

State Fire Marshal Questions  
Plan Review Seminar  
LA-AFAA Quarterly Meeting January 23, 2009

**Question No. 1**

Since NFPA (as far as I can tell) does not give ANY directions on “Waterflows” being “Silenceable” or “Non-Silenceable” Can the SFM give us a clear direction? Some say yes and others say no. All new Fire panels (Notifier) listed 9<sup>th</sup> Edition will not let us even choose “Silenceable”. I have also contacted other members and they too tell me their panels are like that. This answer also needs to be given to all the field inspectors.

NFPA 101 and NFPA 72 do not address this issue. Therefore, waterflow alarms maybe silenced per 72:4.4.3.7.

**Question No. 2**

Since the city of West Monroe does finals on Education buildings inside city, How do we, know that the project is CLEARED out on the State level or do we need to be concerned?

The fire alarm contractor should be at the final inspection to test the system so the fire prevention bureau should be able to give them a copy of their report. Question: Are the fire prevention bureaus requiring the fire alarm contractor to be at the final inspection when they are conducting their final inspection?

**Question No. 3**

Plan Review requires submittal of a Sequence of Operation for approval. There are times when, for various reasons, the Sequence of Operation will change and alter what has been approved. For minor changes within code compliance such as changing from duct detector sending an alarm signal to sending a supervisory signal, does the local inspector have the authority to approve changes to the Sequence of Operation, without resubmittal/approval from Plan Review? If the answer to the above is yes, please give examples of situations that would allow the local inspector to approve changes and examples that would require resubmittal to Plan Review for approval.

No. Changes shall be submitted to the plan reviewer as correspondence from the owner and/or design professional.

**Question No. 4**

Use of the Exemption Request is limited to a maximum of 10 devices. It has been stated by Plan Review that, depending on circumstances, this quantity may be exceeded if requested and approved in advance. Please give examples of situations that may apply where an excess of 10 devices would be allowed to be submitted as an Exemption Request.

Have the NICET qualifier or the owner of the fire alarm company give either Jim Waite or Michael McLean a call to discuss the possibility of exceeding 10 devices on an exemption request. This office handles each on a case by case base. Examples: 1) Adding 1 to 2 visual devices with 10 pull stations. 2) Adding or replacing 22 smoke detectors in elevator lobbies in a 22 story high-rise.

**Question No. 5**

A Fire Alarm Contractor has been awarded a project for a tenant space renovation. It is discovered that there have been no architectural plans submitted for review of the renovation. What action should the Fire Alarm Contractor take in this situation?

Here are few suggestions:

- 1) The fire alarm contractor can notify the owner that the architectural work is required by state law (R.S. 40:1574) to be submitted to the Office of the State Fire Marshal for plan review.
- 2) The fire alarm contractor can contact the district office to send an inspector to the site to require plans to be submitted for plan review.

The fire alarm contractor should not ignore the issue and submit his shop drawings, because the submittal will be placed on hold to request the architectural review number and eventually found not in compliance. A complaint may also be forward to the licensing section. If the submittal is a Required Fire Alarm Exemption, then the submittal is automatically found not in compliance, a complaint shall be filed with the licensing section and the privilege of submitting exemption request shall be suspended per SFM Memorandum – “Use of Exemption Request Forms” (Dated 6/11/02).

**Question No. 6**

For access control systems where all the doors being controlled are using door strikes on perimeter doors only, is a submittal to the state required?

Please be cautious to avoid using terminology such as “access control systems” when referring to other types of security systems or devices such as electric door strikes. Terminology such as “Access-control system” is easily confused with “Access-controlled egress door”, which is specifically defined in NFPA101 as a unique type of special locking. Using the terminology “Access-control systems should be avoided when referring to types of special locking other than that prescribed by NFPA 101:7.2.1.6.2. (Electric door strikes are not recognized as “access-controlled egress doors”).)

To answer the question at hand;

According to item #4 of IM2006-03, “Electric strikes proposed for installation on exterior doors that allow free egress in accordance with NFPA101 will be permitted to be installed without submittal to this office for review.”

**Question No. 7**

Is a submittal required when you are replacing an existing access control system and only the panels are being replaced? All field hardware is remaining as is.

No, provided the existing conditions comply with NFPA 101:7.2.1.6.2, OR the earlier provisions permitted by the edition of NFPA 101 applicable for the particular building.

**Question No. 8**

When installing an access control system where the locking hardware is being supplied and installed by the hardware contractor, is it the responsibility of the access control contractor submitting the locking system to obtain the hardware information to include all in one submittal? What if the hardware (locksmith) isn't licensed for access control?

Door hardware is not typically applicable for "access-controlled egress door" installations. NFPA contains provisions for the installation and operation of locking and releasing devices used at access-controlled egress doors. Locking devices proposed for the installation of "access-controlled egress doors" are typically electromagnetic locks. The releasing devices prescribed by NFPA 101:7.2.1.6.2 to provide unimpeded egress and initiate release of these electromagnetic locks includes a "Sensor" that detects an approaching occupant and a "Manual release device". Locking and releasing devices prescribed by NFPA 101 for unimpeded egress need to be identified by MAKE/MODEL/LOSITNG in order to gain approval for special locking installation requests. Please note that all required special locking/egress devices shall be listed for the intended purpose.

Installation requests that do not identify a properly licensed contractor to install special locking should be and probably will be DENIED.

**Question No. 9**

We have encountered several instances where a "new" fire system has been requested by the Owner or an addition has been requested by the Owner. In these instances the system is a non-required system or has been handled as a service call but an exempt request needed to be filed with the SFM. In these instances no Architectural plan review was done or the Architectural review was done some years back and the project is just now coming to fruition. The Exempt Request were bounced back to us as Non-Compliant due to no architectural review number. Can we have the SFM review this type of instance and what we can do about the process where no architectural review has been done?

Industry can eliminate a number of Not-in-Compliance submittals (i.e. Full Shop Drawing Reviews, Required Exemptions and Non-Required Exemptions) if some time is taken to adequately document the scope of work. In this case, explain that it was the owners' decision to add this non-required fire alarm system to his building.

**Question No. 10**

Can you briefly describe the Industrial Building Exemption process?

Discuss with Joe Delaune.

**Question No. 11**

I was told that Fire Protection Systems can't be installed in buildings fabricated out of State. Many modular Refinery Process Buildings as well as Flammable Liquid Storage Buildings come fitted with systems. Why can't the Louisiana Contractor submit for approval, conduit/wire roughed in out of state, and system certified by the Louisiana firm once the building is moved on location in Louisiana?

Discuss with Joe Delaune.

**Question No. 12**

**A.**

We were contracted to replace the fire alarm for an apartment building. I submitted this system as a "Remote Station". Before the final inspection, the owner decided he was not going to be monitored. The SFM inspector certified the system without the system being monitored. What should I do?

The owner of the firm or NICET qualifier shall contact the plan reviewer to determine if monitoring of the fire alarm system is required (i.e. sprinkler supervision). It may be possible to be handled as correspondence from the owner. If the fire alarm system is required to be monitored, then contact the District Supervisor.

**B.**

Are we required to notify the Fire Marshal's Office if a non-conforming/non-required system is red tagged? Red tag would be removed when customer is able to complete repair of destruction caused by hurricane.

Yes

**C.**

When a complaint is made against an individual or a company, the SFM Office has investigators that do a rigid and thorough job anonymously. Is there a similar procedure in place if a complaint is made against an SFM individual?

When a complaint is made against an individual or a company, the SFM Office has investigators that do a rigid and thorough job anonymously. Complaints made against State Fire Marshal employees are taken seriously and are investigated appropriately and thoroughly.