

SAGIV WEISS-ISHAI (San Francisco Fire Dept)

All my questions are for the CSFM and are based on the 2016 CBC/CFC

- Q-01** Per CBC-2016 Section 907.5.2.3.1: are visual applications required in office buildings provided with a building FA system in the following rooms: “Huddle rooms”, ‘Phone rooms”, “Mother rooms”, “Wellness rooms”, “War rooms”, etc. similar rooms not defined by code? (These rooms can vary in size)
- Q-02.** Can you clarify the exception to Section 907.6.1.1.2 ? Which code requires “continuous metallic raceways “for FA systems NACs for survivability?
- Q-03.** Has the CSFM considered changing the Class A requirement for new High-Rise building – especially if they are provided with a survivable FA system?
- Q-04.** In the reference standard chapter, CBC-2016 reference the ASME A17.1-2013 as the applicable Elevator standard for elevators. However, CCR Title 8 Elevator Safety orders reference the 2004 Edition of A17.1 as the applicable Standard in the state of CA. Is this a mistake in the CBC-2016?
- Q-05.** Can you clarify why Section 3005.4.1 is required to be in CBC? All the information included in this section is already specified in NFPA 13 (both 2013 and 2016 editions) Section 8.15.5.3 with a specific exclusion of Hydraulic Elevators (item 5). The CBC Section 3005.4.1 does not exclude Hydraulic Elevators which may create conflicts
- Q-06.** CFC-2016 Section 1113 is adopted by SFM on the adoption matrix. It includes a retroactive requirement to install FA systems in existing R-1 and R-2 Occupancies complying with this section. Is the intent of the SFM to enforce this retroactive requirement throughout the CA state effective 1/1/2017? Is the FA system to be retroactively installed in R-1 and R02 Occupancies must meet all current CBC/CFC-2016 and NFPA 72-2016 applicable code requirements (installed to current codes?).

KIRK GREENWOOD (SimplexGrinnell)

Q-07. Question for CSFM and OSHPD: **2013/2016 CBC 717.3.3.2 (4) - Where a smoke damper is installed in a corridor wall or ceiling, the damper shall be permitted to be controlled by a smoke detection system installed in the corridor.**

Does this code section imply that the dampers installed in a corridor wall, but do not serve the corridor, can be controlled by a smoke detection system installed in the corridor? Or do those dampers have to serve the corridor that the smoke detection system is installed?

Q-08. For DSA: If a, K-12 public school, boys locker room, that is part of the gymnasium building, is being renovated and the existing fire alarm system uses horns for the audible notification, why would the audible devices in the area of the renovation have to be changed to voice/speaker notification while the rest of the school/building is left as horns?

KEVIN GREEN (PyroComm)

Q-09. On page 3, of the CSFM Information Bulletin IB 15-002 at the bottom, where NFPA 25, 2013 California Edition only requires waterflow testing annually, due to the extreme drought conditions. Does this Information Bulletin (IB 15-002) also apply to NFPA 72, 2013 edition; specifically, Table 14.4.3.2 (17)(k) (functional testing waterflow switches) for semi-annually testing water flow devices by flowing water? There was no reference to NFPA 72, 2013 edition and only NFPA 25, 2013 California edition is being referenced.

STEPHEN ZIMMERMAN (Intrepid Electronic Systems)

Q-08. Title 19 section 905 requires that a C-16 or A license be active for a company to perform sprinkler inspections of any kind. I hear repeatedly that a C-10 fire alarm company can also do such inspections. Is this the case or does Title 19 require a C-16 or A license on any and all sprinkler inspections. As I read the requirement water flow and tamper inspection are excluded and can be performed by a C-10 contractor only as it pertains to their fire alarm testing. Do I interoperate this correctly.

Q-09 Alarm companies who perform water flow and tamper inspections, are they required to follow all water containment laws when flowing water during an alarm inspection?

Q-10 Can you confirm that prevailing wage must be paid for inspection related work for fire alarm and fire sprinkler inspections when state money is involved?

TONY LOCATELLI (Cupertino Electric Inc)

- Q-11 Are generators required to be monitored by the fire alarm system?
- Q-12. Is a two way communication system in accordance with 2013 CBC 1007.8 required to have live voice capability from the call station all the way to the offsite monitoring station? What is the procedure for the monitoring station when these calls are received?
- Q-13. Per 2013 CBC section 508.3.1 in a non separated mixed use occupancy, the alarm system is required to take on the most restrictive requirements. Let's say we have a B occupancy with 320 occupants, and within that structure there as an A occupancy with 700 occupants
- Both occupancies will be required to have the same type of system per previously mentioned code. Is this a horn strobe system or voice evacuation system?
- Q-14 When replacing a fire alarm panel in accordance with the State Fire Marshal interpretation of like for like, are you required to conform with the latest code for DACT requirements (i.e. IP and phone line, radio, etc.) or can you reuse the existing dual phone lines?

KIRK GREENWOOD (SimplexGrinnell)

- Q-15. Does smoke go around corners? i.e. do you have to have line of site to the area covered by the smoke detector? See attached plan example

MARK McQUAID (C.A. Gamble & Associates)

- Q-16. A new fire alarm system is being installed voluntarily in an existing low-rise (B Occupancy with more than 500 people) building to comply with current code requirements. The structure has sprinklers on the first floor and underground parking levels, but not on any floors above grade. Are pull station required throughout or just on the floors without sprinklers?
- Q-17. An existing high-rise office building, fully spinklered and built under codes that required pull stations, is undergoing a complete fire alarm system replacement. Can the pull stations be removed from the building? If so, are there other conditions that must be met to allow this?

MARK McQUAID (C.A. Gamble & Associates)

Q-18. The owner of a high-rise office building is upgrading the front end of the fire alarm system and the addressable field devices are compatible with the new control panel. The existing smoke detectors, while still operational, have yellowed and are unsightly. The owner would like to replace them with new devices for cosmetic purposes only. Is this work permitted to be included under the State Fire Marshal interpretation of requirements for front-end upgrade?

JOEL REITZ (Siemens)

Q-19. CFC Chapter 9: 901.4 Installation: “Required systems shall be extended, altered or augmented as necessary to maintain and continue protection whenever the building is altered, remodeled or added to”. Is the intent of this section to require any existing Initiating and Notification devices within a construction area (floor, wing, zone, etc.) be maintained in operation during remodeling/demolition construction efforts?

Q19-b Or, is the intent of this section to require the FA System be modified during construction in accordance with applicable standards and tested/certified prior to issuing a COO?

Q19-c Is there any difference in the interpretation of this section if it is within a typical B Occupancy vs. an I-2 Occupancy?

JON KAPIS (Sabah)

Q-20. Is the California State Fire Marshal or any other state jurisdiction, including Division of Occupational Safety and Health – Elevator Unit, OSHPD or DSA making changes to the code to require air aspirated smoke detection in elevator shafts when smoke detection is required by the California Building Code? We are seeing this requirement being requested by some jurisdictions based on concerns regarding testing and maintenance and concerns about smoke detector access within the elevator shaft.

Q21. Is the California State Fire Marshal preparing guidance regarding the temperature settings for elevator lobbies to be monitored for temperature when required by NFPA 72, section 21.5.1, item 3?

DAVID SECODA (Aon)

Q22. The 2013 CBC provided an exception to 907.2.3.3 (see below) that has subsequently been repealed (see below). How is the issue being addressed for future rulemaking?

Excerpt from 2012 Triennial Rulemaking Cycle Initial Statement of Reasons, July 1, 2012:

907.2.3, 907.2.3.1, 907.2.3.3, 907.2.3.7 and 907.2.3.7.1 (Relocated provisions to CBC 442.2)

The SFM is proposing modification to the above sections in coordination with the Divisions of State Architect to clarify the application of California Education Code Section 17070.10 for public school construction.

The 2012 IBC has entire fire alarm section dedicated to manual fire alarms for schools; therefore similar provisions are proposed to be taken out of State Amendments 907.2.3.

Exception Section 2.4 has been added to bring consistency with former code language concerning school manual pulls.

The new IBC requirement for emergency voice/alarm communication affects both public and private school projects. An established school campus, in some cases, will not have associated equipment in the existing fire alarm system to accommodate this new provision without additional upgrades and associated costs added to the project. Exception #4 is allowing for this condition.

Code language that is applicable to receiving state funding pursuant to Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 has been moved from Chapter 9 to Chapter 4 for specific application that involves Public School, K-12 projects.

Section 907.2.3 last paragraph was changed to include all fire suppression systems as expressing the intent of this paragraph and the need for all system fire alarm components to be connected to the building fire alarm system.

This change of location for the language is to clearly segregate state funded public school construction projects from non-state funded public school construction projects. It has no financial impact to school districts as the changes do not impose new requirements. Renumbering of sections is required to accommodate the modifications.

Excerpt from 2013 Intervening Code Cycle, Initial Statement of Reasons, January 7, 2014:

907.2.3.3

Rationale: The OSFM is repealing the exception originally proposed to utilize other two way communication methods intended for existing facilities. The omission of this exception will require existing facilities undergoing renovation or additions to address emergency voice/alarm communication systems on a case-by-case basis. The OSFM is reevaluating how to address this issue relating to existing facilities for future rulemaking.

The actions described above are reasonably necessary to carry out the purpose for which it is proposed. The rationale for these actions is to establish minimum requirements for the prevention of fire and for the protection of life and property against fire and panic in occupancies that are addressed in the California Building Standards Codes pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 13108, 13113, 13114, 13131.5, 13143, 17921, 18949.2 and California Education Code Section 17070.