

**NFPA 101 TC ON EDUCATIONAL AND DAY-CARE OCCUPANCIES
PROPOSED TENTATIVE INTERIM AMENDMENT NO. 1436 - FINAL BALLOT RESULTS**

QUESTION NO. 1: I AGREE with the TECHNICAL MERITS of the Proposed TIA Log No. 1436 to add new Section No. 15.2.2.2.4(3)and renumber subsequent items to the 2018 Edition of NFPA 101.

Eligible to Vote: 23

Not Returned : 4

Raymond N.

Hansen,Howard

Hopper,Richard L. Day,Rosa

Lazebnik

Vote Selection

Agree

Keith S. Frangiamore

Votes

15

Comments

The current requirement for existing classroom doors to be opened with not more than one lock/latch releasing operation is leading some school districts to resort to dangerous barricade devices for targeted violence incidents.

Catherine L. Stashak

The multiple provisions of 15.2.2.2.4 weed out the dangerous hardware and locking means being promoted in the marketplace by those unfamiliar with traditional means of egress science found in the model codes. The majority of the security/intruder devices being promoted are even more dangerous, not allowing students the ability to open doors in the event of a fire so they can evacuate or preventing first responders from gaining entry. These devices are also to cumbersome or complicated for students/staff to figure out how to use or are located beyond their reach. If the codes do not start providing guidance on safe ways to deal with security concerns, these more dangerous devices will continue to be used, because the codes do not provide a better alternative. The Committee recognizes that hardware does exist, and could be used that allows two locking mechanisms with one releasing actions (as existing code requires), such as "hotel" locking systems, but the proposed TIA language addresses the inevitable existing conditions that cannot utilize the "hotel locks." Schools often cannot afford the expense of retrofitting "hotel" locks and in some instances existing doors cannot accommodate a new locking system so the entire door needs to be replaced. The language calls for drills and training which historically educational occupancies are active in performing. The language calls for the locking device to be at a level that can be reached by students without the need for a key, tool, or special knowledge or effort. This language provides the opportunity for a second lock that will be consistent with the means of egress design required for the primary lock. The efforts of the NFPA working with security organizations (ASIS), and multiple first responder organizations such as fire, police, FBI, and educational representatives to resolve this conflict resulted in a statement that security and life safety authorities need to work together, inserting language in the already existent model codes that will create buildings that work both ways: Prevent unwanted intruders but also permit safe and timely egress if needed-with human and life safety as the first priority. As permitted by this TIA a more cost effective locking device can be added to existing doors that will satisfy all of the current requirements with the exception of not requiring more than one lock/latch releasing operation to open the door. The additional (second)operation allowed by this TIA can be readily mitigated by the extensive emergency action plan and evacuation drill requirements already in place. The use of dangerous, non-compliant barricade devices will continue to proliferate until the Code offers a reasonable solution such as that offered by this TIA.

Max L. Gandy	Agree
Aleksy L. Szachnowicz	"Agree"
Scott J. Blaser	This is an item that needs to be put in the Life Safety Code now.
Samuel S. Dannaway	Agree
Matthew J. Mertens	agree
Terrence J. Julka	Agree
Richard E. Merck	We have made this change at the State Level in Maryland. I believe it is the proper change.
Richard M. DiMisa	Agree.
Michael L. Sinsigalli	The proposed TIA responds to a current need of existing schools as they struggle to find code compliant means with which to provide added safety to students and staff. The proposed language provides reasonable protection for a limited type of incident.
Michael Naber	It should be noted that issuing a TIA on First Revision language is unusual.
Jason D. Ellis	Agree
Jeffrey L. Haidacher	Agree
Mark J. Aaby	Agree.
Disagree	4
Michael L. Savage, Sr.	The submitter of the TIA's verbiage is very different from that which was approved by the committee. The submitters language makes it a mandatory requirement, the committee voted for a permissable style language "where approved by the AHJ". The submitter also did not submit any technical materials to support his substantiation.
Alfred J. Longhitano	I disagree with the requirement for locking devices to be unlockable from the outside for two reasons. First, this requires school districts that lack funds to provide books, adequate staffing and adequate teacher salaries to divert additional funds to buying and installing pricier door hardware. Second, police and fire personnel have forcible entry tools that allow them to get through locked doors. A lock that can be opened from the outside can be defeated by a criminal who goes to the office and takes the key or credential at gunpoint.
Maria B. Marks	NEMA supports securing classrooms from intruders and allowing people with disabilities to get out of a classroom. This is the Committee's intent of the First Revision for the 2021 edition of the Code. However, the development for the 2021 edition of the Code is in mid-cycle. The Committee needs to review and act on any Public Comments as well as the NITMAM process. A TIA should not be based on a First Revision of the next edition of a code or standard.
Kurt A. Roeper	The TIA language is not the language that was agreed to by the TC as is reflected in the First Draft. It does not contain the clause regarding approval by the AHJ, and it also does not contain the First Draft language rearding doors that are replace having to comply with Ch. 14
Abstain	0

QUESTION NO. 2: I AGREE that the subject is of an EMERGENCY NATURE for one or more of the reasons noted in the Instructions box.

Eligible to Vote: 23

Not Returned : 4

Raymond N.

Hansen,Howard

Hopper,Richard L. Day,Rosa

Lazebnik

Vote Selection

Votes

Comments

Agree

15

Keith S. Frangiamore

The proposed TIA intends to offer to the public a benefit that would lessen a recognized (known) hazard or ameliorate a continuing dangerous condition or situation.

Catherine L. Stashak

The current requirement for existing classroom doors to be opened with not more than one lock/latch releasing operation is leading some school districts to resort to dangerous barricade devices for targeted violence incidents. A modification to the current Code is needed, such as that accepted for the 2021 edition First Draft, to allow schools to install locking mechanisms requiring not more than two non-simultaneous operations to open the door. Failure to modify the current Code immediately will contribute to the continued use of barricade devices and put the safety of students and school staff at an unnecessarily high level of risk.

Max L. Gandy

D

Aleksy L. Szachnowicz

D This TIA would lessen the occasions whereby school districts are utilizing dangerous, unproved, and non-code-compliant barricade devices as an aid against targeted violence incidents.

Scott J. Blaser

There is a Florida task force making recommendations and there are bills in the Florida session right now that are making recommendations on this subject and if we do not get a head of them, we will loose our influence of the Life Safety Code.

Samuel S. Dannaway

Because of reasons C and D

Matthew J. Mertens

D: The proposed TIA intends to offer to the public a benefit that would lessen a recognized (known) hazard or ameliorate a continuing dangerous condition or situation. Namely the use of improper adjuncts and door jamb tools that increase exit hazards and have been proven to have significant unintended consequences.

Terrence J. Julka

E

Richard E. Merck

This change is needed as an emergency change in order to have a usable method for existing Educational Occupancies. D. The proposed TIA intends to offer to the public a benefit that would lessen a recognized (known) hazard or ameliorate a continuing dangerous condition or situation.

Richard M. DiMisa
Michael L. Sinsigalli

D

The issue addressed by the TIA addresses an immediate need in existing educational occupancies.

Michael Naber
Jason D. Ellis
Jeffrey L. Haidacher

It should be noted that issuing a TIA on First Revision language is unusual.

A

Selection D. The proposed TIA intends to offer to the public a benefit that would lessen a recognized (known) hazard or ameliorate a continuing dangerous condition or situation.

Mark J. Aaby

C. As stated in the TIA, "The current requirement for existing classroom doors to be opened with not more than one lock/latch releasing operation is leading some school districts to resort to dangerous barricade devices for targeted violence incidents."

Disagree

4

Michael L. Savage, Sr.

The submitters requested verbiage is far from what was approved by the committee, additionally, Chapter One allows for an equivalent method or material, as the document is enforced by AHJ's in effect the provision is there where approved.

Alfred J. Longhitano

I disagree with the emergency nature of requiring locking devices to be unlockable from the outside. Police and fire personnel have forcible entry tools that allow them to get through locked doors. A lock that can be opened from the outside can be defeated by a criminal who goes to the office and takes the key or credential at gunpoint.

Maria B. Marks

NEMA supports securing classrooms from intruders and allowing people with disabilities to get out of a classroom. This is the Committee's intent of the First Revision for the 2021 edition of the Code. However, the development for the 2021 edition of the Code is in mid-cycle. The Committee needs to review and act on any Public Comments as well as the NITMAM process. A TIA should not be based on a First Revision of the next edition of a code or standard.

Kurt A. Roeper

This subject has been the source of at least 6 prior TIA's that have been rejected by the TC and subsequently denied on appeal to the Standards Council. The subject is again before the TC and is in the First Draft for public comment. The process should be allowed to work and the final language should be guided by the yet to be received public comments.

Abstain

0

TENTATIVE INTERIM AMENDMENT BALLOT
EMERGENCY NATURE SELECTION OF RESPONSES

- A.** The standard contains an error or an omission that was overlooked during the regular revision process.
- B.** The NFPA Standard contains a conflict within the NFPA Standard or with another NFPA Standard.
- C.** The proposed TIA intends to correct a previously unknown existing hazard.
- D.** The proposed TIA intends to offer to the public a benefit that would lessen a recognized (known) hazard or ameliorate a continuing dangerous condition or situation.
- E.** The proposed TIA intends to accomplish a recognition of an advance in the art of safeguarding property or life where an alternative method is not in current use or is unavailable to the public.
- F.** The proposed TIA intends to correct a circumstance in which the revised NFPA Standard has resulted in an adverse impact on a product or method that was inadvertently overlooked in the total revision process or was without adequate technical (safety) justification for the action.