

NFPA 13-2019 Edition
Standard for the Installation of Sprinkler Systems

TIA Log No.: 1460

Reference: Table 20.12.2.6

Comment Closing Date: October 11, 2019

Submitter: Steve Wolin, Reliable Automatic Sprinkler Co., Inc.

www.nfpa.org/13

1. Revise the last row in Table 20.12.2.6, and add a new row, to read as follows:

Table 20.12.2.6 Hose Stream Allowance and Water Supply Duration

Commodity	Sprinkler Type	Sprinkler Spacing Type	Number of Ceiling Sprinklers in Design Area ^a	Size of Design Area at Ceiling	Hose Stream Allowance		Water Supply Duration (minutes)
					gpm	L/min	
. . .							
Alternative protection per 25.8.3.3 25.8.1	NA	NA	NA	NA	500	1900	120
<u>Alternative protection per 25.8.2 or 25.8.3</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>950</u>	<u>60</u>

NA: Not applicable.

^aFor CSMA and ESFR sprinklers, the additional sprinklers included in the design area for obstructions do not need to be considered in determining the total number of sprinklers in this column.

^bLimited to a maximum of 144 ft² (13 m²) per sprinkler.

^cFor storage on-tread, on-side, and laced tires in open portable steel racks or palletized portable racks, with pile height up to 25 ft (7.6 m) and building height up to 30 ft (9.1 m) with K-14.0 (K-200) or K-16.8 (K-240) ESFR sprinklers, the water supply duration is 180 minutes.

Substantiation: The 2019 edition of NFPA 13 inadvertently removed the hose stream allowance and water supply duration requirements for the existing Alternative In-rack Sprinkler Protection scheme, now Option 1. The Option 1 Alternative In-rack Sprinkler Protection scheme was in Sections 16.1.2.4 and 17.1.2.9 in the 2016 edition of NFPA 13. The hose stream allowance and water supply duration requirements were specified in Table 12.8.6 of NFPA 13 2016 edition as 500 gpm and 120 minutes, respectively. As published, the 2019 edition of NFPA 13 does not have a hose stream allowance and water supply duration requirement for Alternative In-rack Sprinkler Protection Option 1 (now in Section 25.8.1).

In addition, Sections 25.8.2.8 and 25.8.2.9 reference Table 20.12.2.6 for hose stream allowance and water supply duration requirements, which are not currently provided. The 250 gpm hose stream allowance and 60 minute water supply duration were omitted for both Section 25.8.2 (Option 2) and 25.8.3 (Option 3).

Emergency Nature: The standard contains an error or an omission that was overlooked during the regular revision process. The NFPA Standard contains a conflict within the NFPA Standard or within another NFPA Standard.

The 2019 edition of NFPA 13 fails to provide hose stream allowance and water supply duration requirements for all of the Alternative In-rack Sprinkler Protection options. In addition, Sections 25.8.2.8 and 25.8.2.9 in the 2019 edition of NFPA 13 contain references to Table 20.12.2.6 for hose stream allowance and water supply duration requirements, respectively, that are not provided. Thus, the 2019 edition of NFPA 13 includes both an omission of necessary hydraulic design requirements and a conflict where Sections 25.8.2.8 and 25.8.2.9 reference requirements that are not currently provided.

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.