire service were not aware of these proposals. The insurance industry members were fairly quit on this matter. A couple of the central station members were somewhat concerned about the liability associated with the delay and appeared to support getting the fire department's acceptance of the delay in writing.

I'm in the office all day except for lunch so if you want to talk about these further please contact me.

*Warren E. Olsen*

**FSCI**  
2420 Alft Lane  
Elgin, IL 60124  
P/847-697-1300 - F/847-697-1310

---