|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| July EFCOG Fire Protection Task Team Meeting Minutes | | | | | |
| 7.27.2016 | | 12:00 MST | | Skype Meeting / 505-844-5300 | |
| Meeting called by | Julie Cordero, Chair | | | | |
| Type of meeting | Monthly Meeting | | | | |
| Facilitator | Julie Cordero | | | | |
| Note taker | Julie Cordero | | | | |
| Timekeeper | N/A | | | | |
| Attendees | Will Cosey, David Greer, Rich Lewis, Jake Greenwell, Angela Brown, Rob Nii, Terry Meisinger, Jim Bisker, Bill Brown, Alex Smith, Jon Gault, Harvey Goranson, James Collins, Tomas Sanchez, Josh Herrera, Virgil Rankin, Allan Coutts, Tom Allison | | | | |
| Action Item Review | | | | | |
|  | Julie Cordero | | | | |
| Discussion | Status update | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| Conclusions |  | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| Action Items | | | Person Responsible | | Deadline |
| Confirm membership of all individuals on distribution and provide non-members the option to join. Non-members not wishing to join will be removed from the distribution. | | | Julie Cordero | | On-going |
| Reminder: Multiple documents have been posted to the Repository (i.e., Delegation of Authority Letters, Equivalencies and Exemptions, Applicability Matrices for DOE O 420.1C, DOE-STD-1066-2012 and DOE-STD-1020-2012,), <http://hqlnc.doe.gov/eh/Fire+Protection.nsf/hp?OpenForm>. Login uses first and last name (e.g., Jane Doe). Verify member information is correct. Send Jim Bisker an e-mail at [Jim.Bisker@hq.doe.gov](mailto:Jim.Bisker@hq.doe.gov) so he can reset your password, if needed. | | | All | | On-going |
| Volunteer for a joint-Contractor review effort of codes/standards.  Note: Rich Lewis, Mike Cates, Darwin Damba and Frank Broidy have already volunteered. | | | All | | On-going |
| Verify acceptability to share e-mail communication between Sharon Steel, Jim Bisker, David Compton and Julie Cordero regarding need/requirement to re-apply for an exemption when an Order is revised | | | Julie Cordero | | E-mail sent on 7/19; pending response |
| Joint-Contractor Review Effort of Codes/Standards | | | | | |
|  | Rich Lewis | | | | |
| Discussion | NFPA Code Review Proposal | | | | |
| The task team is commenting on the Proposal. The next step is to reach out to other sites and gauge the level of interest (getting a commitment from enough sites to make this a viable proposal). A draft guide (or template) will need to be provided for consistency in evaluations.  Julie Cordero suggested starting with a few key documents (i.e., NFPA 25, 13, 72) based on the revision schedules. A targeted e-mail can also be sent to the distribution so that the information isn’t buried in the meeting agenda/minutes.  Allan Coutts stated that IHS is starting to publish red-lined versions. However, the documents include all formatting changes which make them difficult to use).  Tom Allison was at an NFPA Technical Committee meeting recently where it was indicated that NFPA is working on adding back the vertical bar (the bullet indicating deleted text will likely not be added). This is expected in the 2018 NFPA 101 Life Safety Code. | | | | | |
| Conclusions |  | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| Action Items | | | Person Responsible | | Deadline |
|  | | |  | |  |
|  | | |  | |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| FPE Definition per DOE-STD-1066-2012 | | | |
|  | Rich Lewis | | |
| Discussion | Questions from Rich Lewis that was sent to the distribution on 7/22/16:  I was talking to someone today (to be left unnamed) regarding the definition of Fire Protection Engineer in 1066-12.  His interpretation of the definition was that when it talks about a "graduate of an accredited engineering curriculum" that meant Fire Protection Engineers only.  Any other engineer or discipline would be in the "If not such a graduate" category.  Why this is important to me is that means any current college graduate that does not have a degree in Fire Protection Engineer would require six years of engineering practice before they would be eligible to a qualified Fire Protection Engineer.   First, how do you interpret the definition?  And second, can you distribute to the EFCOG group to see how others interpret the requirement? | | |
| 1066 Definition: Fire Protection Engineer (FPE) – A graduate of an accredited engineering curriculum who has completed not less than four years of engineering practice, three of which were in responsible charge of diverse fire protection engineering work. If not such a graduate, an engineer should either: demonstrate knowledge of the principles of fire protection engineering showing evidence by specific academic courses and written examination in the related curriculum of physical, mathematical, and engineering sciences, and have completed not less than six years engineering practice, three of which in responsible charge of diverse fire protection engineering projects, or be a registered professional engineer in fire protection. | | | |
| Several responses and related links were sent back on distribution (e.g., any type of engineer so long as the degree is obtained from an “accredited program” and the individual proves to be capable at FPE work, engineering degree only, Engineering Technology degrees from OSU and EKU – unknown how to treat). Most agree that any type of engineering (not just FPE) is acceptable under the first sentence of the definition.  OPM Classification and Qualifications:  <https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/classification-qualifications/general-schedule-qualification-standards/0800/all-professional-engineering-positions-0800>  CFR Title 41 Public Contracts and Property Management:  <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-2014-title41-vol3/pdf/CFR-2014-title41-vol3.pdf>  DOE-STD-1137-2014:  <http://energy.gov/ehss/downloads/doe-std-1137-2014>  Robert Nii uses an internally developed standard/exam to qualify FPE’s. The FPE definition is used to determine if a candidate is eligible to sit for the internal exam.  OSU and EDU are both ABET accredited.  The current revised 1066 definition is as follows. Note that the term “qualified” fire protection engineer will no longer be used:  Fire Protection Engineer (FPE):  A graduate of an accredited engineering curriculum who has completed not less than four years of engineering practice, three of which were in responsible charge of diverse fire protection engineering work.  If not such a graduate, an ~~engineer~~ individual should either:  demonstrate knowledge of the principles of fire protection engineering showing evidence by specific academic courses and written examination in the related curriculum of physical, mathematical, and engineering sciences, and have completed not less than six years engineering practice, three of which in responsible charge of diverse fire protection engineering projects, or be a registered professional engineer in fire protection.  Federal FPEs under the Department’s Federal Technical Capability Program (see DOE O 426.1, *Federal Technical Capability*) are qualified according to DOE-STD-1137-2014, *Fire Protection Engineering Functional Area Qualification Standard*, or its predecessors. | | | |
| Conclusions | Send Jim Bisker an e-mail with proposed language | | |
|  | | | |
| Action Items | | Person Responsible | Deadline |
| Send Jim Bisker the proposed language of “A graduate of an engineering/engineering technology curriculum….” and justification for considerations. | | Rich Lewis | ASAP |
|  | |  |  |
| DOE-STD-1066 RevCom Status | | | |
|  | Jim Bisker / Julie Cordero / Tom Allison | | |
| Discussion | Metrics Request  SRS Comments | | |
| ~450 comments were received in RevCom  David Compton confirmed that metrics could be provided once they are ready to put the comment resolutions back into Response Negotiation (i.e., total # of comments, # of essential comments, # of suggested comments, dispositions). Dispositions are Accept, Accept in Part, Not Accepted). He suggested we reach out to the Technical Standards Program/Managers regarding # of contractor comments submitted from the Field Offices and the number of Field Office comments that were submitted up from the Program Offices.  Target: October or November publication (vs. December due to intent to publish prior to election). | | | |
| Jim Bisker stated that comment submitters with large/controversial topic were provided information on the status of those comments. For essential comments, the submitter must ‘agree’ or ‘agree to disagree’, in which case DOE will decide. A Site Manager can over-ride a contractor.  Jim Bisker thinks that it’s okay to submit comments on someone else’s comment in the Response Negotiation phase of RevCom. Or just send him an e-mail. The Response Negotiation is typically a 30-day period. There is a 2-week final review period prior to publishing. | | | |
| SRS topics of interest:   * Fire walls vs. fire barriers terms need to be consistent with NFPA (clarification is provided in the current revision) * Sec. 4.4.4 Nuclear Confinement Ventilation is not consistent with current technology/requirements. Jim Bisker recently attended a conference where he consulted with SME’s. He reached out to Dr. Bergman for comments. Thus, revisions may be made prior to RevCom. SRS agrees with this approach. Chapter 10 of the Air Cleaning Handbook will be updated in the future and Dr. Bergman will help with this effort. Other SME’s may also volunteer for this effort. | | | |
| Conclusions |  | | |
|  | | | |
| Action Items | | Person Responsible | Deadline |
|  | |  |  |
|  | |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Review of Proposed Topics for Future Meetings | | | |
|  | Julie Cordero | | |
| Discussion | Proposed topics (from the Jan 2015 survey and others recommended via e-mail or at July meeting):   * Review of Office of Enterprise Assessments Lessons Learned from Targeted Reviews of Fire Protection Programs at DOE Nuclear Facilities (8/7/15) recommendations for all sites across the DOE Complex, <http://energy.gov/ea/services/assessments/environment-safety-and-health-assessments/review-reports> * Fire Safety & Evacuation Plans * RCM (e.g., Fire Extinguishers) * Gloveboxes (e.g., suppression options, utilization of non-combustible materials) * Management of Combustible Loading (i.e., guidelines/thresholds, how combustible materials are quantified so that operations personnel can determine compliance with combustible loading requirements) * Tritium Exit Signs (e.g., who uses them, replacement, disposal method) * Fire Dynamics Simulator (e.g., who uses FDS, are results used to support a technical position or an engineering judgement) * Chemical Management * FPE Staffing Needs Analysis * Halon Removal Efforts * Program Performance Metrics * Tenability Standards for Performance-Based Design * Fact Sheet on Fire Protection Considerations with Green Building Design * Innovative R&D * NFPA 801 (i.e., limited combustible construction conflict with DOE-STD-1066) * \*NEW: NFPA 13 Dry Pipe Systems – Nitrogen Systems * Legacy Issues with Facilities that have an Unknown COR (e.g., Non-Compliance with NFPA Codes and Standards) * 2015 NFPA 101, 13.7.6.1, requirements for crowd managers in Assembly Occupancies * Positive Accountability for Evac Drills * As-built Drawings * VTR/SCIF Locksets * IFC vs. NFPA vs. DOE-STD-1212 Maximum Allowable Quantities * NFPA 72 communication modes for panels (Sec. 26.6.4.1.4) (Lead: Richard Lewis)   Topics discussed in past meetings:   * Acceptance Testing of New Emergency Lights (i.e., post maintenance test requirement when emergency lights are replaced) [July 2015] * Glycerin Anti-Freeze Change-Out [Oct 2015] * Underground/Subterranean Facilities (Lead: John Kubicek) [Nov 2015] * Review/documentation of newly published codes/standards for implementation [Dec 2015] * AHJ Delegations & Impact on Contractors (Lead: John Saidi) [Mar 2016] * ITM at Leased Facilities (Lead: Mike Cates) [May 2016] | | |
| Conclusions |  | | |
|  | | | |
| Action Items | | Person Responsible | Deadline |
|  | |  |  |
|  | |  |  |
| Additional Discussion Items | | | |
|  |  | | |
| Discussion | Follow up on “need/requirement” to re-apply for an Exemption when an Order is revised.  Engineering Practices Subgroup (EPSG) meeting at Argonne National Lab on Aug 9-10th.  Follow up on GAP Analysis between various NFPA 70E editions. | | |
| No requirement was found in O 251.1C to indicate that re-submittal was required for Exemptions when an Order is revised. Several individuals looked during and after last month’s meeting. Jim Bisker thought this might be an MA requirement. | | | |
| Julie Cordero will be providing a short presentation at the EPSG meeting (FP Task Team status, list of planned activities, areas where help is needed. Topics to include:   * Joint-Contractor Review Team * Proposed changes to Fire Safety Committee (Jim Bisker stated that consideration is being given to having the Fire Safety Committee be DOE representatives only with participation from the EFCOG FP Task Team Chair) * Directory upgrade (to include Equivalencies and Exemptions summary) | | | |
| Best Practice #71 Adoption of NFPA 70E 2009 in place of NFPA 70E 2004:  <http://efcog.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/BP71.pdf>  Best Practice #111 Adoption of NFPA 70E 2012 in place of NFPA 70E 2009:  <http://efcog.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/bp-111.pdf> | | | |
| Conclusions |  | | |
|  | | | |
| Action Items | | Person Responsible | Deadline |
| Follow up with Sharon Steel to determine where the ‘requirement’ is with regard to re-submitted Exemption requests when an Order is revised. | | Julie Cordero | Next meeting |
|  | |  |  |