



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

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



**Office of the State Fire Marshal  
Fire Alarm Advisory Committee**

Meeting Date: January 22, 2013

Meeting Time: 09:00 AM-12:00 PM

Meeting Location: Office of the State Fire Marshal, Training Conference Room  
1131 S St., Sacramento, CA 95811

**Staff Present:**

Ben Ho, Division Chief  
James Parsegian, Supervising DSFM, Chair  
Ian Lyman, Management Services Technician  
Glenn Tong, Retired Annuitant

**Members Present:**

\*Walter Brandes, Riverside County Fire Department  
\*Tom Connaughton, Intertek-ETL  
Gary Dunger, Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development  
Shane Clary, Bay Alarm Company  
Rick Cortina, Pyro-Comm Systems, Inc.  
Ronald Farr, Underwriters Laboratories Inc.  
Howard Hopper, Underwriters Laboratories Inc.  
\*Bill Hopple, Hopple & Co.  
Jay Levy, Hochiki America  
Rick Lewis, Rolf Jensen & Associates  
John Mapes, Foster City Fire Department  
Richard Roberts, Honeywell Life Safety  
\*Patrick Ward, AON Fire Protection Engineering

**Members Absent:**

Ray Iverson, Sacramento Metropolitan Fire Department  
Michael Reeser, Santa Rosa Fire Equipment Services

**Guests Present:**

Gene Gantt, California State Firefighters' Association  
\*Ken Quick, Southern California Fire Prevention Officers  
Sherry Wise, Advocation Strategies of Sacramento

\* *Via Conference Call*

Fire Alarm Advisory Committee  
DRAFT Meeting Minutes – January 22, 2013

I. Call to Order

James Parsegian called the meeting to order at 9:01 A.M. and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

II. Roll Call and Introductions

Self-introductions were conducted and Ian Lyman took a roll call. A quorum was established.

III. Approval of 11/8/2012 Meeting Minutes

Richard Roberts made a motion to approve the minutes and two individuals seconded. Minutes approved unanimously as written.

IV. Old Business

A) Regulation to implement the Building Material Listing Program requirements for SB 1394 (proposed regulations was distributed to committee - Title 19, Division 1 State Fire Marshal, Chapter 1.5 Construction Materials and Equipment Listings, Section 208 Special Provisions)

- 1) Section 208, (d), Exception 5 is to be edited from “If battery operated” to “If primary power source is battery” to clarify that the requirement.
- 2) The current proposed regulation is based on existing law as written and is proceeding as-is until any clean-up bill passes subsequently. At such time, the proposed regulations will be amended to reflect the new changes.
- 3) National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 72 defines that smoke alarms are devices with built in audible device and do not get the power from the fire alarm control panel. All UL 268 devices are exempted from SB 1394. SB 1394 had language that clearly differentiates between smoke alarms and smoke detectors.
- 4) Exceptions will be written to provide technical clarifications and will be drafted by a sub workgroup. The SB 1394 Technical Clarification Work Group will be composed of Richard Roberts, Howard Hopper, Ronald Farr, and Ben Ho.
  - a) Howard Hopper recommends that “hush feature” be clarified.
  - b) Richard Roberts notes that the “end of life” feature is ambiguous.
  - c) Richard Roberts said he can provide the work group draft language for the workgroup by close of business 1/26/2012.
- 5) Gene Gantt (California State Firefighters Association) advised that an omnibus clean-up bill is in the works with UL and National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA). The proposed bill would:
  - a) Delete the “end-of-life of the device” requirement that provides notice that the device needs be replaced”.
  - b) Extend the compliance deadline for manufacturers.
- 6) OSFM meeting on 12/12/2012 with manufacturers of products affected by SB 1394. Ben Ho reported that the OSFM met and discussed the issues of the implementation of SB 1394 with the smoke alarm manufacturers. The smoke alarm manufacturers were concerned about the additional requirements and the deadline for compliance along with industry readiness.

B) Discussion on CI cable and letter to UL

Bob James of UL Regulatory Services provided a report regarding the issue of CI cable. He described that the electrical cable created concerns. UL was unable to pinpoint the problems. UL’s listing mark was pulled until one of two things happened:

Fire Alarm Advisory Committee  
DRAFT Meeting Minutes – January 22, 2013

- 1) Standards Technical Panel reconvened and redevelop information for the standard and go through completed research.
- 2) Interim Process completed, in which product is brought in with more robust testing and sampling schedule.
  - a) The Interim Process started in September 2012. FIHT Category, System 1850 was approved in 12/21/2012 for a UL Mark for two-hour rating. He mentioned three-hour assemblies are available. This product is MI cable.
  - b) Bob mentioned that systems now have a four-digit numbering system (used to be two digits). Numbers were retired and issued new ones.
- 3) Bob stated UL will continue to send out email updates. He recommended checking the Category Codes on Mondays or UL website and sign up under the Ultimate Email section.
- 4) It was clarified that UL's test has remained and considered appropriate.
- 5) UL suspended the marking of new CI product (not a recall) and stands by marked products. It is up to enforcing authorities to accept or not.
- 6) Howard Hopper noted that the US Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) is the authority to recall products.
  - a) Ben Ho said he hadn't heard anything definite back from the CPSC.
- 7) Dan Ryan of UL is the contact person to participate in the Standards Technical Panel.
- 8) Bob James' contact information can be found on UL website and CI announcements. As well, Howard Hopper or Ronald Farr can provide such information.
- 9) The subject of an OSFM letter to UL resurfaced and/or what questions needs to be answered. Posed questions and/or ideas were:

- a) What do we do with existing and new construction, including the availability of CI?
- b) Idea of a possible OSFM bulletin referring to UL's bulletin.
- c) FAQ document to help guide and educate the public and local jurisdictions.
- d) At what time in testing did the cable "fail"?
- e) Is the cable "failure" related to conduit?
- f) Does Fire Alarm Advisory want OSFM take a position?
- g) Acceptable to go back to 2007 NFPA 72 fully sprinklered building non-requirement for CI?
- h) Alarm cabling to be required to run through pipe or conduit? Richard Roberts cited Item 4 of Survivability, Level II & III that provides for alternative methods. Also, he cited that a publication by the Department of Veterans Administration, states: "Wiring installed in metal raceway within buildings while protected throughout by sprinklers shall be considered to meet the requirements for pathway survivability Level II in accordance to NFPA 72 2010 as a two-hour performance alternative that has been approved by the authority having jurisdiction shall be permitted for voice communications systems in VA facilities."
- i) Rick Lewis referred to San Francisco receiving a code interpretation that an alternative is to provide a two-hour stacked enclosure, provide raceways from fire command center to the two-hour stacked enclosure encased in concrete.

- 10) It was noted by Ben Ho and James Parsegian that formal code interpretation requests must be brought to the OSFM Interpretation Committee.

V. New Business

- A) Bill Hopple presented the dilemma concerning older fire alarm systems that are no longer listed and whether old or used parts can be used for repair purposes.
  - 1) It was mentioned that some businesses are UL listed that refurbish old alarm parts.
  - 2) UL has information on their website concerning products modified in the field.

Fire Alarm Advisory Committee  
DRAFT Meeting Minutes – January 22, 2013

- 3) UL can perform field visits.
- 4) UL doesn't list re-furbished circuit breakers as you have to know exact electrical characteristics of original testing, such as trip current profile.  
Pat Ward recommended to Bill Hopple if a formal interpretation request was placed that it include "adding" a part concerning old alarm system that are no longer listed. Under alternate means of communication (IPDAX), some systems comply with UL for alternate communication, but some municipalities require a phone line.
- 5) Cable modems are not UL listed, provide eight hours of standby.
- 6) Rick Lewis quoted the 2013 edition of NFPA 72, Chapter 26, "A single communication path is permitted unless prohibited by the enforcing authority. The path shall be supervised at an interval of not more than 60 minutes. A failure of the path shall be annunciated at the supervising stations at no more than 60 seconds."

VI. Open Forum

No items were discussed.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:35 PM