

VI - TECHNICAL COMMITTEE PROJECT REPORT

DATE OF MEETING: September 23, 1993							
PROJECT TITLE: Fire Science							
OBJECTIVE OF PROJECT: Monitor and promote scientific reasoning in the development of fire codes, standards and regulations that ensure a fair treatment for PVC products.							
STATUS REPORT: <u>A. Corrosion</u> - ASTM D9.21 (Con Calorimeter) is going to Society vote. UL has proposed a round robin at a recent meeting Marcelo H. attended for the VI. ASTM E5.21 appears dead. At this point, ASTM D9.21 appears to be the future U.S. test and the one being advance at IEC 89. This is probably the best small scale test for PVC. The CNET and DIN traveling furnace appear to be the European candidates for IEC 89. It is interesting that the company that makes the CNET apparatus is out of business. Both tests are less desirable than D9.21 for PVC. On large scale corrosion tests, both the CSA and UL are in the process of developing LC tests and standards. Marcelo H. is representing the VI on the development of these tests. The CSA's position is that a LC cable must meet all standards in addition to low corrosion. UL has test protocol proposed for evaluation. UI has estimated the cost for development at \$200M. At this time, there does not appear to be a high degree of interest and participants and funding may not be sufficient. We need to decide on VI participation? <u>B. Toxicity</u> - Rich Gottwald (SPI) met with NYC officials to discuss their apparent adoption of an "interim protocol" which is the NY state procedure with a cut-off number of 19.7. Apparently, we have new people involved who are willing to consider the dropping of their toxicity requirements. Rich has sent a letter to NYC summarizing SPI's position and the results of their results of their meeting (No applause yet!) The NIST - Steve Packham modified toxicity test continues to plod (glacial speed) through ASTM E-5. The modifications Dick Gann of NIST recommended and we wanted have been included in the appendix. This apparently leaves the test method "clean of editorial comment". Jack Snell of NIST has said any procedure that gains NFPA approval will have the modifications in the test. The U.S. continues to support a NIST variant in IEC-89. The European community does not want an animal model and has resurrected the DIN traveling furnace. Hopefully, this whole issue will continue to decline line in importance as hazard analysis and risk assessment models gain credibility and application. <u>C. Miscellaneous</u> - 1) David Moore of DESC has not answered Macelo H's June 16 letter. If we wish to pursue the removing of PVC from their HMMIN program, we need to develop a plan and allocate resources. 2) Funding for the NFPA90A research projects on combustibles in plenums has not reached the level needed. The project will be redesigned for the lower funding or canceled. 3) The VSI testing is underway at SWRI. Bruce Anson of Rohm & Haas is the lead technical person. We need to continue to monitor. 4) The National Electrical Cod (NFPA) cycle will begin this year. Submittals, reviews and final SPI position will be done in the Coordinating Committee on Fire Safety of the SPI. If a VI company is planning to submit a proposal, please contact me.							
RECOMMENDED ACTIONS & FUTURE PROGRAMS: 1) If the UI-LC program appears to be gaining enough financial support, I recommend VI participation. The extend of funding is unknown as it will be determined by number of participants. Total program cost is \$200M. 2) The VI needs to determine what degree of effort to expend of DESC. 3) Peter Lloyd of Geon is listed on NFPA panels for the development of the NEC. If he does not participate, the VI needs to choose a substitute.							
MEETING AGENDA: <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 70%;">1) Are any decisions needed by the IMC (Y/N)?</td> <td style="width: 30%; text-align: center;">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2) Is a presentation and/or discussion needed (Y/N)?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3) How much total meeting time should be scheduled for presentation, discussion and/or decision (minutes)?</td> <td style="text-align: center;">30 Minutes</td> </tr> </table>		1) Are any decisions needed by the IMC (Y/N)?	Yes	2) Is a presentation and/or discussion needed (Y/N)?	Yes	3) How much total meeting time should be scheduled for presentation, discussion and/or decision (minutes)?	30 Minutes
1) Are any decisions needed by the IMC (Y/N)?	Yes						
2) Is a presentation and/or discussion needed (Y/N)?	Yes						
3) How much total meeting time should be scheduled for presentation, discussion and/or decision (minutes)?	30 Minutes						
PREPARED BY: H. J. Hall	DATE: August 23, 1993						

August 1993

R&S 143618