



## **Public Input No. 181-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. 1.3 [Excluding any Sub-Sections] ]** This standard shall apply to ESS installations exceeding the values shown in Table 1.3 and the storage of lithium metal or lithium-ion batteries. Table 1.3 Threshold Quantities per Each Fire Area or Outdoor Installation **ESS Technology Aggregate Capacitya kWh MJ Battery ESS** Lead-acid, all types 70 252 Ni-Cad, Ni-MH, and Ni-Zn 70 252 Lithium-ion, all types 20 72 Sodium nickel chloride 20 (70<sup>b</sup>) 72 (252<sup>b</sup>) Flow batteries<sup>C</sup> 20 72 Other battery technologies 10 36 Batteries in one- and two-family dwellings and townhouse units  $\vert$ 1  $\vert$  1  $\vert$  3.6 **Capacitor ESS** Electrochemical double layer capacitors<sup>d</sup> 10.8 **Other ESS** All other ESS 252 Flywheel ESS (FESS) 0.5 1.8 aFor ESS units rated in amp-hrs, kWh equals nominal rated voltage multiplied by amp-hr nameplate rating divided by 1000. For batteries rated in watts per cell, kWh equals the nameplate watts per cell multiplied by the number of cells divided by 1000 and multiplied by the nameplate minutes rating divided by 60. bFor sodium-nickel-chloride batteries that have been listed to UL 1973 and meet the cell-level performance requirements in UL 9540A. <sup>C</sup>Includes vanadium, zinc-bromine, polysulfide-bromide, and other flowing electrolyte-type technologies.  $\alpha$ <sup>d</sup>Capacitors used for power factor correction, filtering, and reactive power flow are exempt. **Additional Proposed Changes File Name Description Approved** 855\_TG8\_Draft\_Changes\_- \_1.3\_Table\_Changes\_OBrian.pdf Additional Technologies, NFPA 855 Table 1.3 **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input** Due to the complexity of modification of tables in Terra View, please see the attached document to indicate the additional line changes to table 1.3

The following proposal has been submitted by task group 8 "new technology" of the NFPA 855 technical committee. The committee heard multiple proposals from various products which outlined a desire to be recognized in table 1.3 in a new category besides "other battery technologies." The task group heard 7 presentations from various manufactures and evaluated the submitted information through the open task group process.

The new technology line items added include Lithium Metal, Nickel-Hydrogen, Zinc Bromide and Zinc Manganese Dioxide batteries which through submitted presentations indicated that through testing appeared to meet the same results or improved results as typically found in Lithium Ion chemistries. The task group is recommending that that material be recognized similar to lithium ion batteries for the aggregate capacity.

#### **Related Public Inputs for This Document**

#### **Related Input Relationship**

Public Input No. 182-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.4.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 183-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5 [Excluding any Sub-**Sections**<sup>1</sup> Public Input No. 184-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. B.5.4] Public Input No. 182-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.4.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 183-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 184-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. B.5.4] Public Input No. 236-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after B.5]

Public Input No. 237-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after B.5]

#### **Submitter Information Verification**



#### **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-3-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** This first revision includes the new technologies to highlight lithium metal, nickelhydrogen, zinc bromide, and zinc manganese dioxide. Nickel iron, zinc-air and iron-air are aqueous alkaline battery chemistries just like Ni-Cd, Ni-MH and Ni-Zn.

This revision updates the correct terminology for Ni-Cd batteries.

The revision adds capacity requirements for hybrid supercapacitors with aggregate capacity similar to lithium-ion batteries. Hybrid supercapacitors are part battery and part capacitor which reduces the risk relative to pure capacitors.

1.3 Application.

This standard shall apply to ESS installations exceeding the values shown in Table 1.3 and the storage of lithium metal or lithium-ion batteries.

Table 1.3



<sup>a</sup>For ESS units rated in amp-hrs, kWh equals nominal rated voltage multiplied by amp-hr nameplate rating divided by 1000. For batteries rated in watts per cell, kWh equals the nameplate watts per cell multiplied by the number of cells divided by 1000 and multiplied by the nameplate minutes rating divided by 60.

<sup>b</sup>For sodium-nickel-chloride batteries that have been listed to UL 1973 and meet the cell-level performance requirements in UL 9540A.

cincludes vanadium, zinc-bromine, polysulfide-bromide, and other flowing electrolyte-type technologies.

dCapacitors used for power factor correction, filtering, and reactive power flow are exempt.

# **Public Input No. 221-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. 1.3 [Excluding any Sub-Sections] ]** This standard shall apply to ESS installations exceeding the values shown in Table 1.3 and the storage of lithium metal or lithium-ion batteries. Table 1.3 Threshold Quantities per Each Fire Area or Outdoor Installation **ESS Technology Aggregate Capacitya kWh MJ Battery ESS** Lead-acid, all types 70 252  $Ni$ -Cad  $Cd$  , Ni-MH, and Ni-Zn  $252$ Lithium-ion, all types 20 72 Sodium nickel chloride  $20(70^b)$   $72(252^b)$ Flow batteries<sup>C</sup> 20 72 Other battery technologies 10 36 Batteries in one- and two-family dwellings and townhouse units  $\vert$ 1  $\vert$ 1 3.6 **Capacitor ESS** Electrochemical double layer capacitors<sup>d</sup>  $\vert$ 3 10.8 **Other ESS** All other ESS 70 252 Flywheel ESS (FESS) 8 and 1.8 aFor ESS units rated in amp-hrs, kWh equals nominal rated voltage multiplied by amp-hr nameplate rating divided by 1000. For batteries rated in watts per cell, kWh equals the nameplate watts per cell multiplied by the number of cells divided by 1000 and multiplied by the nameplate minutes rating divided by 60. bFor sodium-nickel-chloride batteries that have been listed to UL 1973 and meet the cell-level performance requirements in UL 9540A. <sup>C</sup>Includes vanadium, zinc-bromine, polysulfide-bromide, and other flowing electrolyte-type technologies. dCapacitors used for power factor correction, filtering, and reactive power flow are exempt. **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input** Revised so that the conventional "Ni-Cd" reference is used. **Submitter Information Verification Submitter Full Name:** Kevin Fok **Organization:** LG Energy Solution Vertech **Street Address: City:**



# **Public Input No. 229-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. 1.3 [Excluding any Sub-Sections] ]**

This standard shall apply to ESS installations exceeding the values shown in Table 1.3 and the storage of lithium metal or lithium-ion batteries.



Table 1.3 Threshold Quantities per Each Fire Area or Outdoor Installation

aFor ESS units rated in amp-hrs, kWh equals nominal rated voltage multiplied by amp-hr nameplate rating divided by 1000. For batteries rated in watts per cell, kWh equals the nameplate watts per cell multiplied by the number of cells divided by 1000 and multiplied by the nameplate minutes rating divided by 60.

bFor sodium-nickel-chloride batteries that have been listed to UL 1973 and meet the cell-level performance requirements in UL 9540A.

<sup>C</sup>Includes vanadium, zinc-bromine, polysulfide-bromide, and other flowing electrolyte-type technologies.

dCapacitors used for power factor correction, filtering, and reactive power flow are exempt.

#### **Additional Proposed Changes**

Table 1.3- NFPA 855 Public Input for Iron-Air\_Updates.pdf

**File Name Description Approved** Form Energy Proposed Updates - Table 1.3

#### **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

Form Energy is proposing that iron-air technology be added to Table 1.3 as an ESS Technology. It is

recommended that iron-air technology be separately listed (and not covered under "other" technologies) because it has safety benefits that will be seen in other sections of the code (Table 9.6.5). 20 kWh is recommended because iron-air is demonstrated to be equivalent to or safer than other chemistries listed at those threshold quantities. Form Energy has test data available to present to the committee to support this claim. **Related Public Inputs for This Document Related Input Relationship** Public Input No. 231-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.4.1 [Excluding any Sub-**Sections**<sup>1</sup> Public Input No. 292-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] **Submitter Information Verification Submitter Full Name:** Alli Nansel **Organization:** Form Energy **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Wed May 31 16:55:46 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA **Committee Statement Resolution:** FR-3-NFPA 855-2023 **Statement:** This first revision includes the new technologies to highlight lithium metal, nickelhydrogen, zinc bromide, and zinc manganese dioxide. Nickel iron, zinc-air and iron-air are aqueous alkaline battery chemistries just like Ni-Cd, Ni-MH and Ni-Zn. This revision updates the correct terminology for Ni-Cd batteries. The revision adds capacity requirements for hybrid supercapacitors with aggregate capacity similar to lithium-ion batteries. Hybrid supercapacitors are part battery and part capacitor which reduces the risk relative to pure capacitors.

# NFPA 855: Public Input Submittal for Iron-Air Updates

The following document outlines Form Energy's submission for the NFPA 855 Public Input Period. Changes to the current edition are outlined in red.

<b>ESS Technology</b>	kWh	<b>MJ</b>
<b>Battery ESS</b>		
Lead acid, all types	70	252
Ni-Cad, Ni-MH, and Ni-Zn	70	252
Lithium-ion, all types	20	72
Sodium nickel chloride	20(70)	72 (252)
<b>Flow batteries</b>	20	72
Iron-air	20	72
Other battery technologies	10	36
Batteries in one- and two-family dwellings and townhouse units		3.6

Table 1.3 Threshold Quantities per Each Fire Area or Outdoor Installation

Rationale: Form Energy is proposing that iron-air technology be added to Table 1.3 as an ESS Technology.

20 kWh is recommended because iron-air is demonstrated to be equivalent to or safer than other chemistries listed at those threshold quantities. Form Energy has test data available to present to the committee to support this claim.

It is also recommended that iron-air technology be separately listed (and not covered under "other" technologies) because it has safety benefits that will be seen in other sections of the code (Table 9.6.5).

# **Public Input No. 265-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. 1.3 [Excluding any Sub-Sections] ]**

This standard shall apply to ESS installations exceeding the values shown in Table 1.3 and the storage of lithium metal or lithium-ion batteries.



Table 1.3 Threshold Quantities per Each Fire Area or Outdoor Installation

aFor ESS units rated in amp-hrs, kWh equals nominal rated voltage multiplied by amp-hr nameplate rating divided by 1000. For batteries rated in watts per cell, kWh equals the nameplate watts per cell multiplied by the number of cells divided by 1000 and multiplied by the nameplate minutes rating divided by 60.

bFor sodium-nickel-chloride batteries that have been listed to UL 1973 and meet the cell-level performance requirements in UL 9540A.

<sup>C</sup>Includes vanadium, zinc-bromine, polysulfide-bromide, and other flowing electrolyte-type technologies.

dCapacitors used for power factor correction, filtering, and reactive power flow are exempt.

#### **Additional Proposed Changes**

#### **File Name Description Approved**

Test report on abuse

testing

ANW2032\_ATX\_Hybrid\_Supercapacitor\_Abuse\_Test\_Report\_2023.pdf

**Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

Hybrid capacitors do not present thermal runaway problems and as a result require recognition and a higher application threshold. **Related Public Inputs for This Document Related Input Relationship** Public Input No. 266-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.4.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 267-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 266-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.4.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 267-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] **Submitter Information Verification Submitter Full Name:** Robert Davidson **Organization:** Davidson Code Concepts, Llc **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Wed May 31 23:40:55 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA **Committee Statement Resolution:** FR-3-NFPA 855-2023 **Statement:** This first revision includes the new technologies to highlight lithium metal, nickelhydrogen, zinc bromide, and zinc manganese dioxide. Nickel iron, zinc-air and iron-air are aqueous alkaline battery chemistries just like Ni-Cd, Ni-MH and Ni-Zn. This revision updates the correct terminology for Ni-Cd batteries. The revision adds capacity requirements for hybrid supercapacitors with aggregate capacity similar to lithium-ion batteries. Hybrid supercapacitors are part battery and part capacitor which reduces the risk relative to pure capacitors.





**State:**

**Zip:**

**Submittal Date:** Thu May 25 08:44:08 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA

#### **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** NFPA 18A is not referenced in the standard.



#### **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Jeffrey Bonkoski **Organization:** JB Hazmat Consulting, LLC. **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Thu Jun 01 20:40:12 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA

#### **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** NFPA 18A is not referenced in the standard.



**2.3.7** UL Publications. Underwriters Laboratories Inc., 333 Pfingsten Road, Northbrook, IL 60062-2096. UL 263, *Fire Tests of Building Construction and Materials*, 2021. UL 790, *Standard Test Methods for Fire Tests of Roof Coverings*, 2018. UL 1012, *Power Units Other Than Class 2*, 2021. UL 1741, *Inverters, Converters, Controllers and Interconnection System Equipment for Use With Distributed Energy Resources*, 2021. UL 1778, *Uninterruptible Power Systems*, 2017. UL 1973, *Batteries for Use in Stationary, Vehicle Auxiliary Power and Light Electric Rail (LER) Applications,* 2018 2022 . UL 1974, *Evaluation for Repurposing Batteries*, 2018. UL 9540, *Energy Storage Systems and Equipment*, 2020 2023 . UL 9540A, *Test Method for Evaluating Thermal Runaway Fire Propagation in Battery Energy Storage Systems*, 2019. UL 60950-1, *Information Technology Equipment — Safety — Part 1: General Requirements*, 2007, revised 2019. UL 62368-1, *Audio/Video, Information and Communication Technology Equipment — Part 1: Safety Requirements*, 2021. **2.3.8** Other Publications. *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, 11th edition, Merriam-Webster, Inc., Springfield, MA, 2003. **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input** This updates the versions of UL 1973 (2022 version) and UL 9540 (Edition 3 expected to be published in June 2023). Other publication dates and versions in this section should be updated as well. **Submitter Information Verification Submitter Full Name:** Kevin Fok **Organization:** LG Energy Solution Vertech **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Wed May 31 10:50:01 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA **Committee Statement Resolution:** FR-34-NFPA 855-2023 **Statement:** Standards are being updated to current editions.









### **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Robert Davidson



**Statement:** Standards are being updated to current editions.



**Resolution:** FR-34-NFPA 855-2023 **Statement:** Standards are being updated to current editions.



### **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** The proposed standard is not currently published,











# **Public Input No. 260-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. 3.3.9.4 ]**

#### **3.3.9.4** Energy Storage System Walk-In Unit.

A structure containing energy storage systems that includes doors that provide walk-in access for personnel to maintain, test, and service the equipment and is typically used in outdoor and mobile energy storage system applications.

**A.3.3.9.4** In applying this definition the concept of "walk-in access" means the ability or need for any portion of the body to enter the space other than the arms. In crafting the technical language and definition the committee relied on a review of the definition of entry for confined spaces found at Code of Federal Regulations 1910.146.(b) "Entry means the action by which a person passes through an opening into a permit-required confined space". Entry includes ensuing work activities in that space and is considered to have occurred as soon as any part of the entrant's body breaks the plane of an opening into the space. Though the confined space definition is if any part of the body crosses the plane, the committee determined that reaching in to service equipment was acceptable. Its important to note that many of these structures and containers would be considered confined spaces.

#### **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

This added annex note explains how the definition of walk-in unit was developed and clarifies when entry has occured. It is part of series of proposals addressing walk-in units.

#### **Related Public Inputs for This Document**

#### **Related Input Relationship**

Public Input No. 257-NFPA 855-2023 [Sections 9.3.1, 9.3.2] Public Input No. 258-NFPA 855-2023 [Sections 9.5.2.3, 9.5.2.4] Public Input No. 259-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 4.8] Public Input No. 255-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.1] Public Input No. 255-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.1] Public Input No. 261-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.1]

#### **Submitter Information Verification**



#### **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-198-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** The power back up requirements within NFPA 855 for critical safety system was consistently applied across multiple chapters. Additional definitions and a new Section 4.10 have been created to consolidate the power requirements and provide consistency. Г

I




**Statement:** The existing NFPA 70 definition is not specific to energy storage (for example, it doesn't include non-electrical hazards found in ESS). The NFPA 70 definition also differs from OSHA [29CFR Part 1926.32(m)], NFPA 70E and NFPA 70B definitions. All of these definitions were considered to formulate the optimal verbiage. The extract reference was removed because the definition was changed from what is in NFPA 70.





compliance.



# **Public Input No. 241-NFPA 855-2023 [ New Section after 3.3.27 ]**

3. xx \*ESS Field Evaluation: Performed by an AC354 Accredited Field Evaluation Body (FEB) as approved by the authority having jurisdiction, an Energy Storage System Field Evaluation is based on Appropriate Test Standard to verify the failure of structures, systems, or components do not result in fire, electrical shock, or injury of personnel. The ESS Field Evaluation is the process used to determine conformance with requirements for one-of-a-kind, limited-production, used, or modified products that are not listed or labeled under a certification program .

#### **A.3.xx**

*The InternaƟonal AccreditaƟon Service ® (IAS) verifies the competency of independent, third‐party accreditaƟon of field evaluaƟon bodies (FEBs) using AccreditaƟon Criteria for Field EvaluaƟon of Unlisted Electrical Equipment (AC354). The AC354 accreditaƟon process requires each FEB to* demonstrate compliance with both NFPA 790 and NFPA 791. Field Evaluations do not verify *compliance to the Appropriate Test Standard.*

# **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

While the intent of the 855 standard the requirements of the UL 9540 listing is to provide a BESS product that meets this standard through product components and fabrication production that is appropriately evaluated and found acceptable at a production level. This is not consistently happening to provide 9540 listings because of products that are stick built in the field, Products that have multiple fabrications points such as the batteries and modules that are manufactured in Asia, the containers are integrated in South American, and the finishing touches are completed on a clients site in the US. Or certain completed components are not part of the manufacturer's products such as the requirements for a UL listed inverter. Or the Batteries have been repurposed and production pathways are no longer viable to evaluate. Because of these issue production listings are not always achievable through manufacturing, so therefore it doesn't happen. Additional options are and should be available for ensuring a "listing". By providing definitions and clarification around listings, it provides a better compliance options for a system that lacks options for successful compliance.

# **Submitter Information Verification**



#### **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-52-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** This definition aligns with new 4.6.2 on field evaluations. This provides an alternate method of compliance with UL 9540 without lessening safety when due to production methods or separate listing such as UL 1741, UL 1973 and separate evaluations that UL 9540 cannot be accomplish.

> The technical committee is seeking public comment as it is applicable to repurposed batteries that do not have a UL 1973 listing.









Public Input No. 54-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.2 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 55-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.3.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 56-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

#### **Submitter Information Verification**



## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-81-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** Toxic emissions are not adequately addressed in the current addition of NFPA 855. Information on the generation and emission of gases is still limited. A new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions. Definitions of terms used in NFPA 855 have been added from NFPA 55.



Toxic emissions are not adequately addressed in the current addition of 855. A NFPA 855 Task Group was formed for the evaluation of current toxic code requirements and to provide recommendations for changes to the code. Information on the generation and emission of gases is still limited. The addition of a new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions. Information will be amended based on current research on toxics. Definitions added from NFPA 1.

# **Related Public Inputs for This Document**







855 Toxics Task Group 855 Toxics Task Group 855 Toxics Task Group 855 Toxics Task **Group** 855 Toxics Task Group **Group** 

Public Input No. 54-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.2 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 55-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.3.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 56-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

#### **Submitter Information Verification**



## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-82-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** Toxic emissions are not adequately addressed in the current addition of NFPA 855. Information on the generation and emission of gases is still limited. A new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions. Definitions of terms used in NFPA 855 have been added from NFPA 55.



855 Toxics Task

Group

Group

Group

**Group** 

Group

Group

Group

Group

Group

Group

**Group** 







855 Toxics Task

Group

**Group** 

**Group** 

**Group** 

**Group** 

Group

Group

Group

Group

Group

**Group** 

**Group** 

**Group** 

**Group** 



Public Input No. 51-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.11.5]

Public Input No. 52-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.11.8.5] Public Input No. 53-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 54-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.2 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 55-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.3.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 56-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

# **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Paul Hayes **Organization:** The Hiller Companies/American **Affiliation:** None **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Sat Apr 22 11:57:55 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA

## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** CI-84-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** The technical committee is seeking public comment on this for the Second Draft,

Toxic emissions are not adequately addressed in the current addition of 855. A new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions. This adds a definition of the term used in NFPA 855.







# **Submitter Information Verification**



# **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** The proposed revision is not a definition of the term. Clarification should be submitted as

855 Explosion Task **Group** 855 Explosion Task **Group** 855 Explosion Task **Group** 855 Explosion Task **Group** 855 Explosion Task

Group 855 Explosion Task

**Group** 855 Explosion Task **Group** 

a public comment.







Г





#### Group 855 Explosion Task Group 855 Explosion Task **Group** 855 Explosion Task **Group** 855 Explosion Task **Group** 855 Explosion Task Group

# **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-136-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** Simplified to not be specific to NFPA 68 and 69 as NFPA 68 may not be a viable options and other options such as testing may be applicable.





series of steps the facility will take during a critical event, such as a fire or active shooter threat, to ensure employees' safety and minimize the impact on critical operations. The plan also brings in certain requirements from NFPA 1660 on how to mitigate an event, how to prepare for a event, how to respond to a event and how to recover from an event in order to get back to normal operations. Some of these items will be a collaboration with the local first responders especially on the response topic. The rest of the new section uses similar language from previous sections regarding training and refresher training. The last part of the new section is notification. This is a requirement that the facility needs to contact the local emergency responders of the when and where for the required training. This doesn't necessarily mean that the emergency responder will participate in every training; its just a notification of the training. The task group believes that this new section brings in a new plan that was previously missing in the standard which is aimed at everyone working together if there is an incident at the facility.

# **Submitter Information Verification**



# **Committee Statement**

#### **Resolution:** FR-17-NFPA 855-2023










**Statement:** It is not necessary for the emergency operations plan to address the safe re-start up procedures. Start up following an emergency needs to be in accordance with the commissioning plan and not the EOP.

















## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-24-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** This was done to strengthen the ability of an AHJ to call for review and possible modification of older systems installed before UL 9540 and UL 9540A certification/testing were available, due to the fires that have occurred at higher rates in these systems.





**Statement:** There is interpretation in the industry that a signal failure mode would be defined as either a battery failure or a protection system and not both. As a critical safety system must function in single failure mode. , iIt needs to be separate, defined and evaluated independent of a FMEA and equipment failure. Required system and critical system have been separated to be evaluated separately.





I













855 Toxics Task

Group

Group

Group

Group

Group

Group

Group

Group



Public Input No. 56-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

## **Submitter Information Verification**



## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** CI-85-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** The technical committee is seeking public comment on this for the Second Draft,

While many ESS technologies use toxic materials and can produce toxic byproducts (particularly during an abnormal event, such as thermal runaway or fire), there is a difference between generation or released and emission. If the toxic species is generated internal to the battery (or by fire suppression system interaction with the ESS) but is consumed internally or is combusted or reacts to form other non-toxic compounds prior to human exposure it is not considered to be "emitted".

Toxic emissions are not adequately addressed in the current addition of 855. Information on the generation and emission of gases is still limited. A new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions.





1
































Relocated language deleted. "fire command center" added. See related PIs. This was the change. Terra scrambled it. 4.8.1.1 to A.4.8.1.2 deleted. 4.8.2 Annunciation. 4.8.2.1 All required annunciation means shall be located as required by the authority having jurisdiction to facilitate an efficient response to the situation. [72:10.18.3.2] (NO CHANGE) 4.8.2.2 \* Multiple panels shall be aggregated to a master or annunciator panel at a fire command center or location approved by the AHJ. (added "fire command Center".) 4.8.3 \* DELETED 4.8.4 Alarm signals from detection systems shall be transmitted to a supervising station in accordance with NFPA 72. **Related Public Inputs for This Document Related Input Constructions Relationship** Public Input No. 255-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.1] Public Input No. 257-NFPA 855-2023 [Sections 9.3.1, 9.3.2] Public Input No. 258-NFPA 855-2023 [Sections 9.5.2.3, 9.5.2.4] Public Input No. 255-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.1] Public Input No. 260-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 3.3.9.4] Public Input No. 261-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.1] **Submitter Information Verification Submitter Full Name:** Robert Davidson **Organization:** Davidson Code Concepts, Llc **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Wed May 31 22:48:11 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA **Committee Statement Resolution:** FR-43-NFPA 855-2023 **Statement:** This revision ensures that "other" approved locations are permitted as various sites may not have a formal fire command center or may have reporting to multiple locations. This aligns the requirement with the defined fire command center and ties it in with the colloquial term "first responder station."



# **Public Input No. 7-NFPA 855-2022 [ Section No. 4.8.1 [Excluding any Sub-NEPA Sections] ]**

Where required elsewhere in this standard, areas containing ESS systems shall be provided with a smoke detection- $\sigma$ -, thermal image fire detection or radiant energy–sensing system in accordance with *NFPA 72*, unless modified by the requirements in Chapters 9 through 13.

# **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

NFPA 72 2025 edition First Draft incorporated a new definition and requirements for "thermal image fire detectors." While thermal image detectors are technically radiant energy sensing detectors, NFPA 72 has previously limited radiant energy detectors to non-imaging flame or spark detectors (UV-IR, triple IR). The SIG-IDS TC decided to add thermal image fire detector requirements into their own section rather than rewrite the existing radiant energy detector section. In any case, as the term radiant energy detectors is used within NFPA 855, thermal imaging is the appropriate term and technology for detecting overheating energy storage systems at an early stage. There is currently a new UL STP working on a new standard for video and thermal imaging fire detectors (UL/ULC 2684) and this is scheduled to be completed prior to the next edition of NFPA 855.

# **Related Public Inputs for This Document**

#### **Related Input Relationship**

Public Input No. 2-NFPA 855-2022 [Section No. 14.6.4] Public Input No. 3-NFPA 855-2022 [Section No. 14.3.2.1.2] Public Input No. 4-NFPA 855-2022 [Section No. 14.3.2.2.2] Public Input No. 5-NFPA 855-2022 [Section No. 14.3.2.4.2] Public Input No. 6-NFPA 855-2022 [Section No. 14.3.2.3.2] Public Input No. 8-NFPA 855-2022 [Section No. 9.6.1] Public Input No. 9-NFPA 855-2022 [Section No. 9.5.3.1.1.2] Public Input No. 10-NFPA 855-2022 [Section No. 9.5.3.1.2]

# **Submitter Information Verification**



# **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-181-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** NFPA 72 2025 edition First Draft incorporated a new definition and requirements for "thermal image fire detectors." While thermal image detectors are technically radiant energy sensing detectors, NFPA 72 has previously limited radiant energy detectors to non-imaging flame or spark detectors (UV-IR, triple IR). The term radiant energy detectors is used within NFPA 855, thermal imaging is the appropriate term and technology for detecting overheating energy storage systems at an early stage. There is currently a new UL STP working on a new standard for video and thermal imaging fire detectors (UL/ULC 2684) and this is scheduled to be completed prior to the next edition of NFPA 855.and thermal imaging fire detectors (UL/ULC 2684) and this is scheduled to be completed prior to the next edition of NFPA 855.







1



I





I





# **Public Input No. 119-NFPA 855-2023 [ Sections 4.9.1.1, 4.9.1.2, 4.9.1.3 ] Sections 4.9.1.1, 4.9.1.2, 4.9.1.3 4.9.1.1 \*** Lead-acid and nickel-cadmium battery systems less than 50 V ac, 60 V dc that are in telecommunications facilities for installations of communications equipment under the exclusive control of communications utilities and located outdoors or in building spaces used exclusively for such installations that comply with NFPA 76 shall not be required to have a fire suppression system installed. **4.9.1.2** Lead-acid battery systems in uninterruptable power supplies listed and labeled in accordance with the application utilized for standby power applications, which is limited to not more than 10 percent of the floor area on the floor on which the ESS is located, shall not be required to have a fire suppression system installed. **4.9.1.3 \*** Lead-acid and nickel-cadmium battery systems that are used for dc power for control of substations and control or safe shutdown of generating stations under the exclusive control of the electric utility and located outdoors or in building spaces used exclusively for such installations shall not be required to have a fire suppression system installed. **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input** These exemptions are battery specific and are repeated in Chapter 9 section 9.6.2.2. They can be removed from Chapter 4. If action is taken, the annex note for 4.9.1 can be relocated to an annex for 9.6.2.2.1. **Submitter Information Verification Submitter Full Name:** Richard Kluge **Organization:** Ericsson **Affiliation:** ATIS **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Tue May 16 10:08:59 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA **Committee Statement Resolution:** FR-44-NFPA 855-2023 **Statement:** These exemptions are battery specific and are repeated in Chapter 9 Section 9.6.2.2. They can be removed from Chapter 4.













**Statement:** The technical committee is seeking public comment on this for the Second Draft,

V2G is larger than just residential, and thus should be covered in Chapter 4, in addition to Chapter 15.



# **Public Input No. 25-NFPA 855-2023 [ Chapter 6 ]**

#### **Chapter 6** Commissioning

**6.1** System Commissioning.

#### **6.1.1**

ESS shall be evaluated and confirmed for proper operation by the system owner or their designated agent.

#### **6.1.1.1**

Lead-acid and nickel-cadmium battery systems less than 50 V ac, 60 V dc that are in telecommunications facilities for installations of communications equipment under the exclusive control of communications utilities and located outdoors or in building spaces or walk-in units used exclusively for such installations that comply with NFPA 76 shall be permitted to have a commissioning plan complying with recognized industry practices in lieu of complying with 6.1.5.2.

#### **6.1.1.2\***

Lead-acid and nickel-cadmium battery systems that are used for dc power for control of substations and control or safe shutdown orderly shutdown of generating stations under the exclusive control of the electric utilities and located in building spaces or walk-in units used exclusively for such installations shall be permitted to have a commissioning plan in accordance with applicable governmental laws and regulations in lieu of developing a commissioning plan in accordance with 6.1.5.2.

## **6.1.2**

System commissioning shall be conducted after the installation is complete but prior to final inspection and approval.

#### **6.1.3** Commissioning Plan.

#### **6.1.3.1**

The system installer or commissioning agent shall prepare a written commissioning plan that provides a description of the means and methods necessary to document and verify that the system and its associated controls and safety systems, as required by this standard, are in proper working condition.

#### **6.1.3.2**

The commissioning plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following information:

- (1) An overview of the commissioning process developed specifically for the ESS to be installed and narrative description of the activities to be conducted
- (2) Roles and responsibilities for all those involved in the design, commissioning, construction, installation, or operation of the system(s)
- (3) Means and methods whereby the commissioning plan will be made available during the implementation of the ESS project(s)
- (4) Plans and specifications necessary to understand the operation of the ESS and all associated operational controls and safety systems
- (5) A detailed description of each activity to be conducted during the commissioning process, who will perform each activity, and at what point in time the activity is to be conducted
- (6) Procedures to be used in documenting the proper operation of the ESS and all associated operational controls and safety systems
- (7) Testing for any required fire detection or suppression and thermal management, ventilation, or exhaust systems associated with the installation and verification of proper operation of the safety controls
- (8) The following documentation:
	- (9) Commissioning checklist
	- (10) Relevant operational testing forms
	- (11) Necessary commissioning logs
	- (12) Progress reports
- (13) Means and methods whereby facility operation and maintenance staff will be trained on the system
- (14) Identification of personnel who are qualified to service and maintain the system and respond to incidents involving each system
- (15) A decommissioning plan meeting the provisions of Section 8.1 that covers the removal of the system from service and from the facility in which it is located and information on disposal of materials associated with each ESS

**6.1.4** Commissioning Test.

#### **6.1.4.1**

ESS shall be evaluated for their proper operation by the system installer in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions, the commissioning plan, and the requirements of this section after the installation is complete but prior to final approval.

#### **6.1.4.2**

System testing shall be conducted as a component of the commissioning process and include functional performance testing of the ESS that demonstrates that the installation and operation of the system and associated components, controls, and safety-related systems are in accordance with approved plans and specifications and that the operation, function, and maintenance serviceability for each of the commissioned ESS is confirmed.

**6.1.5** Commissioning Report.

#### **6.1.5.1**

The commissioning report shall be provided by the system installer or commissioning agent to the system(s) owner and the AHJ prior to final inspection and approval.

#### **6.1.5.2**

The commissioning report shall document the commissioning process and the results in accordance with 6.1.5.2.1, 6.1.5.2.2, and 6.1.5.2.3.

#### **6.1.5.2.1**

A commissioning report shall summarize the commissioning process and verify the proper operation of the system and associated operational controls and safety systems.

#### **6.1.5.2.2**

The report shall include the final commissioning plan, the results of the commissioning process, and a copy of the plans and specifications associated with the as-built system design and installation.

#### **6.1.5.2.3**

The report shall include any issues identified during commissioning and the measures taken to resolve them.

#### **6.1.5.3** Corrective Action Plan.

#### **6.1.5.3.1**

A corrective action plan acceptable to the AHJ shall be developed for any open or continuing issues that are allowed to be continued after commissioning.

#### **6.1.5.3.2**

The corrective action plan shall be accepted by the AHJ prior to the ESS being placed into service.

#### **6.1.5.4**

A copy of the commissioning report shall be kept with the ESS operations and maintenance manuals required by 4.2.3.

**6.2** Issues and Resolutions Documentation. (Reserved)

**6.3** Operations and Maintenance Documentation.

#### **6.3.1**

Operations and maintenance documentation shall be provided to the ESS owner.

#### **6.3.2**

The documentation shall include design, construction, installation, testing, and commissioning information associated with the ESS as initially approved after being commissioned.

#### **6.3.3**

A copy of the documentation shall be placed in an approved location to be accessible to facility personnel, fire code officials, and emergency responders.

**6.4\*** Recommissioning of Existing Systems.

#### **6.4.1**

Recommissioning shall meet the provisions of Section 6.1 and include the entire system with issuance of a new commissioning report, identification of any new issues and resolutions documentation, and identification of any revisions to the operations and maintenance documentation.

#### **6.4.2\***

When alterations, additions, repositioning, or renovations to the system or any of its components are warranted, they shall be permitted in accordance with Chapter 4 and be performed by qualified entities and the system recommissioned in accordance with Section 6.1.

#### **6.4.3**

Repairs or renewals to systems utilizing identical components shall not require recommissioning.

#### **6.4.4\***

Listed ESS that has been modified in the field beyond the field-installed options that are part of the listing shall be investigated and found suitable by the organization that listed the equipment.

## **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

Delete or replace the word "safe." Section 2.2.2.1 in the Manual of Style for NFPA Technical Committee Documents states that "the main text of codes and standards shall not contain references or requirements that are unenforceable and vague and Table 2.2.2.3 in the Manual of Style for NFPA Technical Committee Documents lists "safe(ly) (ty)."

#### **Submitter Information Verification**



**Submittal Date:** Thu Mar 30 15:59:25 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA

#### **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-124-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** The NFPA Manual of Style for Technical Committee Documents Table 2.2.2.3 states that "the main text of codes and standards shall not contain references or requirements that are unenforceable and vague. The use of the word safe is unenforceable and vague, the use of "orderly' corrects this.








## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** A vendor specified decommissioning plan is critical information for the system owner. Having this prepared at the time of commissioning protects against instances where manufacturer of the system exits the business or otherwise can no longer provide information on safe decommissioning at some future date. Having a decommissioning plan formulated at the time of commissioning does not prevent it from being later revised or updated by the owner or designated agent and submitted for AHJ approval as noted in Chapter 8. The text in Section 8.1 is correct as written and need not change.



Public Input No. 92-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after A.6.1.1.2]

## **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Steve Edley **Organization:** NFPA 855 Task Group 20 **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Mon May 08 19:01:50 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA

## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-98-NFPA 855-2023 **Statement:** Where spill detection systems are provided, they should be tested. In the case of flow batteries, spill detection systems are an integral part of the safety systems.



Г

I







## **7.1.4**

Where the operations and maintenance documentation calls for detailed procedures to be used for specific scheduled operational checks or assessments, an operations record that includes data associated with configurable system settings, system start-up, system shutdown (including emergency shutdown), and long-term shutdown (storage mode) shall be maintained by the system owner or their designated agent and be made available to the AHJ upon request.

## **7.1.5**

The operations record shall be kept in a readily accessible location, or a sign indicating where the record is located shall be posted adjacent to the system.

## **7.1.5.1**

For normally occupied facilities, the operations record shall be on site.

## **7.1.5.2**

The operations record shall be permitted to be made available electronically.

**7.2\*** System Maintenance.

The ESS shall be maintained in accordance with the system manufacturer's instructions.

## **7.2.1**

The maintenance documentation shall include a detailed maintenance schedule covering all affected equipment and the activities to be performed.

## **7.2.2**

Maintenance shall be performed by qualified individuals.

## **7.2.3**

Maintenance documentation indicating the maintenance action taken, the date of the action, who implemented the action, and the results associated with the action shall be maintained as required by Section 6.3.

## **7.2.4**

Maintenance documentation shall record information on any repair, renewal, or renovation made to the ESS.

## **7.2.5** Training.

Training shall be provided to all those responsible for system operation and maintenance.

## **7.2.5.1**

Training on system operation and maintenance shall be provided by the system owner or their designated agent.

## **7.2.5.2**

After recommissioning the system, training on any changes to the operation and maintenance documentation shall be provided.

## **7.2.5.3**

Training records of site operations and maintenance personnel shall be retained and accessible to the AHJ, indicating the training taken, the name(s) of those taking the training, and the training date.

## **7.3** System Testing.

## **7.3.1**

System testing shall be performed when required by the operating instructions or maintenance documentation in accordance with testing procedures provided by the ESS manufacturer.

## **7.3.2**

A record of all testing shall be maintained in accordance with the requirements in Section 6.3.

## **7.3.2.1** Testing records shall be permitted to be made available electronically. **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input** Delete or replace the word "safe." Section 2.2.2.1 in the Manual of Style for NFPA Technical Committee Documents states that "the main text of codes and standards shall not contain references or requirements that are unenforceable and vague and Table 2.2.2.3 in the Manual of Style for NFPA Technical Committee Documents lists "safe(ly) (ty)." **Submitter Information Verification Submitter Full Name:** Palmer Hickman **Organization:** Electrical Training Alliance **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Thu Mar 30 15:48:43 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA **Committee Statement Resolution:** FR-18-NFPA 855-2023 The term "safety" in safety equipment in (3)(f) and in safety concerns in (4) is widely used and recognized so there is no need to delete it. **Statement:** The term "safe" in 7.1.1.2 and 7.1.2 brings no value to the standard. The terms "and shut down" brings great value to the standard as the shutdown procedures are key to the safety of BESSs. The safety procedures should include shut down of the ESS. In the case of some technologies, shutting down of the ESS may be more involved than turning off the inverters.



**Statement:** The term "safe" in 7.1.1.2 and 7.1.2 brings no value to the standard.

The terms "and shut down" brings great value to the standard as the shutdown procedures are key to the safety of BESSs. The safety procedures should include shut down of the ESS. In the case of some technologies, shutting down of the ESS may be more involved than turning off the inverters.





## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** Item (4) is important to the standard as it keeps the requirements for information necessary for response consideration even if an SDS is not onsite. Furthermore, there is no justification to remove the SDS requirement as its federally required and required by most fire codes.



# **Public Input No. 26-NFPA 855-2023 [ Chapter 8 ]**

#### **Chapter 8** Decommissioning

#### **8.1** Decommissioning Plan.

Prior to decommissioning, the owner of an ESS or their designated agent(s) shall prepare a written decommissioning plan complying with 8.1.3 that provides the organization, documentation requirements, and methods and tools necessary to indicate how the safety systems as required by this standard and the ESS and its components will be decommissioned and the ESS removed from the site.

## **8.1.1**

Lead-acid and nickel-cadmium battery systems less than 50 V ac, 60 V dc that are in telecommunications facilities for installations of communications equipment under the exclusive control of communications utilities and located outdoors or in building spaces or walk-in units used exclusively for such installations that are in compliance with NFPA 76 shall be permitted to have a decommissioning plan in compliance with recognized industry practices in lieu of complying with 8.1.3.

#### **8.1.2\***

Lead-acid and nickel-cadmium battery systems that are used for dc power for control of substations and control or safe shutdown orderly shutdown of generating stations under the exclusive control of the electric utilities and located outdoors or in building spaces used exclusively for such installations shall be permitted to have a decommissioning plan complying with applicable governmental laws and regulations in lieu of complying with 8.1.3.

#### **8.1.3\***

The decommissioning plan shall be provided to the AHJ and include the following information:

- (1) An overview of the decommissioning process developed specifically for the ESS that is to be decommissioned
- (2) Roles and responsibilities for all those involved in the decommissioning of the ESS and their removal from the site
- (3) Means and methods in the decommissioning plan submitted during the permitting process to be made available at a point in time corresponding to the decision to decommission the ESS
- (4) Plans and specifications necessary to understand the ESS and all associated operational controls and safety systems, as built, operated, and maintained
- (5) A detailed description of each activity to be conducted during the decommissioning process and who will perform that activity and at what point in time
- (6) Procedures to be used in documenting the ESS and all associated operational controls and safety systems that have been decommissioned
- (7) Guidelines and format for a decommissioning checklist and relevant operational testing forms and necessary decommissioning logs and progress reports
- (8) A description of how any changes to the surrounding areas and other systems adjacent to the ESS, including, but not limited to, structural elements, building penetrations, means of egress, and required fire detection and suppression systems, will be protected during decommissioning and confirmed as being acceptable after the system is removed
- **8.2** Decommissioning Process.

#### **8.2.1**

The AHJ shall be notified prior to decommissioning an ESS.

#### **8.2.2**

The ESS shall be decommissioned by the owner of the ESS or their designated agent(s) in accordance with the decommissioning plan.

**8.3** Decommissioning Report.

A decommissioning report shall be prepared by the ESS owner or their designated agent and summarize the decommissioning process of the system and associated operational controls and safety systems.

## **8.3.1**

The report shall include the final decommissioning plan and the results of the decommissioning process.

#### **8.3.2**

The report shall include any issues identified during decommissioning and the measures taken to resolve them.

**8.3.3**

The decommissioning report shall be retained by the owner and provided to the AHJ upon request.

## **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

Delete or replace the word "safe." Section 2.2.2.1 in the Manual of Style for NFPA Technical Committee Documents states that "the main text of codes and standards shall not contain references or requirements that are unenforceable and vague and Table 2.2.2.3 in the Manual of Style for NFPA Technical Committee Documents lists "safe(ly) (ty)."

## **Submitter Information Verification**



## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-151-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** The NFPA Manual of Style for Technical Committee Documents Table 2.2.2.3 states that "the main text of codes and standards shall not contain references or requirements that are unenforceable and vague. The use of the word safe is unenforceable and vague,. Orderly is a sufficient description.





#### **9.1.5.2.2**

The test report shall be accompanied by a supplemental report prepared by a registered design professional with expertise in fire protection engineering that provides interpretation of the test data in relation to the installation requirements for the ESS.

**9.2** Equipment.

**9.2.1** Listing.

## **9.2.1.1**

ESS shall be listed in accordance with UL 9540, unless specifically exempted elsewhere in this standard.

**9.2.1.2** Lead-Acid and Nickel-Cadmium Battery Systems.

#### **9.2.1.2.1\***

Lead-acid and nickel-cadmium batteries, where used in a stationary standby service with 600 V dc or less, shall be permitted to be listed to UL 1973.

## **9.2.1.2.2\***

Lead-acid and nickel-cadmium battery systems less than 50 V ac, 60 V dc in telecommunications facilities for installations of communications equipment under the exclusive control of communications utilities used in stationary standby service and located outdoors or in building spaces used exclusively for such installations that comply with NFPA 76 shall not be required to be listed in accordance with UL 9540.

## **9.2.1.2.3\***

Lead-acid and nickel-cadmium battery systems that are used for dc power for control of substations and control or safe shutdown orderly shutdown of generating stations under the exclusive control of the electric utility and located outdoors or in building spaces used exclusively for such installations shall not be required to be listed in accordance with UL 9540.

#### **9.2.1.2.4**

Lead-acid battery systems in uninterruptable power supplies listed and labeled in accordance with UL 1778 and utilized for standby power applications, which are limited to not more than 10 percent of the floor area on the floor on which the ESS is located, shall not be required to be listed in accordance with UL 9540.

**9.2.2** HMA for Existing Lithium-Ion ESS.

## **9.2.2.1**

Existing lithium-ion ESS that are not UL 9540 listed shall require a hazard mitigation analysis in accordance with Section 4.4.

## **9.2.2.2**

Lithium-ion ESS shall be upgraded with additional hazard mitigation measures where required by the AHJ based on the findings in the hazard mitigation analysis.

**9.2.3** Energy Storage Management System (ESMS).

#### **9.2.3.1\***

Where required by the equipment listing in accordance with 4.6.1 or the hazard mitigation analysis in accordance with Section 4.4, an approved ESMS or BMS shall be provided for monitoring operating conditions and maintaining voltages, currents, and temperatures within the manufacturer's specifications, unless modified in accordance with Chapters 9 through 13.

## **9.2.3.2\***

The ESMS or BMS shall electrically isolate the ESS or affected components of the ESS or place the system in a safe condition if potentially hazardous conditions are detected.

#### **9.2.3.3\***

When required by the AHJ, visible annunciation shall be provided on the cabinet exterior or in an approved location to indicate potentially hazardous conditions associated with the ESS exist.

**9.2.3.4** Lead-Acid and Nickel-Cadmium Battery Systems.

#### **9.2.3.4.1\***

Lead-acid and nickel-cadmium battery systems less than 50 V ac, 60 V dc in telecommunications facilities for installations of communications equipment under the exclusive control of communications utilities located outdoors or in building spaces used exclusively for such installations that comply with NFPA 76 shall not be required to comply with 9.2.3.1 through 9.2.3.3.

## **9.2.3.4.2\***

Lead-acid and nickel-cadmium battery systems that are used for dc power for control of substations and control or safe shutdown orderly shutdown of generating stations under the exclusive control of the electric utility and located outdoors or in building spaces used exclusively for such installations shall not be required to comply with 9.2.3.1 through 9.2.3.3.

#### **9.2.3.4.3**

Lead-acid and nickel-cadmium battery systems in uninterruptable power supplies listed and labeled in accordance with UL 1778 and used in standby power applications shall not be required to comply with 9.2.3.1 through 9.2.3.3.

**9.2.4** Repurposed and Refurbished Batteries.

#### **9.2.4.1**

Batteries that have been repurposed or refurbished shall meet the applicable technologyspecific requirements in Table 9.6.5.

#### **9.2.4.2\***

Batteries previously used in other applications, such as electric vehicle propulsion, shall not be permitted unless the equipment is repurposed by a UL 1974–compliant battery repurposing company where reused in ESS applications and the system complies with 4.6.1.

**9.3** Location Classification.

Installation locations shall be classified as specified in 9.3.1 or 9.3.2.

**9.3.1** Indoor Installations.

Indoor installations shall be classified in accordance with 9.3.1.1 or 9.3.1.2.

**9.3.1.1** Energy Storage System (ESS) Dedicated-Use Buildings.

ESS dedicated-use buildings shall be constructed in accordance with local building codes and comply with all the following:

- (1) The building shall only be used for energy storage, or energy storage in conjunction with energy generation, electrical grid-related operations, or communications utility equipment.
- (2) Occupants in the rooms and areas containing ESS shall be limited to personnel that operate, maintain, service, test, and repair the ESS and other energy or communication systems.
- (3) No other occupancy types shall be permitted in the building.
- (4) Administrative and support personnel shall be permitted in incidental-use areas within the buildings that do not contain ESS if the following conditions are met:
	- (a) The areas do not occupy more than 10 percent of the building area of the story in which they are located.
	- (b) The areas are separated from the ESS and other rooms and areas containing ESS by 2-hour fire barriers and 2-hour fire-resistance-rated horizontal assemblies constructed in accordance with the local building code, as appropriate.
	- (c) A means of egress is provided from the incidental-use areas to a public way that does not require occupants to traverse through areas containing ESS or other energy systems.

**9.3.1.2** Non-Dedicated-Use Buildings.

Non-dedicated-use buildings shall include all buildings that contain ESS and do not comply with ESS dedicated-use building requirements in 9.3.1.1.

**9.3.2** Outdoor Installations.

Outdoor ESS installations shall be classified as follows:

- (1) *Remote locations*: ESS located more than 100 ft (30.5 m) from buildings, lot lines that can be built upon, public ways, stored combustible materials, hazardous materials, high-piled stock, and other exposure hazards not associated with electrical grid infrastructure
- (2) *Locations near exposures*: all outdoor ESS locations that do not comply with remote outdoor location requirements
- (3) Specific outdoor locations, as follows:
	- (a) *Rooftop installations*: ESS installations located on the roofs of buildings
	- (b) *Open parking garage installations*: ESS installations located in a structure or portion of a structure as defined in 3.3.19
	- (c) Mobile ESS installations
- **9.4** Installation.
- **9.4.1** Maximum Stored Energy.

ESS in the following locations shall comply with Section 9.4 as follows:

- (1) Fire areas within non-dedicated-use buildings containing ESS shall not exceed the maximum stored energy values in Table 9.4.1 except as permitted by 9.4.1.1.
- (2) Outdoor ESS installations in locations near exposures shall not exceed the maximum stored energy values in Table 9.4.1 except as permitted by 9.4.1.2.
- (3) ESS installations in open parking garages and on rooftops of buildings shall not exceed the maximum stored energy values in Table 9.4.1 except as permitted by 9.4.1.2.
- (4) Mobile ESS equipment as covered by 9.5.3.2 shall not exceed the maximum stored energy values in Table 9.4.1 except as permitted by 9.4.1.2.

Table 9.4.1 Maximum Stored Energy



aFor ratings in amp-hrs, kWh should equal maximum rated voltage multiplied by amp-hr rating divided by 1000.

bNickel battery technologies include nickel cadmium (Ni-Cad), nickel metal hydride (Ni-MH), and nickel zinc (Ni-Zn).

<sup>C</sup>Includes vanadium, zinc-bromine, polysulfide, bromide, and other flowing electrolyte-type technologies.

#### **9.4.1.1**

Where approved by the AHJ, fire areas in non-dedicated-use buildings containing ESS that exceed the amounts in Table 9.4.1 shall be permitted based on a hazard mitigation analysis in accordance with Section 4.4 and fire and explosion testing complying with 9.1.5.

## **9.4.1.2**

Where approved by the AHJ, outdoor ESS installations, ESS installations in open parking garages and on rooftops of buildings, and mobile ESS equipment that exceed the amounts in Table 9.4.1 shall be permitted based on a hazard mitigation analysis in accordance with Section 4.4 and fire and explosion testing in accordance with 9.1.5.

## **9.4.1.3**

Where a single fire area within a building or walk-in unit contains a combination of energy systems covered in Table 9.4.1, the maximum stored energy per fire area shall be determined based on the sum of percentages of each type divided by the maximum stored energy of each type.

## **9.4.1.4**

The sum of the percentages calculated in 9.4.1.3 shall not exceed 100 percent except as permitted in 9.4.1.1 or 9.6.2.3.

**9.4.2\*** Size and Separation.

#### **9.4.2.1**

ESS shall be comprised of groups with a maximum stored energy of 50 kWh each.

#### **9.4.2.2**

Each group shall be spaced a minimum 3 ft (0.9 m) from other groups and from walls in the storage room or area.

## **9.4.2.3**

The AHJ shall be permitted to approve groups with larger energy capacities or smaller group spacing based on performance criteria from fire and explosion testing complying with 9.1.5.

**9.4.2.4** Lead-Acid and Nickel-Cadmium Battery Systems.

## **9.4.2.4.1\***

Paragraphs 9.4.2.1 and 9.4.2.2 shall not apply to lead-acid and nickel-cadmium battery systems less than 50 V ac, 60 V dc in telecommunications facilities that comply with NFPA 76.

#### **9.4.2.4.2\***

Paragraphs 9.4.2.1 and 9.4.2.2 shall not apply to lead-acid and nickel-cadmium battery systems that are used for dc power for control of substations and control or safe shutdown orderly shutdown of generating stations under the exclusive control of the electric utility and located outdoors or in building spaces used exclusively for such installations.

#### **9.4.2.4.3**

Paragraphs 9.4.2.1 and 9.4.2.2 shall not apply to lead-acid battery systems in uninterruptable power supplies listed and labeled in accordance with UL 1778, utilized for standby power applications, which is limited to not more than 10 percent of the floor area on the floor on which the ESS is located.

#### **9.4.2.4.4**

Lead-acid and nickel-cadmium batteries listed to UL 1973 and used in stationary standby applications shall be comprised of groups with a maximum stored energy of 250 kWh each.

**9.5** Location and Applications.

**9.5.1** Indoor Installations.

Indoor ESS installations shall comply with this section and as detailed in Table 9.5.1.

Table 9.5.1 Indoor ESS Installations



NA: Not applicable.

**9.5.1.1** ESS Dedicated Use Buildings.

#### **9.5.1.1.1**

Where approved by the AHJ, the fire control and suppression systems, the size and separation requirements, and the water supply shall be permitted to be omitted in ESS dedicated-use buildings located more than 100 ft (30.5 m) from buildings, lot lines that can be built upon, public ways, stored combustible materials, hazardous materials, high-piled stock, and other exposure hazards not associated with electrical grid infrastructure.

## **9.5.1.1.2**

When approved, alarm signals shall not be required to be transmitted to an approved location when local fire alarm annunciation is provided and trained personnel are always present.

**9.5.1.2** Non-Dedicated-Use Buildings.

**9.5.1.2.1\*** Occupied Work Centers.

ESS in occupied work centers shall comply with this section.

## **9.5.1.2.1.1**

ESS shall be permitted in the same room as the equipment that they support.

## **9.5.1.2.1.2**

ESS shall be housed in a noncombustible, locked cabinet or other enclosure to prevent access by unauthorized personnel unless located in an equipment room accessible only to authorized personnel.

**9.5.1.2.2** Dwelling Units and Sleeping Units.

#### **9.5.1.2.2.1**

Stationary ESS shall not be installed in sleeping rooms or closets or spaces opening directly into sleeping rooms.

## **9.5.1.2.2.2**

Stationary ESS shall not be installed in living areas of dwelling units unless specifically allowed in Chapters 9 through 13.

## **9.5.1.2.2.3**

Portable ESS shall be permitted to be used in sleeping rooms and in habitable spaces of dwelling units provided they are listed and are used in accordance with the terms of their listing.

**9.5.2** Outdoor Installations.

Outdoor ESS installations shall comply with this section and as detailed in Table 9.5.2.

## Table 9.5.2 Outdoor Stationary ESS Installations



NA: Not applicable.

## **9.5.2.1** HMA.

A HMA shall be required for lithium-ion ESS that exceed 600 kWh (2,160 MJ) for outdoor ESS installations, ESS installations in open parking garages and on rooftops of buildings, and mobile ESS equipment.

**9.5.2.2** Vegetation Control.

## **9.5.2.2.1**

Areas within 10 ft (3 m) on each side of outdoor ESS shall be cleared of combustible vegetation and other combustible growth.

## **9.5.2.2.2**

Single specimens of trees, shrubbery, or cultivated ground cover such as green grass, ivy, succulents, or similar plants used as ground covers shall be permitted to be exempt provided that they do not form a means of readily transmitting fire.

## **9.5.2.3** Walk-in Units.

## **9.5.2.3.1**

Where an ESS includes an outer enclosure, the unit shall only be entered for inspection, maintenance, and repair of energy storage units and ancillary equipment and not be occupied for other purposes.

## **9.5.2.3.2\***

Walk-in units shall comply with this standard and local building code requirements.

## **9.5.2.3.3**

Spacing shall not be required between the ESS and the enclosure walls in outdoor walk-in units.

#### **9.5.2.4** Maximum Size.

#### **9.5.2.4.1**

Outdoor ESS walk-in units or ESS cabinets shall not exceed 53 ft  $\times$  8.5 ft  $\times$  9.5 ft (16.2 m  $\times$ 2.6 m × 2.9 m), not including HVAC and other equipment.

#### **9.5.2.4.2**

Outdoor ESS walk-in units or ESS cabinets that exceed the dimensions in 9.5.2.4.1 shall be treated as indoor installations and comply with the requirements in 9.5.1.

**9.5.2.5** Remote Locations.

When agreeable with the ESS owner and approved by the AHJ, fire suppression systems and water supply shall not be required.

**9.5.2.6** Locations Near Exposures.

**9.5.2.6.1** Clearance to Exposures.

ESS located outdoors shall be separated by a minimum 10 ft  $(3 \text{ m})$  from the following exposures:

- (1) Lot lines
- (2) Public ways
- (3) Buildings
- (4) Stored combustible materials
- (5) Hazardous materials
- (6) High-piled stock
- (7) Other exposure hazards not associated with electrical grid infrastructure

#### **9.5.2.6.1.1**

The required separation distances shall be permitted to be reduced to 3 ft (0.9 m) when a 1-hour freestanding fire barrier, suitable for exterior use, and extending 5 ft (1.5 m) above and 5 ft (1.5 m) beyond the physical boundary of the ESS installation is provided to protect the exposure.

#### **9.5.2.6.1.2**

Clearances to buildings shall be permitted to be reduced to 3 ft (0.9 m) where noncombustible exterior walls with no openings or combustible overhangs are provided on the wall adjacent to the ESS and the fire resistance rating of the exterior wall complies with the fire resistance requirements in 9.6.4.

#### **9.5.2.6.1.3**

Clearances to buildings shall be permitted to be reduced to 3 ft (0.9 m) based on fire and explosion testing complying with 9.1.5.

#### **9.5.2.6.1.4**

Where approved, clearances to exposures other than buildings shall be permitted to be reduced to 3 ft (0.9 m) where fire and explosion testing of the ESS in accordance with 9.1.5 demonstrates that a fire within the ESS enclosure will not generate radiant heat flux sufficient to ignite stored materials or otherwise threaten the exposure.

#### **9.5.2.6.1.5**

Clearances to buildings and exposures shall be permitted to be reduced to 3 ft (0.9 m) where the enclosure of the ESS has a 2-hour fire resistance rating established in accordance with ASTM E119 or UL 263.

#### **9.5.2.6.1.6** ESS Exhaust Outlets.

ESS exhaust outlets shall comply with the following:

- (1) Exhaust outlets from an ESS that exhaust other than ventilation air shall be located at least 15 ft (4.57 m) from heating, ventilating, and air conditioning (HVAC) air intakes, windows, doors, loading docks, ignition sources, and other openings into buildings and facilities.
- (2) Exhaust outlet(s) from an ESS shall not be directed onto means of egress, walkways, or pedestrian or vehicular travel paths.

**9.5.2.6.1.7** Means of Egress Separation.

#### **(A)**

ESS located outdoors shall be separated from any accessible means of egress as required by the AHJ to ensure safe unimpeded egress under fire conditions but in no case less than 10 ft (3 m).

**(B)**

Where approved by the AHJ, clearances to accessible means of egress shall be permitted to be reduced to 3 ft (0.9 m) where fire and explosion testing in accordance with 9.1.5 demonstrates that a fire within the ESS will not adversely impact the means of egress.

**9.5.2.6.1.8** Exterior Wall Installations.

## **(A)**

ESS shall be permitted to be installed outdoors on exterior walls of buildings when all of the following conditions are met:

- (1) The maximum stored energy of individual ESS units shall not exceed 20 kWh (72 MJ).
- (2) The ESS shall comply with applicable requirements in Chapter 4.
- (3) The ESS shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions and their listing.
- (4) Individual ESS units shall be separated from each other by at least 3 ft (0.9 m).
- (5) The ESS shall be separated from doors, windows, operable openings into buildings, or HVAC inlets by at least 5 ft (1.5 m).

#### **(B)**

Where approved by the AHJ, smaller separation distances in 9.5.2.6.1.8(A)(4) and 9.5.2.6.1.8(A)(5) shall be permitted based on fire and explosion testing in accordance with 9.1.5.

**9.5.3** Specific Outdoor Locations.

**9.5.3.1** Rooftop and Open Parking Garage Installations.

Rooftop and open parking garage ESS installations shall comply with this section and as detailed in Table 9.5.3.1.





NA: Not applicable.

**9.5.3.1.1** Rooftop Installations.

## **9.5.3.1.1.1**

Installations shall be permitted on rooftops of buildings that do not obstruct fire department rooftop operations when approved.

#### **9.5.3.1.1.2**

ESS and associated equipment that are located on rooftops and not enclosed by building construction shall comply with the following:

- (1) Stairway access to the roof for emergency response and fire department personnel shall be provided either through a bulkhead from the interior of the building or a stairway on the exterior of the building.
- (2) Service walkways at least 5 ft (1.5 m) in width shall be provided for service and emergency personnel from the point of access to the roof to the system.
- (3) ESS and associated equipment shall be located from the edge of the roof a distance equal to at least the height of the system, equipment, or component but not less than 5 ft (1.5 m).
- (4) The roofing materials under and within 5 ft (1.5 m) horizontally from an ESS or associated equipment shall be noncombustible or shall have a Class A rating when tested in accordance with ASTM E108 or UL 790.
- (5) A Class I standpipe outlet shall be installed at an approved location on the roof level of the building or in the stairway bulkhead at the top level.
- (6) Installations on rooftops over 75 ft (23 m) in height above grade shall be permitted when approved by the AHJ.
- (7) Access, service space, guards, and handrails shall be provided where required by the local building and mechanical codes.
- (8) A radiant energy-sensing fire detection system complying with Section 4.8 shall be provided to protect the ESS.
- (9) The ESS shall be a minimum of 10 ft (3 m) from the fire service access point on the rooftop.

**9.5.3.1.2** Open Parking Garages.

ESS and associated equipment that are located in open parking garages shall comply with all of the following:

- (1) ESS shall not be located within 50 ft (15.3 m) of air inlets for building HVAC systems. When approved, this distance is permitted to be reduced to 25 ft (7.6 m) if the automatic fire alarm system monitoring the radiant energy-sensing detectors de-energizes the ventilation system connected to the air intakes upon detection of fire.
- (2) ESS shall not be located within 25 ft (7.6 m) of exits leading from the attached building when located on a covered level of the parking structure not directly open to the sky above. When approved, the separation distance is permitted to be reduced to 10 ft (3 m) based on fire, explosion, and fault condition testing conducted in accordance with 9.1.5.
- (3) Means of egress separation shall comply with 9.5.2.6.1.7.
- (4) A radiant energy-sensing fire detection system complying with Section 4.8 shall be provided to protect the ESS.
- (5) An approved fence with a locked gate or other approved barrier shall be provided to keep the general public at least 5 ft (1.5 m) from the outer enclosure of the ESS.

**9.5.3.1.3** Clearance to Exposures.

#### **9.5.3.1.3.1**

ESS located on rooftops and in open parking garages shall be separated by a minimum 10 ft (3 m) from the following exposures:

- (1) Buildings, except the portion of the building on which rooftop ESS is mounted
- (2) Lot lines
- (3) Public ways
- (4) Stored combustible materials
- (5) Locations where motor vehicles can be parked
- (6) Hazardous materials
- (7) Other exposure hazards

#### **9.5.3.1.3.2**

Clearances shall be permitted to be reduced to 3 ft (0.9 m) under the following conditions:

- (1) Where a 1-hour freestanding fire barrier, suitable for exterior use, and extending 5 ft (1.5 m) above and extending 5 ft (1.5 m) beyond the physical boundary of the ESS installation is provided to protect the exposure
- (2) Where the weatherproof ESS enclosure is constructed of noncombustible materials and it has been demonstrated that a fire within the enclosure will not ignite combustible materials outside the enclosure based on fire and explosion testing complying with 9.1.5

**9.5.3.1.4** Fire Suppression and Control.

#### **9.5.3.1.4.1**

ESS located in walk-in enclosures on rooftops or in open parking garages shall be provided with automatic fire control and suppression systems within the ESS enclosure in accordance with Section 4.9.

#### **9.5.3.1.4.2**

Areas containing ESS other than walk-in units in open parking structures not open above to the sky shall be provided with an automatic fire suppression system complying with Section 4.9.

## **9.5.3.1.4.3**

When approved by the AHJ, ESS shall be permitted to be installed in open parking garages without the protection of an automatic fire control and suppression system where fire and explosion testing conducted in accordance with 9.1.5 indicates that an ESS fire does not present an exposure hazard to parked vehicles or compromise the means of egress.

**9.5.3.2** Mobile ESS Equipment and Operations.

Mobile ESS operation shall be classified as specified in 9.5.3.2.1 or 9.5.3.2.2.

**9.5.3.2.1** Charging and Storage.

#### **9.5.3.2.1.1**

For the purpose of 9.5.3.2, charging and storage shall cover the operation where mobile ESS are charged and stored so they are ready for deployment to another site and where they are charged and stored after a deployment.

## **9.5.3.2.1.2**

Mobile ESS used to temporarily provide power to lead-acid and nickel-cadmium battery systems that are used for dc power for control of substations and control or safe shutdown or shutdown of generating stations under the exclusive control of the electric utility and located outdoors or in building spaces used exclusively for such installations shall not be required to comply with 9.5.3.2.1.

**9.5.3.2.2** Deployment.

#### **9.5.3.2.2.1**

For the purpose of 9.5.3.2, deployment shall cover operations where mobile ESS are located at a site other than the charging and storage site and are being used to provide power.

#### **9.5.3.2.2.2**

Mobile ESS used to temporarily provide power to lead-acid and nickel-cadmium battery systems that are used for dc power for control of substations and control or safe shutdown or shutdown of generating stations under the exclusive control of the electric utility and located outdoors or in building spaces used exclusively for such installations shall not be required to comply with 9.5.3.2.2.

**9.5.3.2.3** Approved Locations.

Locations where mobile ESS are charged, stored, and deployed shall be restricted to the locations approved by the AHJ.

#### **9.5.3.2.4** Local Staging.

Mobile ESS in transit from the charging and storage location to the deployment location and back shall not be parked within 100 ft (30.5 m) of an occupied building for more than 1 hour during transit, unless specifically approved in advance by the AHJ.

**9.5.3.2.5** Charging and Storage Requirements.

Installations where mobile ESS are charged and stored shall be treated as permanent ESS installations and shall comply with the following sections, as applicable:

- (1) Indoor charging and storage shall comply with 9.5.2.4.1.
- (2) Outdoor charging and storage shall comply with 9.5.2.
- (3) Charging and storage on rooftops and in open parking garages shall comply with 9.5.3.1.

#### **9.5.3.2.5.1**

Construction documents complying with Section 4.2 shall be provided to the AHJ with any locally required construction permit applications for mobile ESS charging and storage locations.

#### **9.5.3.2.5.2**

Electrical connections shall be permitted to be made using temporary wiring complying with the manufacturer's instructions, the UL 9540 listing, and *NFPA 70*.

## **9.5.3.2.5.3**

Fire suppression system connections to the water supply shall be acceptable to the AHJ.

**9.5.3.2.6** Deployed Mobile ESS Requirements.

Deployed mobile ESS equipment and operations shall comply with this section and Table 9.5.3.2.6.

Table 9.5.3.2.6 Mobile Energy Storage Systems (ESS)



a<sub>In walk-in units, spacing is not required between ESS units and the walls of the enclosure.</sub>

bAlarm signals are not required to be transmitted to an approved location for mobile ESS deployed 30 days or less.

cOnly required for walk-in units.

**9.5.3.2.6.1** Deployment Documents.

The following information shall be provided to the AHJ with any locally required operational permit applications for mobile ESS deployments:

- (1) Relevant information for the mobile ESS equipment and protection measures in the construction documents required by Section 4.2
- (2) Location and layout diagram of the area in which the mobile ESS is to be deployed, including a scale diagram of all nearby exposures
- (3) Location and content of signage
- (4) Description of fencing to be provided around the ESS, including locking methods
- (5) Details on fire suppression, smoke and automatic fire detection, system monitoring, thermal management, exhaust ventilation, and explosion control, if provided
- (6) For deployment, the intended duration of operation, including anticipated connection and disconnection times and dates
- (7) Description of the temporary wiring, including connection methods, conductor type and size, and circuit overcurrent protection to be provided
- (8) Description of how fire suppression system connections to water supplies or extinguishing agents are to be provided
- (9) Contact information for personnel who are responsible for maintaining and servicing the equipment and responding to emergencies

**9.5.3.2.6.2** Restricted Locations.

Deployed mobile ESS operations shall not be located indoors, in covered parking garages, on rooftops, below grade, or under building overhangs.

**9.5.3.2.6.3** Wheeled Vehicles.

Mobile operations on wheeled vehicles or trailers shall not be required to comply with 4.7.2 seismic protection requirements.

## **9.5.3.2.6.4** Fire Suppression Connections.

Fire suppression system connections to the water supply shall be permitted to use approved temporary connections.

#### **9.5.3.2.6.5** Duration.

## **(A)**

Mobile ESS deployments that provide power for durations longer than 30 days shall comply with 9.5.3.2.5.

## **(B)**

Mobile ESS deployments in excess of 30 days, for emergencies, shall not be required to comply with 9.5.3.2.5, with AHJ approval.

#### **9.5.3.2.6.6** Clearance to Exposures.

## **(A)**

Deployed mobile ESS shall be separated by a minimum 10 ft (3 m) from the following exposures:

- (1) Public ways
- (2) Buildings
- (3) Stored combustible materials
- (4) Hazardous materials
- (5) High-piled stock
- (6) Other exposure hazards not associated with electrical grid infrastructure

#### **(B)**

Required separation distances shall be permitted to be reduced in accordance with 9.5.2.6.1.1 through 9.5.2.6.1.4.

## **(C)**

Deployed mobile ESS shall be separated by a minimum 50 ft (15.3 m) from public seating areas and from tents, canopies, and membrane structures with an occupant load of 30 or more.

**9.5.3.2.6.7** Electrical Connections.

Electrical connections shall be made in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.

## **(A)**

Temporary wiring for electrical power connections shall comply with *NFPA 70* or equivalent code.

## **(B)**

Fixed electrical wiring shall not be permitted.

## **9.5.3.2.6.8** Fencing.

## **(A)**

An approved fence with a locked gate or other approved barrier shall be provided to keep the general public at least 5 ft (1024 mm) from the outer enclosure of a deployed mobile ESS.

## **(B)**

A mobile ESS that is locked to prevent access by unauthorized persons shall be permitted to comply with 9.5.3.2.6.8(A).

**9.6** Protection and Remediation.

#### **9.6.1** Smoke and Fire Detection.

Areas containing ESS systems located within buildings or structures shall be provided with a smoke detection or radiant energy–sensing system in accordance with Section 4.8, unless modified by this chapter.

**9.6.2** Fire Control and Suppression.

## **9.6.2.1**

Fire control and suppression for rooms or areas within buildings and outdoor walk-in units containing ESS shall be provided in accordance with Section 4.9, unless modified by this chapter.

**9.6.2.2** Lead-Acid and Nickel-Cadmium Battery Systems.

#### **9.6.2.2.1**

Lead-acid and nickel-cadmium battery systems less than 50 V ac, 60 V dc that are in telecommunications facilities for installations of communications equipment under the exclusive control of communications utilities and located outdoors or in building spaces used exclusively for such installations that comply with NFPA 76 shall not be required to have a fire suppression system installed.

#### **9.6.2.2.2**

Lead-acid battery systems in uninterruptable power supplies listed and labeled in accordance with the application used for standby power applications, which is limited to not more than 10 percent of the floor area on the floor on which the ESS is located, shall not be required to have a fire suppression system installed.

#### **9.6.2.2.3\***

Lead-acid and nickel-cadmium battery systems that are used for dc power for control of substations and control or safe shutdown of generating stations under the exclusive control of the electric utility and located outdoors or in building spaces used exclusively for such installations shall not be required to have a fire suppression system installed.

#### **9.6.2.3**

Where more than one ESS technology is present within a fire area, the fire protection systems shall be designed to protect the greatest hazard.

#### **9.6.3** Water Supply.

## **9.6.3.1**

Sites where nonmechanical ESS are installed shall be provided with a permanent source of water for fire protection in accordance with 4.9.4, unless modified by this chapter.

**9.6.3.2** Lead-Acid and Nickel-Cadmium Systems.

#### **9.6.3.2.1\***

Normally unoccupied, remote standalone telecommunications structures with a gross floor area of less than 1500 ft<sup>2</sup> (139 m<sup>2</sup>) with lead-acid and nickel-cadmium battery systems less than 50 V ac, 60 V dc that are in telecommunications facilities for installations of communications

equipment under the exclusive control of communications utilities and located outdoors or in building spaces used exclusively for such installations that comply with NFPA 76 shall not be required to have a fire water supply.

## **9.6.3.2.2**

Lead-acid and nickel-cadmium battery systems that are used for dc power for control of substations and control or safe shutdown or shutdown of generating stations under the exclusive control of the electric utility and located outdoors or in building spaces used exclusively for such installations shall not be required to have a fire water supply.

**9.6.4** Fire Barriers.
Rooms or spaces containing ESS shall be separated from other areas of the building by fire barriers with a minimum 2-hour fire resistance rating and horizontal assemblies with a minimum 2-hour fire resistance rating, constructed in accordance with the local building code.

#### **9.6.4.1**

Rooms or spaces, containing only ESS listed to UL 9540 and that are marked as meeting the cell-level performance criteria of UL 9540A, shall be permitted to be separated from other areas of the building with a minimum 1-hour fire resistance rating constructed in accordance with local building codes.

#### **9.6.4.2**

Lead-acid and nickel cadmium battery systems that are used for dc power for control of substations and control or safe shutdown or shutdown of generating stations under the exclusive control of the electric utility and located outdoors or in building spaces used exclusively for such installations shall not be required have a 2-hour fire resistance separation from the rest of the building.

**9.6.5** Technology-Specific Requirements.

Electrochemical ESS shall comply with the applicable sections of Chapters 4 and 9 as specified in Table 9.6.5.

Table 9.6.5 Electrochemical ESS Technology-Specific Requirements



\*The protection in this column is not required if documentation acceptable to the AHJ, including a hazard mitigation analysis complying with Section 4.4, provides justification that the protection is not necessary based on the technology used.

†Applicable only to vented (e.g., flooded) batteries.

**9.6.5.1\*** Exhaust Ventilation During Normal Operation.

Where required by Table 9.6.5 or elsewhere in this standard, exhaust ventilation during normal operation shall be provided for rooms, enclosures, walk-in units, and cabinets as follows:

- (1) ESS rooms and walk-in units shall use mechanical exhaust ventilation in accordance with 9.6.5.1.5.
- (2) Outdoor ESS cabinets shall use either mechanical or natural exhaust ventilation in accordance with 9.6.5.1.4 or 9.6.5.1.5.
- **9.6.5.1.1** Ni-MH Batteries.

Exhaust ventilation shall not be required for Ni-MH batteries.

#### **9.6.5.1.2** Abnormal Conditions.

Protection against the release of flammable gases during abnormal charging or thermal runaway conditions shall be in accordance with 9.6.5.6.

**9.6.5.1.3** Indoor ESS Cabinets.

Exhaust ventilation for ESS cabinets installed indoors shall evaluate air movement through the cabinet and exhaust from the room.

**9.6.5.1.4\*** Natural Exhaust Ventilation.

Exhaust ventilation shall be designed to limit the maximum concentration of flammable gas to 25 percent of the lower flammable limit (LFL) of the total volume of the outdoor cabinet during the worst-case event of simultaneous "boost" charging of all the batteries, in accordance with nationally recognized standards.

**9.6.5.1.5** Mechanical Exhaust Ventilation.

Exhaust ventilation shall be provided in accordance with the applicable mechanical code and one of the following:

- (1) Where hydrogen is the gas generated, an exhaust ventilation rate based on hydrogen generation estimates sufficient to limit the maximum concentration of hydrogen to 1.0 percent of the total volume of the room, walk-in unit, or cabinet during the worst-case event of simultaneous "boost" charging of all the batteries, in accordance with nationally recognized standards
- (2) An exhaust ventilation rate based on the area of not less than 1 ft<sup>3</sup>/min/ft<sup>2</sup> (5.1 L/sec/m<sup>2</sup>) of floor area of the room, walk-in unit, enclosure, container, or cabinet

#### **9.6.5.1.5.1**

Mechanical exhaust ventilation shall be either continuous or activated by a gas detection system in accordance with 9.6.5.1.5.4.

#### **9.6.5.1.5.2**

Required mechanical exhaust ventilation systems shall be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's installation instructions and local building, mechanical, and fire codes.

#### **9.6.5.1.5.3**

Required mechanical exhaust ventilation systems shall either be supervised by an approved central, proprietary, or remote station service in accordance with *NFPA 72* or initiate an audible and visual signal at an approved, constantly attended location.

#### **9.6.5.1.5.4\***

Where gas detection is used to activate exhaust ventilation in accordance with 9.6.5.1.5.1, rooms, walk-in units, enclosures, walk-in containers, and cabinets containing ESS shall be protected by an approved continuous gas detection system that complies with the following:

- (1) The gas detection system shall be designed to activate the mechanical exhaust ventilation system when the level of flammable gas detected in the room, walk-in unit, enclosure, container, and cabinet exceeds 25 percent of the LFL of the flammable gas mixture.
- (2) The mechanical exhaust ventilation system shall remain on until the flammable gas detected is less than 25 percent of the LFL of the flammable gas mixture.
- (3) The gas detection system shall be provided with a minimum of 2 hours of standby power.
- (4) Failure of the gas detection system shall annunciate a trouble signal at an approved central, proprietary, or remote station in accordance with *NFPA 72* or at an approved, constantly attended location.

**9.6.5.2** Spill Control.

#### **9.6.5.2.1**

Rooms, buildings, or areas containing ESS with free-flowing liquid electrolyte in individual vessels having a capacity of more than 55 gal (208 L) or multiple vessels having an aggregate capacity exceeding 1000 gal (3785 L) shall be provided with spill control to prevent the flow of liquids to adjoining areas.

#### **9.6.5.2.2\***

An approved method and materials for the control of a spill of electrolyte or other hazardous liquid shall be provided that will be capable of controlling a spill from the single largest vessel.

#### **9.6.5.2.3**

In rooms, buildings, or areas protected by water-based fire protection systems, the capacity of the spill containment system shall accommodate the capacity of the expected fire protection system discharge for a period of 10 minutes.

#### **9.6.5.2.4**

The capacity increase in 9.6.5.2.3 shall not apply to integral spill containment systems that are shielded from the fire protection system discharge.

#### **9.6.5.2.5**

Sealed valve-regulated lead-acid (VRLA) batteries and other ESS equipment with immobilized electrolyte and immobilized hazardous liquids shall not require spill control.

#### **9.6.5.2.6**

Rooms, buildings, or areas containing other hazardous materials shall include spill control as required in NFPA 1.

#### **9.6.5.3** Neutralization.

#### **9.6.5.3.1\***

An approved method to neutralize spills from ESS with free-flowing electrolyte shall be provided.

#### **9.6.5.3.2**

Neutralization shall not be required for ESS with immobilized electrolyte.

#### **9.6.5.3.3**

The method shall be capable of neutralizing a spill from the largest battery or vessel to a pH between 5.0 and 9.0.

#### **9.6.5.4\*** Safety Caps.

Where required by Table 9.6.5, vented batteries used in ESS shall be provided with flamearresting safety caps.

**9.6.5.5\*** Thermal Runaway Protection.

Where required by Table 9.6.5, a listed device evaluated as part of the ESS or other approved method shall be provided to manage charging and discharging during normal operation of the ESS to maintain batteries and capacitors within their safe operating their operating parameters and preclude thermal runaway.

#### **9.6.5.5.1**

Thermal runaway protection shall not be required for vented (e.g., flooded) lead-acid and Ni-Cd batteries.

#### **9.6.5.5.2**

Thermal runaway protection shall be permitted to be provided by the battery management system or a capacitor ESS management system that has been evaluated as part of the UL 1973 or UL 9540 listing.

**9.6.5.6\*** Explosion Control.

#### **9.6.5.6.1**

Where required elsewhere in this standard, explosion prevention or deflagration venting shall be provided in accordance with this section.

#### **9.6.5.6.1.1**

Explosion prevention and deflagration venting shall not be required where approved by the AHJ based on fire and explosion testing in accordance with 9.1.5 and a deflagration hazard study demonstrating that flammable gas concentrations cannot exceed 25 percent of the LFL.

#### **9.6.5.6.1.2**

Explosion control shall not be required for the following:

- (1) Lead-acid and Ni-Cd battery systems less than 50 V ac, 60 V dc in telecommunications facilities for installations of communications equipment under the exclusive control of communications utilities located in building spaces or walk-in units used exclusively for such installations that comply with NFPA 76
- (2) Lead-acid and Ni-Cd battery systems that are and used for dc power for control of substations and control or safe shutdown or shutdown of generating stations under the exclusive control of the electric utility located outdoors or in building spaces used exclusively for such installations
- (3) Lead-acid battery systems in uninterruptable power supplies listed and labeled in accordance with the application used for standby power applications, and housed in a single cabinet in a single fire area in buildings or walk-in units
- (4) Lead-acid and Ni-Cd batteries listed in accordance with UL 1973
- (5) Batteries listed in accordance with UL 1973 that do not go into thermal runaway or produce flammable gas in the UL 9540A cell level test or equivalent test

#### **9.6.5.6.2**

Protection against the release of flammable gases during normal operation shall be in accordance with 9.6.5.1.

#### **9.6.5.6.3\***

ESS installed within a room, building, ESS cabinet, ESS walk-in unit, or otherwise nonoccupiable enclosure shall be provided with one of the following:

- (1) Explosion prevention systems designed, installed, operated, maintained, and tested in accordance with NFPA 69
- (2) Deflagration venting installed and maintained in accordance with NFPA 68

#### **9.6.5.6.4\***

Where approved, ESS cabinets designed to ensure that no hazardous pressure waves, debris, shrapnel, or enclosure pieces are ejected, as validated by installation level fire and explosion testing and an engineering evaluation complying with 9.1.5 that includes the cabinet, shall be permitted in lieu of providing explosion control that complies with NFPA 68 or NFPA 69.

#### **9.6.5.6.5**

ESS enclosures and cabinets shall be designed so explosive discharge of gases or projectiles are not ejected during fire and explosion testing complying with 9.1.5 that includes the ESS enclosure and cabinets.

### **9.6.5.6.6\***

Where ESS batteries or cabinets are installed in a container outdoors, other than a walk-in unit, the installation shall comply with one of the following:

- (1) The container shall be provided with explosion control complying with 9.6.5.6.3.
- (2) Combination of the container and cabinets shall be tested together to show compliance with 9.6.5.6.1.1.

#### **9.6.5.6.7**

Where gas detection is used to activate a combustible gas concentration reduction system and based on an appropriate NFPA 69 deflagration study, enclosures containing ESS shall be protected by an approved continuous gas detection system that complies with the following:

- (1) The gas detection system shall be designed to activate the combustible gas concentration reduction system on detection of flammable gases at no more than 10 percent of the LFL of the gas mixture or of the individual components.
- (2) The combustible gas concentration reduction system shall remain on to ensure the flammable gas does not exceed 25 percent of the LFL of the gas mixture or of the individual components.
- (3) The gas detection system and combustible gas concentration reduction system shall be provided with a minimum of 2 hours of standby power.
- (4) For lithium-ion batteries, the gas detection system shall be provided with a minimum of 24 hours of standby power and 2 hours in alarm or as required by the HMA.
- (5) The gas detection system shall annunciate the following at an approved central, proprietary, or remote station in accordance with *NFPA 72*, or at an approved constantly attended location:
	- (6) A trouble signal upon failure of the gas detection system
	- (7) An alarm signal if flammable gas concentration exceeds 10 percent of the LFL

#### **9.6.5.6.8**

Compartmentalization created by cold and hot aisle arrangements within the ESS enclosure shall be addressed in accordance with the following:

- (1) For NFPA 69 designs, the performance of ventilation systems shall be independently verified for a thermal runaway event in either aisle/subcompartment.
- (2) For NFPA 68 designs, the placement of explosion relief panels shall ensure that the explosion hazard is addressed for both hot and cold aisles/subcompartments.
- (3) The gas detection system shall be designed to activate on detection of flammable gas in either aisle/subcompartment.

#### **9.6.5.6.9**

The protection design shall demonstrate that deflagrations are not propagated to interconnected or adjacent cabinets, enclosures, or rooms.

**9.6.6** Remediation Measures.

**9.6.6.1\*** Authorized Service Personnel.

Where a fire or other event has damaged the ESS and ignition or reignition of the ESS is possible, the owner, agent, or lessee shall dispatch authorized service personnel to assist emergency first responders to mitigate the hazard or remove damaged equipment from the premises with a response time approved by the AHJ.

#### **9.6.6.2\*** Hazard Support Personnel.

Where required by the AHJ for public safety, the owner or their authorized agent shall provide hazard support personnel at the owner's expense.

#### **9.6.6.2.1\***

Trained hazard support personnel shall be approved by the AHJ.

#### **9.6.6.2.2**

Trained hazard support personnel shall be available to respond to possible ignition or re-ignition of the damaged ESS, within the response time noted in the approved emergency operations plan.

#### **9.6.6.2.3**

The authorized service personnel shall be permitted to perform the duties of the hazard support personnel.

#### **9.6.6.2.4\***

Required hazard support personnel shall monitor the ESS continuously in a method approved by the AHJ from the time the fire department releases the emergency scene until the hazard is mitigated and the AHJ gives authorization to the owner or their authorized agent that onsite hazard support personnel are no longer required.

#### **9.6.6.2.5\***

On-duty hazard support personnel shall have the following responsibilities:

- (1) Ensure the security and safety of the ESS site in accordance with the emergency operation plan and decommissioning plan
- (2) Keep diligent watch for fires or signs of off-gassing, obstructions to means of egress, and other hazards for the time required in accordance with 9.6.6.2.4
- (3) Ensure a means of communication is available to immediately contact the fire department if their assistance is needed to mitigate any hazards
- (4) Take prompt measures for remediation of hazards
- (5) Take prompt measures to assist in the evacuation of the public from the structures in accordance with the emergency operations plan
- (6) Allow only authorized personnel to enter the ESS site
- (7) Ensure authorized personnel are wearing proper PPE
- (8) Where required by the AHJ, maintain a written or electronic log of all personnel entering/leaving the portion of the site containing the ESS
- (9) Record all postincident tasks performed

# **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

Delete or replace the word "safe." Section 2.2.2.1 in the Manual of Style for NFPA Technical Committee Documents states that "the main text of codes and standards shall not contain references or requirements that are unenforceable and vague and Table 2.2.2.3 in the Manual of Style for NFPA Technical Committee Documents lists "safe(ly) (ty)."

# **Submitter Information Verification**



# **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-120-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** The NFPA Manual of Style for Technical Committee Documents Table 2.2.2.3 states that "the main text of codes and standards shall not contain references or requirements that are unenforceable and vague. The use of the word safe is unenforceable and vague.



ensuring that the gases released are ignited, if possible, will ensure that the fire propagation hazard is sufficiently evaluated.







**Statement:** Since the code assumes compete failure of a unit or cabinets, this will require an ignition source to ignite those technologies that produce combustible gases during 9540A but do not catch fire. Currently an outdoor ESS unit can "pass" UL9540A if no visible flames are observed, however copious quantities of smoke/vent/off-gas may be emanating from the ESS. Based on cell and module level testing we know that this mixture is flammable and often may ignite in which case the fire may be sustained and propagate internally or to adjacent/target units. As these are one-off tests there is an aspect of uncertainty and thus ensuring that the gases released are ignited, if possible, will ensure that the fire propagation hazard is sufficiently evaluated.



# 9.1.5.1.2.1\*

**When cell thermal runaway results in the release of flammable gases during a cell or module level test, a unit level test shall be conducted involving intentional ignition of the vent gases to assess the fire propagation hazard.**

# A. 9.1.5.1.2.1

**Intentional ignition of the vent gases informs the degree of fire hazard presented by the released flammable gases and the development of a fire protection strategy. The ignition source should be of sufficient magnitude such as generated by a spark igniter, glow plug, or pilot flame located in close proximity to the origin of the vented gases, but outside of the module of origin, to cause prompt ignition of the flammable gases. External ignition in this manner is not intended to address deflagration mitigation as required in 9.1.5.1.4.**

# **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

NFPA Explosion Task Group recommendation - As 9540A is meant to be a fire test, if not all tests result in a fire. In order to properly evaluate a fire condition if the test doesn't initially result in a fire condition, the vent gasses may have to be ignited by means of an alternate source. This statement requires that ignition.

# **Related Public Inputs for This Document**

**Related Input Relationship** 

Public Input No. 64-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.8] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 65-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 66-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 67-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 4.2.1.3] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 71-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.1.1] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 72-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.1.2] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 73-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.3] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 74-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. A.9.6.5.6.3] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 75-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.4] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 76-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.5] 855 Explosion Task

**Group Group** Group **Group Group Group** Group **Group Group Group** 



# **Submitter Information Verification**















**Public Input No. 1-NFPA 855-2022 [ New Section after 9.1.5.2.2 ]**

9.1.5.2.3<sup>\*</sup> For Chapter 15 ESS installations that do not exceed the individual or aggregate ratings referenced in 15.5.3, the AHJ shall be permitted to require the test report to be accompanied by a supplemental report prepared by an approved independent third party with expertise in the matter that provides an interpretation of the test data in relation to the installation requirements for the **ESS.**

**A.9.1.5.2.3 SecƟon 1.3.2 indicates that ESS in one‐ and two‐family dwellings and townhouses shall** only be required to comply with Chapter 15. However, 15.3.1 identifies reduced spacing conditions which require fire and explosion testing to comply with 9.1.5. Since these residential ESS cannot **exceed 20 kWh and the total aggregate energy of the installations is limited. This section does not** apply to residential ESS that exceed the individual and aggregate ratings specified in 15.5.1 and **15.5.2, since 15.5.3 requires these larger systems to comply with commercial ESS requirements in Chapter 4 through 9.** 

# **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

This new section would eliminate the requirement for a registered design professional with fire protection engineering expertise and replace that with language similar to what is currently found in NFPA 1, Section 1.16.1 when technical assistance is required by the AHJ (the IFC has similar language in 104.8.2). The current language is onerous for the smaller residential installations. In most cases the installations are simpler with clear cut location requirements contained within Chapter 15 where there is no need for a supplemental report.

As written, an installer could be doing the exact same installation at a number of homes in a jurisdiction, and they would need a registered design professional (e.g., FPE) for each installation. The new Section 9.1.5.2.3 matches how this topic, (technical assistance for supplemental reports), is addressed in NFPA 1 Fire Code. The requirement is only triggered if the AHJ request the supplemental report and the professional preparing the report can be any independent third party with expertise in the matter that is approved by the AHJ.

# **Submitter Information Verification**



# **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** This conflicts with recent TIA and subsequent revision which removed the connection between Chapter 15 and Chapter 9 to separate the requirements for testing and registered design professional.



# **Public Input No. 247-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. 9.2.1.1 ]**

# **9.2.1.1**

ESS shall be evaluated, tested and listed by a recognized laboratory in accordance with the appropriate test standard (UL 9540), unless specifically exempted elsewhere in this standard.

# **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

While the intent of the 855 standard the requirements of the UL 9540 listing is to provide a BESS product that meets this standard through product components and fabrication production that is appropriately evaluated and found acceptable at a production level. This is not consistently happening to provide 9540 listings because of products that are stick built in the field, Products that have multiple fabrications points such as the batteries and modules that are manufactured in Asia, the containers are integrated in South American, and the finishing touches are completed on a clients site in the US. Or certain completed components are not part of the manufacturer's products such as the requirements for a UL listed inverter. Or the Batteries have been repurposed and production pathways are no longer viable to evaluate. Because of these issue production listings are not always achievable through manufacturing, so therefore it doesn't happen. Additional options are and should be available for ensuring a "listing". By providing definitions and clarification around listings, it provides a better compliance options for a system that lacks options for successful compliance

# **Submitter Information Verification**



# **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** Proposed changes do not improve the language.





Г





# **Public Input No. 112-NFPA 855-2023 [ Sections 9.2.1.2.2, 9.2.1.2.3 ] Sections 9.2.1.2.2, 9.2.1.2.3 9.2.1.2.2\*** Lead-acid and nickel-cadmium battery systems less than 50 V ac, 60 V dc in telecommunications facilities for installations of communications equipment under the exclusive control of communications utilities used in stationary standby service and located outdoors or in building spaces used exclusively for such installations that comply with NFPA 76 shall not be required to be listed- in accordance with UL 9540. **9.2.1.2.3\*** Lead-acid and nickel-cadmium battery systems that are used for dc power for control of substations and control or safe shutdown of generating stations under the exclusive control of the electric utility and located outdoors or in building spaces used exclusively for such installations shall not be required to be listed-in accordance with UL 9540. **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input** Issue 1 of NFPA 855 exempted telecom and electric utility batteries from listing. Issue 2 introduced an option to list certain lead-acid batteries to UL 1973. But saying telecom and electric utility batteries don't need to be listed to UL 9540, does not exempt them from UL 1973 listing, as was originally intended. The NEC exempts all lead-acid batteries from all listing requirements and excluding telecom and utility lead-acid batteries from both UL 9540 and UL 1973 is consistent with the NEC and issue 1 of 855. **Submitter Information Verification Submitter Full Name:** Richard Kluge **Organization:** Ericsson **Affiliation:** ATIS **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Mon May 15 20:54:05 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA **Committee Statement Resolution:** FR-126-NFPA 855-2023 **Statement:** Modifying Section 9.2.1.2.1 provides for an improved clarification of the carve out and recognition of the improvement with UL 1973 providing for listing of this technology







Г

I







#### $9.2.4.2$   $2 -$

Batteries previously used in other applications, such as electric vehicle propulsion, shall

#### **4**

Refurbished batteries that are used in an application that (1) differs from the original use, or (2) have internal parts replaced or repaired shall be treated as remanufactured batteries and also comply with 4.2.4.5 and 4.2.4.6.

### **9.2.4.5\***

Repurposed batteries, remanufactured batteries, and the refurbished batteries covered by 9.2.4.4.1 shall not be permitted unless the equipment is repurposed or remanufactured by a UL 1974–compliant battery repurposing company where reused in ESS applications and the system complies with 4.6.1 company that is listed in accordance with UL 1974.

#### **Note - (Renumber A.2.4.2 to A.2.4.5 with no text changes)**

#### **9.2.4.6\***

The repurposed, or remanufactured batteries, modules and cells shall be provided with a nameplate marking that includes the electrical ratings, chemistry; model number; and manufacturer's identification..

# **A.9.2.4.6**

As part of the repurposing process, UL 1974 requires all markings from the original manufacturer (OEM) to be removed and replaced with markings provided as part of the repurposing or remanufacturing of the batteries. This means there will be no markings that reference the battery OEM after the product has been repurposed .

# **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

This proposal accomplishes the following:

1. Clarifies that repurposed, remanufactured, and refurbished batteries must comply with 9.2.4 and other applicable requirements in the standard.

2. 9.2.4.4 and 9.2.4.4.1 address refurbished batteries, and does not require refurbishing operations that are primarily cosmetic in nature to be performed by a UL 1974 facility.

3. Revised 9.2.4.5 provide clarity that the repurposing or remanufacturing company is listed, and that the listing can be provided by any approved certification organization.

4. 9.2.4.6 identifies the markings to be provided on the repurposed batteries, as required in UL 1974, Section 23. The annex clarifies that UL 1974 does not allow the battery OEM identification to be visible on the repurposed batteries.

5. The proposal assumes the scope of UL 1974 will be expanded to cover remanufactured batteries.

This public input was developed by an NFPA 855 2nd life battery task group (#16).

# **Related Public Inputs for This Document**

**Related Input Relationship** 

Public Input No. 334-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 4.6.5]

# **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Howard Hopper **Organization:** UL Solutions



repurposed battereis should still be listed to UL 1973.

have to be listed to UL 9540 as indicated in 4.6.1 of NFPA 855 and it's also why






#### **9.3. 1.3**

Walk-in units shall be treated as indoor installations.

#### **A.9.3.1.3**

Walk-in ESS are units where other than the arms of personnel can enter the enclosure or container housing the system or system components for any reason. This includes ESS enclosed within an outer enclosure similar to an ISO shipping container. It does not include ESS cabinets where personnel can reach into the outer enclosure to perform service or maintenance. Building codes regulate such structures and containers as buildings.

#### **9.3. 2** Outdoor Installations.

Outdoor ESS installations shall be classified as follows:

- (1) *Remote locations*: ESS located more than 100 ft (30.5 m) from buildings, lot lines that can be built upon, public ways, stored combustible materials, hazardous materials, high-piled stock, and other exposure hazards not associated with electrical grid infrastructure
- (2) *Locations near exposures*: all outdoor ESS locations that do not comply with remote outdoor location requirements
- (3) Specific outdoor locations, as follows:
	- (a) *Rooftop installations*: ESS installations located on the roofs of buildings
	- (b) *Open parking garage installations*: ESS installations located in a structure or portion of a structure as defined in 3.3.19
	- (c) Mobile ESS installations

#### **9.3.1.2**

Outdoor ESS cabinets that exceed 53 ft  $\times$  8.5 ft  $\times$  9.5 ft (16.2 m  $\times$  2.6 m  $\times$  2.9 m) in size, not including HVAC and other equipment shall be treated as indoor installations.

## **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

See Public Input 255

## **Related Public Inputs for This Document**

#### **Related Input Relationship**

Public Input No. 255-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.1] Connected for complete

Public Input No. 255-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.1]

Public Input No. 258-NFPA 855-2023 [Sections 9.5.2.3, 9.5.2.4] Public Input No. 259-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 4.8] Public Input No. 260-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 3.3.9.4]

Public Input No. 261-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.1]

## **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Robert Davidson **Organization:** Davidson Code Concepts, Llc **Street Address: City:**

change



Г







intended only add new ESS types..

The following proposal has been submitted by task group 8 "new technology" of the NFPA 855 technical committee. The committee heard multiple proposals from various products which outlined a desire to be recognized in table 9.4.1 in a new ESS Type besides "other battery technologies." The task group heard 7 presentations from various manufactures and evaluated the submitted information through the open task group process.

The ESS line items added include Nickel-Hydrogen and Zinc Manganese Dioxide batteries which through submitted presentations indicated that through testing had little impact of fire through the various testing processes.. The task group is recommending that that material be recognized with an unlimited Maximum Stored Energy based on 9.4.1

The ESS line items are further recommended to be modified to include specific line items for Lithium Metal, and Zinc Bromide batteries with a maximum of 600 kWH. Through the presentation the submitted information by the various manufactures appeared the batteries performed above the hazards shown with Lithium-Ion.

#### **Related Public Inputs for This Document**



Public Input No. 181-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 1.3 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

Public Input No. 183-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

Public Input No. 181-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 1.3 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

Public Input No. 183-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

#### **Submitter Information Verification**



#### **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-4-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** The ESS line items added include nickel-hydrogen and zinc manganese dioxide batteries which indicate that through testing had little impact of fire through the various testing processes. The new battery types are added to the table based on criteria in 9.4.1.

> Various technologies where added such as zinc-air to be consistent with able 1.3. Footnote b was modified to be consistent with the various technologies in Table 1.3.

The ESS line items are to be modified to include specific line items for lithium metal, and zinc bromide batteries with a maximum of 600 kWH. The batteries perform above the hazards shown with lithium-Ion.

The technical committee is seeking public comment for the possible deletion of this table in its entirety.

#### 9.4.1 Maximum Stored Energy.

ESS in the following locations shall comply with Section 9.4 as follows:

- (1) Fire areas within non-dedicated-use buildings containing ESS shall not exceed the maximum stored energy values in Table 9.4.1 except as permitted by 9.4.1.1.
- (2) Outdoor ESS installations in locations near exposures shall not exceed the maximum stored energy values in Table 9.4.1 except as permitted by 9.4.1.2.
- (3) ESS installations in open parking garages and on rooftops of buildings shall not exceed the maximum stored energy values in Table 9.4.1 except as permitted by 9.4.1.2.
- (4) Mobile ESS equipment as covered by 9.5.3.2 shall not exceed the maximum stored energy values in Table 9.4.1 except as permitted by 9.4.1.2.





<sup>a</sup>For ratings in amp-hrs, kWh should equal maximum rated voltage multiplied by amp-hr rating divided by 1000.

<sup>b</sup>Nickel battery technologies include nickel cadmium (Ni-Cad), nickel metal hydride (Ni-MH), and nickel zinc (Ni-Zn).

<sup>c</sup>Includes vanadium, zinc-bromine, polysulfide, bromide, and other flowing electrolyte-type technologies.



 It is also recommended that iron-air technology be separately listed (and not covered under "other" technologies) because it has safety benefits that will be seen in other sections of the code (Table 9.6.5). **Related Public Inputs for This Document Related Input Relationship** Public Input No. 229-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 1.3 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Addition of iron-air chemistry to tables 1.3 and 9.4.1 **Submitter Information Verification Submitter Full Name:** Alli Nansel **Organization:** Form Energy **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Wed May 31 17:30:45 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA **Committee Statement Resolution:** FR-4-NFPA 855-2023 **Statement:** The ESS line items added include nickel-hydrogen and zinc manganese dioxide batteries which indicate that through testing had little impact of fire through the various testing processes. The new battery types are added to the table based on criteria in 9.4.1. Various technologies where added such as zinc-air to be consistent with able 1.3. Footnote b was modified to be consistent with the various technologies in Table 1.3. The ESS line items are to be modified to include specific line items for lithium metal, and zinc bromide batteries with a maximum of 600 kWH. The batteries perform above the hazards shown with lithium-Ion. The technical committee is seeking public comment for the possible deletion of this table in its entirety.

# NFPA 855: Public Input Submittal for Iron-Air Updates

The following document outlines Form Energy's submission for the NFPA 855 Public Input Period. Changes to the current edition are outlined in red.

<b>ESS Type</b>	<b>Maximum Stored Energy (kWh)</b>
Lead-acid batteries, all types	Unlimited
<b>Nickel batteries</b>	Unlimited
Lithium-ion batteries, all types	600
Sodium nickel chloride batteries	600
<b>Flow batteries</b>	600
<b>Iron-air batteries</b>	600
Other battery technologies	200
Storage capacitors	20

Table 9.4.1 Maximum Stored Energy

Rationale: Form Energy is proposing that iron-air batteries be added to Table 9.4.1 as an ESS Type with increased maximum stored energy limits from "other battery technologies".

600 kWh is recommended because iron-air is demonstrated to be equivalent to or safer than other chemistries listed at that same maximum stored energy quantity. Form Energy has test data available to present to the committee to support these safety claims.

It is also recommended that iron-air technology be separately listed (and not covered under "other" technologies) because it has safety benefits that will be seen in other sections of the code (Table 9.6.5).



## **Submitter Information Verification**



## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-4-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** The ESS line items added include nickel-hydrogen and zinc manganese dioxide batteries which indicate that through testing had little impact of fire through the various testing processes. The new battery types are added to the table based on criteria in 9.4.1.

> Various technologies where added such as zinc-air to be consistent with able 1.3. Footnote b was modified to be consistent with the various technologies in Table 1.3.

The ESS line items are to be modified to include specific line items for lithium metal, and zinc bromide batteries with a maximum of 600 kWH. The batteries perform above the hazards shown with lithium-Ion.

The technical committee is seeking public comment for the possible deletion of this table in its entirety.







Г





## **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

Toxic emissions are not adequately addressed in the current addition of 855. A NFPA 855 Task Group was formed for the evaluation of current toxic code requirements and to provide recommendations for changes to the code. Information on the generation and emission of gases is still limited. The addition of a new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions. Information will be amended based on current research on toxics.

## **Related Public Inputs for This Document**



**Relationship** group group group group







## **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Paul Hayes



#### **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** CI-104-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** The technical committee is seeking public comment on this for the Second Draft,

Information on the generation and emission of gases is still limited. A new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions. As the technology specific protection table changes with the changes in technology and batter type, the applicable code requirements for location specific application is not always clear. The specific mitigation measures are added to the tables for guidance per locations.

## **Public Input No. 81-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. 9.5.1 [Excluding any Sub-NFPA Sections] ]**

Indoor ESS installations shall comply with this section and as detailed in Table 9.5.1.

Table 9.5.1 Indoor ESS Installations



NA: Not applicable.

\* Table 9.6.5 shall determine if a sub-category of electrochemical ESS must comply with this requirement. The listed reference section shall determine whether the form-factor of an ESS defined in section 3.3.9 shall comply or is exempt from this requirement.

## **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

NFPA 855 Explosion Control Task Group Recommendations - As the technology Specific protection table changes with the changes in technology and batter type, the applicable code requirements for location specific application is not always clear. The specific mitigation measures are added to the tables for guidance per locations.

## **Related Public Inputs for This Document**

Public Input No. 64-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.8] 855 Explosion Task

## **Related Input Relationship**

Group

Public Input No. 65-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 66-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 67-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 4.2.1.3] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 70-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.1.5.1.2] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 71-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.1.1] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 72-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.1.2] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 73-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.3] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 74-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. A.9.6.5.6.3] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 75-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.4] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 76-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.5] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 77-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.6] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 78-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.9] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 79-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.7] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 80-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.8] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 82-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.2 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 83-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.3.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 84-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.3.2.6 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

Public Input No. 85-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.5.6.7] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 64-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.8] Public Input No. 65-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] Public Input No. 66-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] Public Input No. 67-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 4.2.1.3] Public Input No. 70-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.1.5.1.2] Public Input No. 71-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.1.1] Public Input No. 72-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.1.2] Public Input No. 73-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.3] Public Input No. 74-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. A.9.6.5.6.3] Public Input No. 75-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.4] Public Input No. 76-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.5] Public Input No. 77-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.6] Public Input No. 78-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.9]

**Group Group Group** 855 Explosion Task **Group** 855 Explosion Task **Group** 855 Explosion Task **Group Group** 



## **Public Input No. 54-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. 9.5.2 [Excluding any Sub-NFPA Sections] ]**

Outdoor ESS installations shall comply with this section and as detailed in Table 9.5.2. Table 9.5.2 Outdoor Stationary ESS Installations



## **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

Toxic emissions are not adequately addressed in the current addition of 855. A NFPA 855 Task Group was formed for the evaluation of current toxic code requirements and to provide recommendations for changes to the code. Information on the generation and emission of gases is still limited. The addition of a new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions. Information will be amended based on current research on toxics.

## **Related Public Inputs for This Document**



Public Input No. 32-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] 855 Toxics Task

**Group Group** 

**Group** 



**Group** 855 Toxics Task **Group** 855 Toxics Task **Group** 855 Toxics Task Group 855 Toxics Task Group 855 Toxics Task **Group** 855 Toxics Task **Group** 855 Toxics Task **Group** 855 Toxics Task **Group Group** Group 855 Toxics Task **Group** 855 Toxics Task Group 855 Toxics Task **Group** 855 Toxics Task Group 855 Toxics Task Group 855 Toxics Task **Group** 

Public Input No. 36-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. A.4.6.11] Public Input No. 37-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. A.9.1.5.1] Public Input No. 38-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. A.9.6.5.1] Public Input No. 39-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.1.2] Public Input No. 40-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 41-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 42-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 43-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 44-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 45-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 46-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 47-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.2.3.3] Public Input No. 48-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 15.10] Public Input No. 49-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. C.4.2] Public Input No. 50-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.7.3.7.2] Public Input No. 51-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.11.5] Public Input No. 52-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.11.8.5] Public Input No. 53-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 55-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.3.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 56-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

#### **Submitter Information Verification**



#### **Committee Statement**



## **Public Input No. 82-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. 9.5.2 [Excluding any Sub-NFPA Sections] ]**

Outdoor ESS installations shall comply with this section and as detailed in Table 9.5.2. Table 9.5.2 Outdoor Stationary ESS Installations



NA: Not applicable.

\* \* Table 9.6.5 shall determine if a sub-category of electrochemical ESS must comply with this requirement. The listed reference section shall determine whether the form-factor of an ESS defined in 3.3.9 shall comply or is exempt from this requirement.

## **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

NFPA 855 Explosion Control Task Group Recommendations - As the technology Specific protection table changes with the changes in technology and batter type, the applicable code requirements for location specific application is not always clear. The specific mitigation measures are added to the tables for guidance per locations.

## **Related Public Inputs for This Document**

#### **Related Input Relationship**

Public Input No. 64-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.8] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 65-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 66-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 67-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 4.2.1.3] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 70-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.1.5.1.2] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 71-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.1.1] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 72-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.1.2] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 73-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.3] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 74-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. A.9.6.5.6.3] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 75-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.4] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 76-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.5] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 77-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.6] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 78-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.9] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 79-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.7] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 80-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.8] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 81-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 83-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.3.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 84-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.3.2.6 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 85-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.5.6.7] 855 Explosion Task Public Input No. 64-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.8] Public Input No. 65-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] Public Input No. 66-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] Public Input No. 67-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 4.2.1.3] Public Input No. 70-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.1.5.1.2] Public Input No. 71-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.1.1] Public Input No. 72-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.1.2] Public Input No. 73-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.3] Public Input No. 74-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. A.9.6.5.6.3]

Public Input No. 75-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.4] Public Input No. 76-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.5] **Group Group** Group Group Group **Group Group** Group Group **Group Group Group Group** Group Group 855 Explosion Task **Group** 855 Explosion Task Group 855 Explosion Task **Group Group** 

Public Input No. 77-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.6] Public Input No. 78-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.9] Public Input No. 79-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.7] Public Input No. 80-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.8] Public Input No. 81-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

#### **Submitter Information Verification**



#### **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** CI-105-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** The technical committee is seeking public comment on this for the Second Draft,

Information on the generation and emission of gases is still limited. A new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions. As the technology Specific protection table changes with the changes in technology and batter type, the applicable code requirements for location specific application is not always clear. The specific mitigation measures are added to the tables for guidance per locations.

Т

÷





٦



**Submittal Date:** Wed May 31 22:42:20 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA

**Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-119-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** This clarifies what is treated as a building in Section 9.3.1.2. It eliminates the size restriction for cabinet and walk-in units.






Г







## **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

Toxic emissions are not adequately addressed in the current addition of 855. A NFPA 855 Task Group was formed for the evaluation of current toxic code requirements and to provide recommendations for changes to the code. Information on the generation and emission of gases is still limited. The addition of a new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions. Information will be amended based on current research on toxics.

## **Related Public Inputs for This Document**



Public Input No. 31-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] 855 Toxics Task

Public Input No. 32-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] 855 Toxics Task

#### **Relationship**

**Group Group** 



**Group Group** 855 Toxics Task **Group** 855 Toxics Task **Group** 855 Toxics Task Group 855 Toxics Task Group 855 Toxics Task **Group** Group **Group** 855 Toxics Task Group

Public Input No. 36-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. A.4.6.11] Public Input No. 37-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. A.9.1.5.1] Public Input No. 38-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. A.9.6.5.1] Public Input No. 39-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.1.2] Public Input No. 40-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 41-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 42-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 43-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 44-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 45-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 46-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 47-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.2.3.3] Public Input No. 48-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 15.10] Public Input No. 49-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. C.4.2] Public Input No. 50-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.7.3.7.2] Public Input No. 51-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.11.5] Public Input No. 52-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.11.8.5] Public Input No. 53-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 54-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.2 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 56-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

### **Submitter Information Verification**



### **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-153-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** As the technology specific protection table changes with the changes in technology and battery type, the applicable code requirements for location specific application is not always clear. Specific mitigation measures are added to the tables for guidance per locations.

> A new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions.

# **Public Input No. 83-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. 9.5.3.1 [Excluding any Sub-NFPA Sections] ]**

Rooftop and open parking garage ESS installations shall comply with this section and as detailed in Table 9.5.3.1.



Table 9.5.3.1 Rooftop and Open Parking Garage ESS Installations

NA: Not applicable.

 $*$  Table 9.6.5 shall determine if a sub-category of electrochemical ESS must comply with this requirement. The listed reference section shall determine whether the form-factor of an ESS defined in 3.3.9 shall comply or is exempt from this requirement.

## **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

NFPA 855 Explosion Control Task Group Recommendations - As the technology Specific protection

table changes with the changes in technology and batter type, the applicable code requirements for location specific application is not always clear. The specific mitigation measures are added to the tables for guidance per locations.

# **Related Public Inputs for This Document**



## **Submitter Information Verification**



## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-153-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** As the technology specific protection table changes with the changes in technology and battery type, the applicable code requirements for location specific application is not always clear. Specific mitigation measures are added to the tables for guidance per locations.

> A new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions.





fire detectors." While thermal image detectors are technically radiant energy sensing detectors, NFPA 72 has previously limited radiant energy detectors to non-imaging flame or spark detectors (UV-IR, triple IR). The SIG-IDS TC decided to add thermal image fire detector requirements into their own section rather than rewrite the existing radiant energy detector section. In any case, as the term radiant energy detectors is used within NFPA 855, thermal imaging is the appropriate term and technology for detecting overheating energy storage systems at an early stage. There is currently a new UL STP working on a new standard for video and thermal imaging fire detectors (UL/ULC 2684) and this is scheduled to be completed prior to the next edition of NFPA 855.

## **Related Public Inputs for This Document**

Public Input No. 2-NFPA 855-2022 [Section No. 14.6.4] Public Input No. 3-NFPA 855-2022 [Section No. 14.3.2.1.2] Public Input No. 4-NFPA 855-2022 [Section No. 14.3.2.2.2] Public Input No. 5-NFPA 855-2022 [Section No. 14.3.2.4.2] Public Input No. 6-NFPA 855-2022 [Section No. 14.3.2.3.2]

#### **Related Input Relationship**















## **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Paul Hayes



## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-154-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** As the technology specific protection table changes with the changes in technology and battery type, the applicable code requirements for location specific application is not always clear. Specific mitigation measures are added to the tables for guidance per locations.



**Statement:** This revision cleans up the smoke and fire detection requirements; correlates the requirements with NFPA 72 and NFPA 70. The Section 4.8.1 moves are consistent with realignment of Chapter 4 to Chapters 9-13. New Section 9.6.1.5 (former 4.8.3) is revised due to the nature of incidents with ESS, alarm condition is needed in excess of 5 minutes found in NFPA 72. Two hours of alarm time

> allows for fire ground operations as opposed to the building evacuation time that NFPA 72 is focused on.







allows for fire ground operations as opposed to the building evacuation time that NFPA 72 is focused on.



found in NFPA 72. Two hours of alarm time

allows for fire ground operations as opposed to the building evacuation time that NFPA 72 is focused on.









**9.6.1** Smoke and Fire Detection.

Areas containing ESS systems located within buildings or structures shall be provided with a smoke detection or radiant energy–sensing system in accordance with Section 4.8 NFPA 72, unless modified by this chapter.

### **9.6.1.1 \***

Normally unoccupied, remote standalone telecommunications structures with a gross floor area of less than 1500 ft2 (139 m2) using lead-acid or nickel-cadmium battery technology shall not be required to have the detection required in 4.8.1.

#### **A.9.6.1.1**

Paragraph 9.6.1.1 aligns with 90.2(B)(4) of NFPA 70.

This requirement is intended to address small, normally unoccupied structures in remote locations, such as repeater stations, which are not adjacent to other important buildings or structures. It is not intended to apply to structures in an urban or suburban setting. The AHJ determines which structures are considered remote. The hardship of installing and maintaining smoke detection in these small, remote structures, along with heating and cooling to maintain the smoke detectors within listing specifications, is a reason for this exclusion.

See NFPA 76 for more information on fire detection for telecommunications structures.

## **9.6.1.2 \***

Lead-acid and nickel-cadmium battery systems that are used for dc power for control of substations and control or safe shutdown of generating stations under the exclusive control of the electric utility and located outdoors or in building spaces used exclusively for such installations shall be allowed to use the process control system to monitor the smoke detectors required in 4.8.1.

### **A.9.6.1.2**

Paragraph 4.8.1.2 aligns with the scope of 90.2(D)(5) of NFPA 70.

### **9.6.1.3**

All required annunciation means shall be located as required by the authority having jurisdiction to facilitate an efficient response to the situation. [72:10.18.3.2]

### **9.6.1.4 \***

Multiple panels shall be aggregated to a master or annunciator panel at a fire command center or location approved by the AHJ.

## **A.9.6.1.4**

As part of the smoke detection system's local annunciation, providing a fire alarm annunciation panel for emergency responders in an approved location where it can annunciate the ESS(s) being monitored should be considered. The location and information provided should be covered by the emergency operations plan required by 4.3.2.1 and evaluated as part of the HMA.

### **9.6.1.5 \***

Smoke and fire detection systems protecting an ESS with lithium-ion batteries shall be required to provide a secondary power supply in accordance with NFPA 72 capable of 24 hours in standby and 2 hours in alarm.

#### **A.9.6.1.5**

The HMA or deflagration evaluation study in conjunction with UL 9540A or fire and explosion test data will be used to support the requirement for additional power supply backup above and beyond NFPA 72 requirements. This requirement applies to lithiumion technologies because testing and actual events have shown that events can be several hours in duration. The additional backup will allow first responders to monitor situational conditions for longer periods of time.

#### **9.6.1.6**

Alarm signals from detection systems shall be transmitted to a supervising station in accordance with NFPA 72.

# **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

This proposal coupled with several others cleans up the smoke and fire detection requirements; correlates the requirements with NFPA 72 and NFPA 70; relocates technology specific requirements and clarifies that walk-in units are treated as indoor installations.

## **Related Public Inputs for This Document**

**Related Input Relationship** Public Input No. 257-NFPA 855-2023 [Sections 9.3.1, 9.3.2] Public Input No. 258-NFPA 855-2023 [Sections 9.5.2.3, 9.5.2.4] Public Input No. 259-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 4.8] Public Input No. 260-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 3.3.9.4] Public Input No. 257-NFPA 855-2023 [Sections 9.3.1, 9.3.2] Public Input No. 258-NFPA 855-2023 [Sections 9.5.2.3, 9.5.2.4] Public Input No. 259-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 4.8] Public Input No. 260-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 3.3.9.4] Public Input No. 261-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.1]

## **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Robert Davidson **Organization:** Davidson Code Concepts, Llc **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Wed May 31 22:26:56 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA

## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-95-NFPA 855-2023 **Statement:** This revision cleans up the smoke and fire detection requirements.


**Statement:** This revision cleans up the smoke and fire detection requirements; correlates the requirements with NFPA 72 and NFPA 70. The Section 4.8.1 moves are consistent with realignment of Chapter 4 to Chapters 9-13. New Section 9.6.1.5 (former 4.8.3) is revised due to the nature of incidents with ESS, alarm condition is needed in excess of 5 minutes found in NFPA 72. Two hours of alarm time

> allows for fire ground operations as opposed to the building evacuation time that NFPA 72 is focused on.

Г

I





# **Public Input No. 307-NFPA 855-2023 [ New Section after 9.6.2 ] 9.6.x.1** If large-scale fire and explosion installation level testing is performed and demonstrates that the suppression agent does not create a deflagration hazard the suppression system may be installed for the specific tested ESS make and model. **A.9.6.x.1** As of current knowledge, there exists no publicly accessible data that confirms the efficacy of clean agent or aerosol systems in mitigating or suppressing thermal runaway. Nevertheless, empirical evidence has demonstrated that these systems are proficient in suppressing a fire, consequently resulting in the continued generation and accumulation of combustible gases, thereby creating a deflagration hazard. Therefore, it is critical to demonstrate, through largescale experimentation, that the installation of a clean agent or aerosol suppression system does not produce or result in the accumulation of combustible gases. It also is important to note that the efficacy of any suppression system will be tied to the system design details as well as the specific cell chemistry, module, and unit configuration, thus testing for a specfic configuration may not be generally applicable. **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input** This addition makes it clear that clean agents, inert gases, and aerosol systems are specifically not allowed to be installed unless they have been tested. It has been frequent practice to install these types of systems to address non-battery fires, however they are typically not able to differentiate the conditions and thus may activate and exacerbate the situation rather than improve it. **Related Public Inputs for This Document Related Input Relationship** Public Input No. 303-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.2] Subsection Public Input No. 311-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.2] **Submitter Information Verification Submitter Full Name:** Noah Ryder **Organization:** Fire and Risk Alliance **Affiliation:** Submitted on behalf of NFPA 855 TG9 **Street Address: City: State:**

**Zip:**

**Submittal Date:** Thu Jun 01 11:45:25 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA

## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-97-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** Fire protection systems need to demonstrate that they are capable of addressing all the hazards in the protected space.

ı



ı







Г











# **Public Input No. 115-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. 9.6.4 ]**

#### **9.6.4** Fire Barriers.

Rooms or spaces containing ESS shall be separated from other areas of the building by fire barriers with a minimum 2-hour fire resistance rating and horizontal assemblies with a minimum 2-hour fire resistance rating, constructed in accordance with the local building code.

#### **9.6.4.1**

Rooms or spaces, containing only ESS listed to UL 9540 and that are marked as meeting the cell-level performance criteria of UL 9540A, shall be permitted to be separated from other areas of the building with a minimum 1-hour fire resistance rating constructed in accordance with local building codes.

#### **9.6.4. X**

Rooms or spaces, containing lead-acid or nickel-cadmium batteries, where used in a stationary standby service with 600 V dc or less, shall be permitted to be separated from other areas of the building with a minimum 1-hour fire resistance rating constructed in accordance with local building codes.

#### **9.6.4. 2**

Lead-acid and nickel cadmium battery systems that are used for dc power for control of substations and control or safe shutdown of generating stations under the exclusive control of the electric utility and located outdoors or in building spaces used exclusively for such installations shall not be required have a 2-hour fire resistance separation from the rest of the building.

#### **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

Fire codes in the past permitted a 1 hour separation between battery systems and most other occupancies. Lead-acid and nickel-cadmium batteries contain a non-flammable electrolyte present a low risk of fire spread. 9.6.4.1 relaxes the 2 hour separation for ESS listed to UL 9540, but as lead-acid and nickel-cadmium batteries are not typically listed, a separate carve out for them when used in traditional standby applications is justified.

#### **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Richard Kluge **Organization:** Ericsson **Affiliation:** ATIS **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Mon May 15 21:35:57 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA

#### **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-133-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** The revision correlates with improved fire safety of a UL 1973 listed lead-acid and Ni-Cd batteries which do not warrant higher rated fire walls..















I









# NFPA 855: Public Input Submittal for Iron-Air Updates

The following document outlines Form Energy's submission for the NFPA 855 Public Input Period. Changes to the current edition are outlined in red.

Compliance Requirement	Lead- Acid	Ni-Cd, Ni MH, Ni-Zn	Lithium- lon	<b>Flow</b>	<b>Sodium</b> <b>Nickel</b> <b>Chloride</b>	<b>Iron-Air</b>	<b>EDLC</b> Energy <b>Storage</b>	Other <b>Battery</b> <b>Tech</b>	Reference
Exhaust Ventilation	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	Yes	9.6.5.1
Spill Control	Yes <sup>1</sup>	Yes <sup>1</sup>	No	Yes	No	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	Yes	9.6.5.2
Neutralization	Yes <sup>1</sup>	Yes <sup>1</sup>	<b>No</b>	Yes	No	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	Yes	9.6.5.3
<b>Safety Caps</b>	Yes	Yes	No	No.	No	<b>Yes</b>	Yes	Yes	9.6.5.4
Thermal Runaway	Yes	Yes	Yes	No.	Yes	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	Yes	9.6.5.5
Explosion Control	Yes	Yes	Yes	No.	Yes	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	Yes	9.6.5.6

Table 9.6.5 Electrochemical ESS Technology-Specific Requirements

Rationale: Form Energy is proposing that iron-air technology be added as a separate column to Table 9.6.5 because it has safety benefits that are not currently reflected by the requirements for "other battery technologies".

Iron-air chemistry requires an aqueous caustic electrolyte therefore spill control and neutralization shall be required. The aqueous electrolyte in iron-air chemistry results in hydrogen generation as a parasitic side-reaction therefore exhaust ventilation, explosion control, and safety caps shall be required.

Thermal runaway protection for managing charging and discharging within safe operating parameters shall not be required for iron-air batteries. Operating conditions outside of normal ranges (overcharge, overdischarge, high current charge/discharge) do not result in thermal runaway for iron-air chemistry. Form Energy has test data available to present to the committee to support this claim.



855 Toxics Task

**Group** 

**Group** 

Group

**Group** 

Group

Group

**Group** 

**Group** 

**Group** 

**Group** 

**Group** 

Group

**Group** 

Group

**Group** 

**Group** 

**Group** 

**Group** 

**Group** 

**Group** 

Group

**Group** 

**Group** 





## **Submitter Information Verification**



### **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** The Technical Committee reaffirms the acceptance of TIA 23-1.







855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics Task Group



Г






Г















# **Public Input No. 144-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. 9.6.5.6 ]**

#### **9.6.5.6\*** Explosion Control.

#### **9.6.5.6.1**

Where required elsewhere in this standard, explosion prevention or deflagration venting shall be provided in accordance with this section.

#### **9.6.5.6.1.1**

Explosion prevention and deflagration venting shall not be required where approved by the AHJ based on fire and explosion testing in accordance with 9.1.5 and a deflagration hazard study demonstrating that flammable gas concentrations cannot exceed 25 percent of the LFL.

#### **9.6.5.6.1.2**

Explosion control shall not be required for the following:

- (1) Lead-acid and Ni-Cd battery systems less than 50 V ac, 60 V dc in telecommunications facilities for installations of communications equipment under the exclusive control of communications utilities located in building spaces or walk-in units used exclusively for such installations that comply with NFPA 76
- (2) Lead-acid and Ni-Cd battery systems that are and used for dc power for control of substations and control or safe shutdown of generating stations under the exclusive control of the electric utility located outdoors or in building spaces used exclusively for such installations
- (3) Lead-acid battery systems in uninterruptable power supplies listed and labeled in accordance with the application used for standby power applications, and housed in a single cabinet in a single fire area in buildings or walk-in units
- (4) Lead-acid and Ni-Cd batteries listed in accordance with UL 1973
- (5) Batteries listed in accordance with UL 1973 that do not go into thermal runaway or produce flammable gas in the UL 9540A cell level test or equivalent test

#### **9.6.5.6.2**

Protection against the release of flammable gases during normal operation shall be in accordance with 9.6.5.1.

#### **9.6.5.6.3\***

ESS installed within a room, building, ESS cabinet, ESS walk-in unit, or otherwise nonoccupiable enclosure shall be provided with one of the following:

- (1) Explosion prevention systems designed, installed, operated, maintained, and tested in accordance with NFPA 69
- (2) Deflagration venting installed and maintained in accordance with NFPA 68

#### **9.6.5.6.4\***

Where approved, ESS cabinets designed to ensure that no hazardous pressure waves, debris, shrapnel, or enclosure pieces are ejected, as validated by installation level fire and explosion testing and an engineering evaluation complying with 9.1.5 that includes the cabinet, shall be permitted in lieu of providing explosion control that complies with NFPA 68 or NFPA 69.

#### **9.6.5.6.5**

ESS enclosures and cabinets shall be designed so explosive discharge of gases or projectiles are not ejected during fire and explosion testing complying with 9.1.5 that includes the ESS enclosure and cabinets.

#### **9.6.5.6.6\***

Where ESS batteries or cabinets are installed in a container outdoors, other than a walk-in unit, the installation shall comply with one of the following:

- (1) The container shall be provided with explosion control complying with 9.6.5.6.3.
- (2) Combination of the container and cabinets shall be tested together to show compliance with 9.6.5.6.1.1.

#### **9.6.5.6.7**

Where gas detection is used to activate a combustible gas concentration reduction system and based on an appropriate NFPA 69 deflagration study, enclosures containing ESS shall be protected by an approved continuous gas detection system that complies with the following:

- (1) The gas detection system shall be designed to activate the combustible gas concentration reduction system on detection of flammable gases at no more than 10 percent of the LFL of the gas mixture or of the individual components.
- (2) The combustible gas concentration reduction system shall remain on to ensure the flammable gas does not exceed 25 percent of the LFL of the gas mixture or of the individual components.
- (3) The gas detection system and combustible gas concentration reduction system shall be provided with a minimum of 2 hours of standby power.
- (4) For lithium-ion batteries, the gas detection system shall be provided with a minimum of 24 hours of standby power and 2 hours in alarm or as required by the HMA.
- (5) The gas detection system shall annunciate the following at an approved central, proprietary, or remote station in accordance with *NFPA 72*, or at an approved constantly attended location:
	- (a) A trouble signal upon failure of the gas detection system
	- (b) An alarm signal if flammable gas concentration exceeds 10 percent of the LFL

#### **9.6.5.6.8**

Compartmentalization created by cold and hot aisle arrangements within the ESS enclosure shall be addressed in accordance with the following:

- (1) For NFPA 69 designs, the performance of ventilation systems shall be independently verified for a thermal runaway event in either aisle/subcompartment.
- (2) For NFPA 68 designs, the placement of explosion relief panels shall ensure that the explosion hazard is addressed for both hot and cold aisles/subcompartments.
- (3) The gas detection system shall be designed to activate on detection of flammable gas in either aisle/subcompartment.

#### **9.6.5.6.9**

The protection design shall demonstrate that deflagrations are not propagated to interconnected or adjacent cabinets, enclosures, or rooms.

#### **Additional Proposed Changes**

**File Name Description Approved**

855\_Log1585\_20\_2.pdf 855\_Log1585\_20\_2

#### **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

NOTE: This public input originates from Tentative Interim Amendment No. 20-2 (Log 1585) issued by the Standards Council on August 26, 2021 and per the NFPA Regs., needs to be reconsidered by the Technical Committee for the next edition of the Document.

Substantiation: NFPA 855 Chapter 4.12 listed only rooms building and walk in units under the requirements for explosion control. At the time of the first addition of NFPA 855 it was not evident that the changes in the industry to smaller containers would require the term "cabinets" be included for this chapter and be explicitly stated. The exclusion of "cabinets" in chapter 4.12 has had unintended consequences. It has led to the perception of some in the industry that ESS cabinets do not require explosion control. Some in the industry have assumed that since ESS cabinets were not include in the description they most be exclude. Use of this "loophole" can lead to what the TC would consider an unsafe installation. This TIA is submitted so that minimum levels of safety are required for all installations and to eliminate the unstated exception. In order to correct this exclusion, we are recommending "cabinets" be explicitly stated in chapter 4.12. It was also determined that language should be added to address pressure waves, shrapnel, and container pieces. Additional guidance is added to the annex for clarification.

Emergency Nature: The proposed TIA intends to correct a previously unknown existing hazard.

During the development of NFPA 855 the potential for a deflagration, nor the severity of the event, involving the gases created by a thermal runaway occurrence within an Energy Storage System Cabinet was not recognized. The potential size of ESS cabinets as they exist today was not envisioned either. Based on thermal runaway events and the results of large-scale fire burn testing the potential for a deflagration and the severe dangers presented to workers and emergency responders is clearly recognized. Though the deflagration hazard is now widely known, there are manufacturers and installers that assert that deflagration protection is not required for cabinets because NFPA 855 and fire codes do not specifically call for the hazard to be addressed. This TIA is intended to address this issue by adding a requirement that the potential deflagration hazard associated with ESS cabinets be analyzed and mitigated for ESS installations regulated by NFPA 855.

#### **Submitter Information Verification**



#### **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-109-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** The Technical Committee reaffirms the acceptance of TIA 20-2

This revision:

1) clarifies the exempt report requirements and adds standards as a condition of , and clarifies the application to ESS walk-in units and ESS cabinets It eliminates the reference to UL 1973 as a qualifier since it does not prevent the hazard.

2) For A9.6.5.6: Explosion control has never been an issue with lead-acid or nickelcadmium batteries. If ventilation requirements as outlined in 9.6.1 are ignored, then a possible explosive situation could develop over time. However, requiring specific explosion control or deflagration equipment is not necessary.

3) For 9.6.5.6.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

4) For 9.6.5.6.1.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

5) For 9.6.5.6.1.2: Uninterruptable was corrected as a typo. item 4 was deleted with better clarification of Item 5. This adds clarifying conditions that support the exclusion of selected technologies by identifying the standards of IEEE 1635 and ASHRAE 21. It makes the conditions of exception more stringent. Safe is removed as it is not defined.

6) For 9.6.5.6.13: The standard does not identify how the gas composition and volume of a thermal runaway event is to be determined for the purpose of use in and NFPA 68 or NFPA 69 solution.

7) For 9.6.5.6.3: This change removes multiple area designations as they just cause confusion especially as technologies change. The requirement is simplified to apply to all ESS. The option for NFPA 68 compliance is removed as for large scale gas deflagrations, they have not shown to be effective at mitigating the pressure release.

8) For A.9.6.5.6.3: Removal of NFPA 68 as in option in 9.6.5.6.3 requires additional clarification and modification in the annex. Information was added that still allows NFPA 68 as a supplementary option to NFPA 69 solutions.

9) For 9.6.5.6.4: The adds the new defined term of registered designed professional. NFPA 68 is not viable as a standalone option. These requirements are reversed so that the design and testing per 9.1.5 comes first, and based on that the AHJ could approve forgoing NFPA 69.

10) For 9.6.5.6.5: An explosion of a "box in a box" was edited to clarify and explain this concept.

11) For 9.6.5.6.6: This section is no longer needed with edits in prior sections. Explosion requirements for a box in a box have been updated.

12) For 9.6.5.6.7: Clarity has been added for standby power tied to the new Section 4.10. and for locations that a failed condition must be annunciated for first responder protection. Additional sections were added for the survivability evaluation of the NFPA 69 system; interaction requirements between suppression system; and NFPA 69 system and inspection requirements.

13) For 9.6.5.6.8: NFPA 68 and explosion panels are not a viable option for explosion mitigation in duct work and HVAC system internal to a BESS which creates a box in a box type deflagration.



**Tentative Interim Amendment** 

## **NFPA® 855**

## **Standard for the Installation of Stationary Energy Storage Systems**

### 2020 Edition

**Reference:** Section 4.12, A.4.12 and A.4.12.1 **TIA 20-2** (SC 21-8-37 / TIA Log #1585)

Pursuant to Section 5 of the NFPA Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards, the National Fire Protection Association has issued the following Tentative Interim Amendment to NFPA 855, Standard for the Installation of Stationary Energy Storage Systems, 2020 edition. The TIA was processed by the Technical Committee on Energy Storage Systems, and was issued by the Standards Council on August 26, 2021, with an effective date of September 15, 2021.

#### 1. Revise Section 4.12 to read as follows:

4.12\* Explosion Control. Where required elsewhere in this standard, explosion prevention or deflagration venting shall be provided in accordance with this section.

4.12.1\* ESS installed within a room, building, ESS cabinet, or ESS walk-in unit shall be provided with one of the following:

(1) Explosion prevention systems designed, installed, operated, maintained, and tested in accordance with NFPA 69. (2) Deflagration venting installed and maintained in accordance with NFPA 68.

4.12.2.1.1 Explosion prevention and deflagration venting shall not be required where approved by the AHJ based on large-scale fire testing in accordance with 4.1.5 and a deflagration hazard study that demonstrates that flammable gas concentrations in the room, building, ESS cabinet, or ESS walk-in unit cannot exceed 25 percent of the LFL-in-locations where the gas is likely to accumulate.

4.12.1.2 Where approved, ESS cabinets that have been designed to ensure no hazardous pressure waves, debris, shrapnel, or enclosure pieces are ejected, as validated by installation level large-scale testing and engineering evaluation complying with 4.1.5 that includes the cabinet, shall be permitted in lieu of providing explosion control complying with NFPA 68 or **NFPA 69.** 

#### 2. Revise Annexes A.4.12 and A.4.12.1 to read as follows:

A.4.12 During failure conditions such as thermal runaway, fire, and abnormal faults, some ESS, in particular electrochemical batteries and capacitors, begin off-gassing flammable and toxic gases, which can include mixtures of CO, H<sub>2</sub>, ethylene, methane, benzene, HF, HCl, and HCN. Among other things, these gases present an explosion hazard that needs to be mitigated. Explosion control is provided to mitigate this hazard.

Both the exhaust ventilation requirements of Section 4.9 and the explosion control requirements of Section 4.12 are designed to mitigate hazards associated with the release of flammable gases in battery rooms, ESS cabinets, and ESS walk-in units. The difference is that exhaust ventilation is intended to provide protection for flammable gases released during normal charging and discharging of battery systems since some electrochemical ESS technologies such as vented lead-acid batteries release hydrogen when charging.

In comparison, the Section 4.12 provisions are designed to provide protection for electrochemical ESS during an abnormal condition, such as thermal runaway, which can be instigated by physical damage, overcharging, short circuiting, and overheating of technologies such as lithium-ion batteries, which incidentally do not release detectable amounts of flammable gas during normal charging and discharging, but which can release significant quantities of flammable gas during a thermal event.

A.4.12.1 This requirement targets rooms, buildings, and walk in units, not ESS in cabinets installed indoors or outdoors or in open parking garages. This requirement recognizes that some cabinet designs with low internal volume, the application of NFPA 68 or NFPA 69 might not be practical. It is possible that a quantitative explosion analysis is necessary to show there is no threat to life and safety. As an example, the cabinet design might be installed such that any overpressure due to ignition of gases and vapors released from cells in thermal runaway within the enclosure are released to the exterior of the enclosure. There should be no uncontrolled release of overpressure of the enclosure. All debris, shrapnel, or pieces of the enclosure ejected from the system should be controlled. The UL 9540A unit level and installation level test identified in 4.1.5 will provide the test data referenced in this section, which is necessary for verification of the adequacy of the engineered deflagration safety of the cabinet.

NFPA 68 applies to the design, location, installation, maintenance, and use of devices and systems that vent the combustion gases and pressures resulting from a deflagration within an enclosure so that structural and mechanical damage is minimized, and provides criteria for design, installation, and maintenance of deflagration vents and associated components. NFPA 68 does not apply to detonations. Hydrogen accumulation in a confined space can lead to a detonation. For that reason, the combustion gases generated during the cell, module and installation level testing under UL 9540A must be utilized in applying a NFPA 68 solution. Where the likelihood for detonation exists, alternative solutions, such as those in NFPA 69.

NFPA 69 applies to the design, installation, operation, maintenance, and testing of systems for the prevention of explosions in enclosures that contain flammable concentrations of flammable gases, vapors, mists, dusts, or hybrid mixtures by means of the following methods:

- (1) Control of oxidant concentration
- (2) Control of combustible concentration
- (3) Pre-deflagration detection and control of ignition sources
- (4) Explosion suppression
- (5) Active isolation
- (6) Passive isolation
- (7) Deflagration pressure contaminent
- (8) Passive explosion suppression

Due to possible accumulation of flammable gases during abnormal conditions for lithium-ion batteries, combustible gas concentration reduction can be a viable mitigation strategy. Gas detection and appropriate interlocks can be used based on appropriate evaluation under a NFPA 69 deflagration hazard study. NFPA 69 allows concentration to exceed 25 percent LFL, but not more than 60 percent with reliable gas detection and exhaust interlocks as demonstrated by a safety integrity level (SIL 2) instrumented safety system rating.

Data on flammable gas composition and release rates, such as that included in UL 9540A large-scale fire testing, provide the information needed to design effective explosion control systems.

Issue Date: August 26, 2021

Effective Date: September 15, 2021

(Note: For further information on NFPA Codes and Standards, please see www.nfpa.org/docinfo) Copyright © 2021 All Rights Reserved NATIONAL FIRE PROTECTION ASSOCIATION

## **Public Input No. 253-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. 9.6.5.6 ]**

#### **9.6.5.6\*** Explosion Control.

#### **9.6.5.6.1**

Where required elsewhere in this standard, explosion prevention or deflagration venting shall be provided in accordance with this section.

#### **9.6.5.6.1.1**

Explosion prevention and deflagration venting shall not be required where approved by the AHJ based on fire and explosion testing in accordance with 9.1.5 and a deflagration hazard study demonstrating that flammable gas concentrations cannot exceed accumulate exceeding 25 percent of the LFL. LFL in any area of a cabinet or area of a room the ESS is located within has been submitted to the AHJ for review and approval..

#### **9.6.5.6.1.2**

Explosion control shall not be required for the following:

- (1) Lead-acid and Ni-Cd battery systems less than 50 V ac, 60 V dc in telecommunications facilities for installations of communications equipment under the exclusive control of communications utilities located in building spaces or walk-in units used exclusively for such installations that comply with NFPA 76
- (2) Lead-acid and Ni-Cd battery systems that are and used for dc power for control of substations and control or safe shutdown of generating stations under the exclusive control of the electric utility located outdoors or in building spaces used exclusively for such installations installations that follow the guidelines of IEEE 1635/ASHRAE 21
- (3) Lead-acid battery systems in uninterruptable power supplies listed and labeled in accordance with the application used for standby power applications, and housed in a single cabinet in a single fire area in buildings or walk-in units
- (4) Lead-acid and Ni-Cd batteries listed in accordance with UL 1973 Batteries listed in accordance with UL 1973
- (5) units that follow the guidelines of IEEE 1635/ASHRAE 21
- (6) Batteries that do not go into thermal runaway or produce flammable gas in the UL 9540A cell level test or equivalent test

#### **9.6.5.6.2**

Protection against the release of flammable gases during normal operation shall be in accordance with 9.6.5.1.

#### **9.6.5.6.3\***

ESS installed within a room, building, ESS cabinet, ESS walk-in unit, or otherwise nonoccupiable enclosure shall be provided with one of the following:

- (1) Explosion prevention systems designed, installed, operated, maintained, and tested in accordance with NFPA 69
- (2) Deflagration venting installed and maintained in accordance with NFPA 68

#### **9.6.5.6.4\***

Where approved, ESS cabinets designed to ensure that no hazardous pressure waves, debris, shrapnel, or enclosure pieces are ejected, as validated by installation level fire and explosion testing and an engineering evaluation complying with 9.1.5 that includes the cabinet, shall be permitted in lieu of providing explosion control that complies with NFPA 68 or NFPA 69.

#### **9.6.5.6.5**

ESS enclosures walk-in units and ESS cabinets shall be designed so explosive discharge of gases or projectiles are not ejected during fire and explosion testing complying with 9.1.5 that includes the ESS enclosure and cabinets.

#### **9.6.5.6.6\***

Where ESS batteries walk-in units or ESS cabinets are installed in within a container outdoors , other than a walk-in unit, or within a room or building space the installation shall comply with one both of the following:

- (1) The container ESS walk-in unit or ESS cabinet shall be provided with explosion control complying with 9.6.5.6.3.
- (2) Combination of the container and cabinets shall be tested together to show compliance with The Room or container they are installed within shall be provided with explosion control complying with  $9.6.5.61 3.1$ .

#### **9.6.5.6.7**

Where gas detection is used to activate a combustible gas concentration reduction system and based on an appropriate NFPA 69 deflagration study, enclosures containing ESS shall be protected by an approved continuous gas detection system that complies with the following:

- (1) The gas detection system shall be designed to activate the combustible gas concentration reduction system on detection of flammable gases at no more than 10 percent of the LFL of the gas mixture or of the individual components.
- (2) The combustible gas concentration reduction system shall remain on to ensure the flammable gas does not exceed 25 percent of the LFL of the gas mixture or of the individual components.
- (3) The gas detection system and combustible gas concentration reduction system shall be provided with a minimum of 2 hours of standby power system shall be installed in accordance with NFPA 72 .
- (4) For lithium-ion batteries, the combustible gas detection reduction system shall be provided with a minimum of 24 hours of standby power and 2 hours in alarm or as required emergency power for the duration of time a potential deflagration hazard would exist should an uncontrolled thermal runaway event occur as documented by the HMA.
- (5) The gas detection system shall annunciate the following at an approved central, proprietary, or remote station in accordance with *NFPA 72* , or at an approved constantly attended location:
	- (6) A trouble signal upon failure of the gas detection system
	- (7) An alarm signal if flammable gas concentration exceeds 10 percent of the LFL

annunciation means shall be located as required by the authority having jurisdiction to facilitate an efficient response to the situation and alarm signals shall be transmitted to a supervising station in accordance with NFPA 72:

#### **9.6.5.6.8**

Compartmentalization created by cold and hot aisle arrangements within the ESS enclosure walk-in unit or ESS cabinet shall be addressed in accordance with the following:

- (1) For NFPA 69 designs, the performance of ventilation systems shall be independently verified for a thermal runaway event in either aisle/subcompartment.
- (2) For NFPA 68 designs, the placement of explosion relief panels shall ensure that the explosion hazard is addressed for both hot and cold aisles/subcompartments.
- (3) The gas detection system shall be designed to activate on detection of flammable gas in either aisle/subcompartment.

#### **9.6.5.6.9**

The protection design shall demonstrate that deflagrations are not propagated to interconnected or adjacent cabinets, enclosures, or rooms.

#### **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

The proposed change clarifies the exempt report requirements, adds standards as a condition of Section 9.6.5.6.1.2 exemptions #2 and #3; Eliminates the reference to UL 1973 as a qualifier since the it does not prevent the hazard; clarifies the application to ESS walk-in units and ESS cabinets; eliminates a conflict with NFPA 72 regarding back up power supply for gas detection systems; addresses the duration time for emergency power for concentration reduction systems.

#### **Submitter Information Verification**



#### **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-109-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** The Technical Committee reaffirms the acceptance of TIA 20-2

This revision:

1) clarifies the exempt report requirements and adds standards as a condition of , and clarifies the application to ESS walk-in units and ESS cabinets It eliminates the reference to UL 1973 as a qualifier since it does not prevent the hazard.

2) For A9.6.5.6: Explosion control has never been an issue with lead-acid or nickelcadmium batteries. If ventilation requirements as outlined in 9.6.1 are ignored, then a possible explosive situation could develop over time. However, requiring specific explosion control or deflagration equipment is not necessary.

3) For 9.6.5.6.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

4) For 9.6.5.6.1.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

5) For 9.6.5.6.1.2: Uninterruptable was corrected as a typo. item 4 was deleted with better clarification of Item 5. This adds clarifying conditions that support the exclusion of selected technologies by identifying the standards of IEEE 1635 and ASHRAE 21. It makes the conditions of exception more stringent. Safe is removed as it is not defined.

6) For 9.6.5.6.13: The standard does not identify how the gas composition and volume of a thermal runaway event is to be determined for the purpose of use in and NFPA 68 or NFPA 69 solution.

7) For 9.6.5.6.3: This change removes multiple area designations as they just cause

confusion especially as technologies change. The requirement is simplified to apply to all ESS. The option for NFPA 68 compliance is removed as for large scale gas deflagrations, they have not shown to be effective at mitigating the pressure release.

8) For A.9.6.5.6.3: Removal of NFPA 68 as in option in 9.6.5.6.3 requires additional clarification and modification in the annex. Information was added that still allows NFPA 68 as a supplementary option to NFPA 69 solutions.

9) For 9.6.5.6.4: The adds the new defined term of registered designed professional. NFPA 68 is not viable as a standalone option. These requirements are reversed so that the design and testing per 9.1.5 comes first, and based on that the AHJ could approve forgoing NFPA 69.

10) For 9.6.5.6.5: An explosion of a "box in a box" was edited to clarify and explain this concept.

11) For 9.6.5.6.6: This section is no longer needed with edits in prior sections. Explosion requirements for a box in a box have been updated.

12) For 9.6.5.6.7: Clarity has been added for standby power tied to the new Section 4.10. and for locations that a failed condition must be annunciated for first responder protection. Additional sections were added for the survivability evaluation of the NFPA 69 system; interaction requirements between suppression system; and NFPA 69 system and inspection requirements.

13) For 9.6.5.6.8: NFPA 68 and explosion panels are not a viable option for explosion mitigation in duct work and HVAC system internal to a BESS which creates a box in a box type deflagration.



6) For 9.6.5.6.13: The standard does not identify how the gas composition and volume of a thermal runaway event is to be determined for the purpose of use in and NFPA 68 or NFPA 69 solution.

7) For 9.6.5.6.3: This change removes multiple area designations as they just cause confusion especially as technologies change. The requirement is simplified to apply to all ESS. The option for NFPA 68 compliance is removed as for large scale gas deflagrations, they have not shown to be effective at mitigating the pressure release.

8) For A.9.6.5.6.3: Removal of NFPA 68 as in option in 9.6.5.6.3 requires additional clarification and modification in the annex. Information was added that still allows NFPA 68 as a supplementary option to NFPA 69 solutions.

9) For 9.6.5.6.4: The adds the new defined term of registered designed professional. NFPA 68 is not viable as a standalone option. These requirements are reversed so that the design and testing per 9.1.5 comes first, and based on that the AHJ could approve forgoing NFPA 69.

10) For 9.6.5.6.5: An explosion of a "box in a box" was edited to clarify and explain this concept.

11) For 9.6.5.6.6: This section is no longer needed with edits in prior sections. Explosion requirements for a box in a box have been updated.

12) For 9.6.5.6.7: Clarity has been added for standby power tied to the new Section 4.10. and for locations that a failed condition must be annunciated for first responder protection. Additional sections were added for the survivability evaluation of the NFPA 69 system; interaction requirements between suppression system; and NFPA 69 system and inspection requirements.

13) For 9.6.5.6.8: NFPA 68 and explosion panels are not a viable option for explosion mitigation in duct work and HVAC system internal to a BESS which creates a box in a box type deflagration.



5) For 9.6.5.6.1.2: Uninterruptable was corrected as a typo. item 4 was deleted with better clarification of Item 5. This adds clarifying conditions that support the exclusion of selected technologies by identifying the standards of IEEE 1635 and ASHRAE 21. It makes the conditions of exception more stringent. Safe is removed as it is not defined.

6) For 9.6.5.6.13: The standard does not identify how the gas composition and volume of a thermal runaway event is to be determined for the purpose of use in and NFPA 68 or NFPA 69 solution.

7) For 9.6.5.6.3: This change removes multiple area designations as they just cause confusion especially as technologies change. The requirement is simplified to apply to all ESS. The option for NFPA 68 compliance is removed as for large scale gas deflagrations, they have not shown to be effective at mitigating the pressure release.

8) For A.9.6.5.6.3: Removal of NFPA 68 as in option in 9.6.5.6.3 requires additional clarification and modification in the annex. Information was added that still allows NFPA 68 as a supplementary option to NFPA 69 solutions.

9) For 9.6.5.6.4: The adds the new defined term of registered designed professional. NFPA 68 is not viable as a standalone option. These requirements are reversed so that the design and testing per 9.1.5 comes first, and based on that the AHJ could approve forgoing NFPA 69.

10) For 9.6.5.6.5: An explosion of a "box in a box" was edited to clarify and explain this concept.

11) For 9.6.5.6.6: This section is no longer needed with edits in prior sections. Explosion requirements for a box in a box have been updated.

12) For 9.6.5.6.7: Clarity has been added for standby power tied to the new Section 4.10. and for locations that a failed condition must be annunciated for first responder protection. Additional sections were added for the survivability evaluation of the NFPA 69 system; interaction requirements between suppression system; and NFPA 69 system and inspection requirements.

13) For 9.6.5.6.8: NFPA 68 and explosion panels are not a viable option for explosion mitigation in duct work and HVAC system internal to a BESS which creates a box in a box type deflagration.





**Statement:** The Technical Committee reaffirms the acceptance of TIA 20-2

to UL 1973 as a qualifier since it does not prevent the hazard.

**Group** 55 Explosion Task **Group** 55 Explosion Task **Group** 55 Explosion Task **Group** 

**Resolution:** FR-109-NFPA 855-2023

This revision:

2) For A9.6.5.6: Explosion control has never been an issue with lead-acid or nickelcadmium batteries. If ventilation requirements as outlined in 9.6.1 are ignored, then a possible explosive situation could develop over time. However, requiring specific explosion control or deflagration equipment is not necessary.

3) For 9.6.5.6.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

4) For 9.6.5.6.1.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

5) For 9.6.5.6.1.2: Uninterruptable was corrected as a typo. item 4 was deleted with better clarification of Item 5. This adds clarifying conditions that support the exclusion of selected technologies by identifying the standards of IEEE 1635 and ASHRAE 21. It makes the conditions of exception more stringent. Safe is removed as it is not defined.

6) For 9.6.5.6.13: The standard does not identify how the gas composition and volume of a thermal runaway event is to be determined for the purpose of use in and NFPA 68 or NFPA 69 solution.

7) For 9.6.5.6.3: This change removes multiple area designations as they just cause confusion especially as technologies change. The requirement is simplified to apply to all ESS. The option for NFPA 68 compliance is removed as for large scale gas deflagrations, they have not shown to be effective at mitigating the pressure release.

8) For A.9.6.5.6.3: Removal of NFPA 68 as in option in 9.6.5.6.3 requires additional clarification and modification in the annex. Information was added that still allows NFPA 68 as a supplementary option to NFPA 69 solutions.

9) For 9.6.5.6.4: The adds the new defined term of registered designed professional. NFPA 68 is not viable as a standalone option. These requirements are reversed so that the design and testing per 9.1.5 comes first, and based on that the AHJ could approve forgoing NFPA 69.

10) For 9.6.5.6.5: An explosion of a "box in a box" was edited to clarify and explain this concept.

11) For 9.6.5.6.6: This section is no longer needed with edits in prior sections. Explosion requirements for a box in a box have been updated.

12) For 9.6.5.6.7: Clarity has been added for standby power tied to the new Section 4.10. and for locations that a failed condition must be annunciated for first responder protection. Additional sections were added for the survivability evaluation of the NFPA 69 system; interaction requirements between suppression system; and NFPA 69 system and inspection requirements.

13) For 9.6.5.6.8: NFPA 68 and explosion panels are not a viable option for explosion mitigation in duct work and HVAC system internal to a BESS which creates a box in a box type deflagration.



#### **Statement:** The Technical Committee reaffirms the acceptance of TIA 20-2

This revision:

1) clarifies the exempt report requirements and adds standards as a condition of , and clarifies the application to ESS walk-in units and ESS cabinets It eliminates the reference to UL 1973 as a qualifier since it does not prevent the hazard.

2) For A9.6.5.6: Explosion control has never been an issue with lead-acid or nickelcadmium batteries. If ventilation requirements as outlined in 9.6.1 are ignored, then a possible explosive situation could develop over time. However, requiring specific explosion control or deflagration equipment is not necessary.

3) For 9.6.5.6.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

4) For 9.6.5.6.1.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

5) For 9.6.5.6.1.2: Uninterruptable was corrected as a typo. item 4 was deleted with better clarification of Item 5. This adds clarifying conditions that support the exclusion of selected technologies by identifying the standards of IEEE 1635 and ASHRAE 21. It makes the conditions of exception more stringent. Safe is removed as it is not defined.

6) For 9.6.5.6.13: The standard does not identify how the gas composition and volume of a thermal runaway event is to be determined for the purpose of use in and NFPA 68 or NFPA 69 solution.

7) For 9.6.5.6.3: This change removes multiple area designations as they just cause confusion especially as technologies change. The requirement is simplified to apply to all ESS. The option for NFPA 68 compliance is removed as for large scale gas deflagrations, they have not shown to be effective at mitigating the pressure release.

8) For A.9.6.5.6.3: Removal of NFPA 68 as in option in 9.6.5.6.3 requires additional clarification and modification in the annex. Information was added that still allows NFPA 68 as a supplementary option to NFPA 69 solutions.

9) For 9.6.5.6.4: The adds the new defined term of registered designed professional. NFPA 68 is not viable as a standalone option. These requirements are reversed so that the design and testing per 9.1.5 comes first, and based on that the AHJ could approve forgoing NFPA 69.

10) For 9.6.5.6.5: An explosion of a "box in a box" was edited to clarify and explain this concept.

11) For 9.6.5.6.6: This section is no longer needed with edits in prior sections. Explosion requirements for a box in a box have been updated.

12) For 9.6.5.6.7: Clarity has been added for standby power tied to the new Section 4.10. and for locations that a failed condition must be annunciated for first responder protection. Additional sections were added for the survivability evaluation of the NFPA 69 system; interaction requirements between suppression system; and NFPA 69 system and inspection requirements.

13) For 9.6.5.6.8: NFPA 68 and explosion panels are not a viable option for explosion mitigation in duct work and HVAC system internal to a BESS which creates a box in a box type deflagration.

any BESS configuration.

Г



2) For A9.6.5.6: Explosion control has never been an issue with lead-acid or nickelcadmium batteries. If ventilation requirements as outlined in 9.6.1 are ignored, then a possible explosive situation could develop over time. However, requiring specific explosion control or deflagration equipment is not necessary.

3) For 9.6.5.6.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

4) For 9.6.5.6.1.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

5) For 9.6.5.6.1.2: Uninterruptable was corrected as a typo. item 4 was deleted with better clarification of Item 5. This adds clarifying conditions that support the exclusion of selected technologies by identifying the standards of IEEE 1635 and ASHRAE 21. It makes the conditions of exception more stringent. Safe is removed as it is not defined.

6) For 9.6.5.6.13: The standard does not identify how the gas composition and volume of a thermal runaway event is to be determined for the purpose of use in and NFPA 68 or NFPA 69 solution.

7) For 9.6.5.6.3: This change removes multiple area designations as they just cause confusion especially as technologies change. The requirement is simplified to apply to all ESS. The option for NFPA 68 compliance is removed as for large scale gas deflagrations, they have not shown to be effective at mitigating the pressure release.

8) For A.9.6.5.6.3: Removal of NFPA 68 as in option in 9.6.5.6.3 requires additional clarification and modification in the annex. Information was added that still allows NFPA 68 as a supplementary option to NFPA 69 solutions.

9) For 9.6.5.6.4: The adds the new defined term of registered designed professional. NFPA 68 is not viable as a standalone option. These requirements are reversed so that the design and testing per 9.1.5 comes first, and based on that the AHJ could approve forgoing NFPA 69.

10) For 9.6.5.6.5: An explosion of a "box in a box" was edited to clarify and explain this concept.

11) For 9.6.5.6.6: This section is no longer needed with edits in prior sections. Explosion requirements for a box in a box have been updated.

12) For 9.6.5.6.7: Clarity has been added for standby power tied to the new Section 4.10. and for locations that a failed condition must be annunciated for first responder protection. Additional sections were added for the survivability evaluation of the NFPA 69 system; interaction requirements between suppression system; and NFPA 69 system and inspection requirements.

13) For 9.6.5.6.8: NFPA 68 and explosion panels are not a viable option for explosion mitigation in duct work and HVAC system internal to a BESS which creates a box in a box type deflagration.

Г





### **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Paul Hayes **Organization:** The Hiller Companies/American **Affiliation:** none **Street Address: City: State:**

855 Explosion Task **Group** 



inspection requirements.

13) For 9.6.5.6.8: NFPA 68 and explosion panels are not a viable option for explosion mitigation in duct work and HVAC system internal to a BESS which creates a box in a box type deflagration.






This revision:

1) clarifies the exempt report requirements and adds standards as a condition of , and

clarifies the application to ESS walk-in units and ESS cabinets It eliminates the reference to UL 1973 as a qualifier since it does not prevent the hazard.

2) For A9.6.5.6: Explosion control has never been an issue with lead-acid or nickelcadmium batteries. If ventilation requirements as outlined in 9.6.1 are ignored, then a possible explosive situation could develop over time. However, requiring specific explosion control or deflagration equipment is not necessary.

3) For 9.6.5.6.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

4) For 9.6.5.6.1.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

5) For 9.6.5.6.1.2: Uninterruptable was corrected as a typo. item 4 was deleted with better clarification of Item 5. This adds clarifying conditions that support the exclusion of selected technologies by identifying the standards of IEEE 1635 and ASHRAE 21. It makes the conditions of exception more stringent. Safe is removed as it is not defined.

6) For 9.6.5.6.13: The standard does not identify how the gas composition and volume of a thermal runaway event is to be determined for the purpose of use in and NFPA 68 or NFPA 69 solution.

7) For 9.6.5.6.3: This change removes multiple area designations as they just cause confusion especially as technologies change. The requirement is simplified to apply to all ESS. The option for NFPA 68 compliance is removed as for large scale gas deflagrations, they have not shown to be effective at mitigating the pressure release.

8) For A.9.6.5.6.3: Removal of NFPA 68 as in option in 9.6.5.6.3 requires additional clarification and modification in the annex. Information was added that still allows NFPA 68 as a supplementary option to NFPA 69 solutions.

9) For 9.6.5.6.4: The adds the new defined term of registered designed professional. NFPA 68 is not viable as a standalone option. These requirements are reversed so that the design and testing per 9.1.5 comes first, and based on that the AHJ could approve forgoing NFPA 69.

10) For 9.6.5.6.5: An explosion of a "box in a box" was edited to clarify and explain this concept.

11) For 9.6.5.6.6: This section is no longer needed with edits in prior sections. Explosion requirements for a box in a box have been updated.

12) For 9.6.5.6.7: Clarity has been added for standby power tied to the new Section 4.10. and for locations that a failed condition must be annunciated for first responder protection. Additional sections were added for the survivability evaluation of the NFPA 69 system; interaction requirements between suppression system; and NFPA 69 system and inspection requirements.

13) For 9.6.5.6.8: NFPA 68 and explosion panels are not a viable option for explosion mitigation in duct work and HVAC system internal to a BESS which creates a box in a box type deflagration.





## 855 Explosion Task Group 855 Explosion Task Group 855 Explosion Task Group 855 Explosion Task Group

# **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-109-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** The Technical Committee reaffirms the acceptance of TIA 20-2

This revision:

1) clarifies the exempt report requirements and adds standards as a condition of , and clarifies the application to ESS walk-in units and ESS cabinets It eliminates the reference to UL 1973 as a qualifier since it does not prevent the hazard.

2) For A9.6.5.6: Explosion control has never been an issue with lead-acid or nickelcadmium batteries. If ventilation requirements as outlined in 9.6.1 are ignored, then a possible explosive situation could develop over time. However, requiring specific explosion control or deflagration equipment is not necessary.

3) For 9.6.5.6.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

4) For 9.6.5.6.1.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

5) For 9.6.5.6.1.2: Uninterruptable was corrected as a typo. item 4 was deleted with better clarification of Item 5. This adds clarifying conditions that support the exclusion of selected technologies by identifying the standards of IEEE 1635 and ASHRAE 21. It makes the conditions of exception more stringent. Safe is removed as it is not defined.

6) For 9.6.5.6.13: The standard does not identify how the gas composition and volume of a thermal runaway event is to be determined for the purpose of use in and NFPA 68 or NFPA 69 solution.

7) For 9.6.5.6.3: This change removes multiple area designations as they just cause confusion especially as technologies change. The requirement is simplified to apply to all ESS. The option for NFPA 68 compliance is removed as for large scale gas deflagrations, they have not shown to be effective at mitigating the pressure release.

8) For A.9.6.5.6.3: Removal of NFPA 68 as in option in 9.6.5.6.3 requires additional clarification and modification in the annex. Information was added that still allows NFPA 68 as a supplementary option to NFPA 69 solutions.

9) For 9.6.5.6.4: The adds the new defined term of registered designed professional. NFPA 68 is not viable as a standalone option. These requirements are reversed so that the design and testing per 9.1.5 comes first, and based on that the AHJ could approve forgoing NFPA 69.

10) For 9.6.5.6.5: An explosion of a "box in a box" was edited to clarify and explain this concept.

11) For 9.6.5.6.6: This section is no longer needed with edits in prior sections. Explosion requirements for a box in a box have been updated.

12) For 9.6.5.6.7: Clarity has been added for standby power tied to the new Section 4.10. and for locations that a failed condition must be annunciated for first responder protection. Additional sections were added for the survivability evaluation of the NFPA 69 system; interaction requirements between suppression system; and NFPA 69 system and inspection requirements.

13) For 9.6.5.6.8: NFPA 68 and explosion panels are not a viable option for explosion mitigation in duct work and HVAC system internal to a BESS which creates a box in a box type deflagration.



explosion control or deflagration equipment is not necessary.

3) For 9.6.5.6.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

4) For 9.6.5.6.1.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

5) For 9.6.5.6.1.2: Uninterruptable was corrected as a typo. item 4 was deleted with better clarification of Item 5. This adds clarifying conditions that support the exclusion of selected technologies by identifying the standards of IEEE 1635 and ASHRAE 21. It makes the conditions of exception more stringent. Safe is removed as it is not defined.

6) For 9.6.5.6.13: The standard does not identify how the gas composition and volume of a thermal runaway event is to be determined for the purpose of use in and NFPA 68 or NFPA 69 solution.

7) For 9.6.5.6.3: This change removes multiple area designations as they just cause confusion especially as technologies change. The requirement is simplified to apply to all ESS. The option for NFPA 68 compliance is removed as for large scale gas deflagrations, they have not shown to be effective at mitigating the pressure release.

8) For A.9.6.5.6.3: Removal of NFPA 68 as in option in 9.6.5.6.3 requires additional clarification and modification in the annex. Information was added that still allows NFPA 68 as a supplementary option to NFPA 69 solutions.

9) For 9.6.5.6.4: The adds the new defined term of registered designed professional. NFPA 68 is not viable as a standalone option. These requirements are reversed so that the design and testing per 9.1.5 comes first, and based on that the AHJ could approve forgoing NFPA 69.

10) For 9.6.5.6.5: An explosion of a "box in a box" was edited to clarify and explain this concept.

11) For 9.6.5.6.6: This section is no longer needed with edits in prior sections. Explosion requirements for a box in a box have been updated.

12) For 9.6.5.6.7: Clarity has been added for standby power tied to the new Section 4.10. and for locations that a failed condition must be annunciated for first responder protection. Additional sections were added for the survivability evaluation of the NFPA 69 system; interaction requirements between suppression system; and NFPA 69 system and inspection requirements.

13) For 9.6.5.6.8: NFPA 68 and explosion panels are not a viable option for explosion mitigation in duct work and HVAC system internal to a BESS which creates a box in a box type deflagration.





to UL 1973 as a qualifier since it does not prevent the hazard.

1) clarifies the exempt report requirements and adds standards as a condition of , and clarifies the application to ESS walk-in units and ESS cabinets It eliminates the reference

55 Explosion Task roup 55 Explosion Task roup 55 Explosion Task roup 55 Explosion Task roup

**Resolution:** FR-109-NFPA 855-2023

This revision:

2) For A9.6.5.6: Explosion control has never been an issue with lead-acid or nickelcadmium batteries. If ventilation requirements as outlined in 9.6.1 are ignored, then a possible explosive situation could develop over time. However, requiring specific explosion control or deflagration equipment is not necessary.

3) For 9.6.5.6.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

4) For 9.6.5.6.1.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

5) For 9.6.5.6.1.2: Uninterruptable was corrected as a typo. item 4 was deleted with better clarification of Item 5. This adds clarifying conditions that support the exclusion of selected technologies by identifying the standards of IEEE 1635 and ASHRAE 21. It makes the conditions of exception more stringent. Safe is removed as it is not defined.

6) For 9.6.5.6.13: The standard does not identify how the gas composition and volume of a thermal runaway event is to be determined for the purpose of use in and NFPA 68 or NFPA 69 solution.

7) For 9.6.5.6.3: This change removes multiple area designations as they just cause confusion especially as technologies change. The requirement is simplified to apply to all ESS. The option for NFPA 68 compliance is removed as for large scale gas deflagrations, they have not shown to be effective at mitigating the pressure release.

8) For A.9.6.5.6.3: Removal of NFPA 68 as in option in 9.6.5.6.3 requires additional clarification and modification in the annex. Information was added that still allows NFPA 68 as a supplementary option to NFPA 69 solutions.

9) For 9.6.5.6.4: The adds the new defined term of registered designed professional. NFPA 68 is not viable as a standalone option. These requirements are reversed so that the design and testing per 9.1.5 comes first, and based on that the AHJ could approve forgoing NFPA 69.

10) For 9.6.5.6.5: An explosion of a "box in a box" was edited to clarify and explain this concept.

11) For 9.6.5.6.6: This section is no longer needed with edits in prior sections. Explosion requirements for a box in a box have been updated.

12) For 9.6.5.6.7: Clarity has been added for standby power tied to the new Section 4.10. and for locations that a failed condition must be annunciated for first responder protection. Additional sections were added for the survivability evaluation of the NFPA 69 system; interaction requirements between suppression system; and NFPA 69 system and inspection requirements.

13) For 9.6.5.6.8: NFPA 68 and explosion panels are not a viable option for explosion mitigation in duct work and HVAC system internal to a BESS which creates a box in a box type deflagration.







### 55 Explosion Task roup 55 Explosion Task roup 55 Explosion Task roup 55 Explosion Task roup

55 Explosion Task roup

**Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-109-NFPA 855-2023

**Committee:** ESS-AAA

**Statement:** The Technical Committee reaffirms the acceptance of TIA 20-2

This revision:

1) clarifies the exempt report requirements and adds standards as a condition of , and

clarifies the application to ESS walk-in units and ESS cabinets It eliminates the reference to UL 1973 as a qualifier since it does not prevent the hazard.

2) For A9.6.5.6: Explosion control has never been an issue with lead-acid or nickelcadmium batteries. If ventilation requirements as outlined in 9.6.1 are ignored, then a possible explosive situation could develop over time. However, requiring specific explosion control or deflagration equipment is not necessary.

3) For 9.6.5.6.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

4) For 9.6.5.6.1.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

5) For 9.6.5.6.1.2: Uninterruptable was corrected as a typo. item 4 was deleted with better clarification of Item 5. This adds clarifying conditions that support the exclusion of selected technologies by identifying the standards of IEEE 1635 and ASHRAE 21. It makes the conditions of exception more stringent. Safe is removed as it is not defined.

6) For 9.6.5.6.13: The standard does not identify how the gas composition and volume of a thermal runaway event is to be determined for the purpose of use in and NFPA 68 or NFPA 69 solution.

7) For 9.6.5.6.3: This change removes multiple area designations as they just cause confusion especially as technologies change. The requirement is simplified to apply to all ESS. The option for NFPA 68 compliance is removed as for large scale gas deflagrations, they have not shown to be effective at mitigating the pressure release.

8) For A.9.6.5.6.3: Removal of NFPA 68 as in option in 9.6.5.6.3 requires additional clarification and modification in the annex. Information was added that still allows NFPA 68 as a supplementary option to NFPA 69 solutions.

9) For 9.6.5.6.4: The adds the new defined term of registered designed professional. NFPA 68 is not viable as a standalone option. These requirements are reversed so that the design and testing per 9.1.5 comes first, and based on that the AHJ could approve forgoing NFPA 69.

10) For 9.6.5.6.5: An explosion of a "box in a box" was edited to clarify and explain this concept.

11) For 9.6.5.6.6: This section is no longer needed with edits in prior sections. Explosion requirements for a box in a box have been updated.

12) For 9.6.5.6.7: Clarity has been added for standby power tied to the new Section 4.10. and for locations that a failed condition must be annunciated for first responder protection. Additional sections were added for the survivability evaluation of the NFPA 69 system; interaction requirements between suppression system; and NFPA 69 system and inspection requirements.

13) For 9.6.5.6.8: NFPA 68 and explosion panels are not a viable option for explosion mitigation in duct work and HVAC system internal to a BESS which creates a box in a box type deflagration.



**State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Fri Apr 28 09:54:15 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA

# **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** This is covered in the new Section 4.10.



This revision:

1) clarifies the exempt report requirements and adds standards as a condition of , and clarifies the application to ESS walk-in units and ESS cabinets It eliminates the reference to UL 1973 as a qualifier since it does not prevent the hazard.

2) For A9.6.5.6: Explosion control has never been an issue with lead-acid or nickelcadmium batteries. If ventilation requirements as outlined in 9.6.1 are ignored, then a possible explosive situation could develop over time. However, requiring specific explosion control or deflagration equipment is not necessary.

3) For 9.6.5.6.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

4) For 9.6.5.6.1.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

5) For 9.6.5.6.1.2: Uninterruptable was corrected as a typo. item 4 was deleted with better clarification of Item 5. This adds clarifying conditions that support the exclusion of selected technologies by identifying the standards of IEEE 1635 and ASHRAE 21. It makes the conditions of exception more stringent. Safe is removed as it is not defined.

6) For 9.6.5.6.13: The standard does not identify how the gas composition and volume of a thermal runaway event is to be determined for the purpose of use in and NFPA 68 or NFPA 69 solution.

7) For 9.6.5.6.3: This change removes multiple area designations as they just cause confusion especially as technologies change. The requirement is simplified to apply to all ESS. The option for NFPA 68 compliance is removed as for large scale gas deflagrations, they have not shown to be effective at mitigating the pressure release.

8) For A.9.6.5.6.3: Removal of NFPA 68 as in option in 9.6.5.6.3 requires additional clarification and modification in the annex. Information was added that still allows NFPA 68 as a supplementary option to NFPA 69 solutions.

9) For 9.6.5.6.4: The adds the new defined term of registered designed professional. NFPA 68 is not viable as a standalone option. These requirements are reversed so that the design and testing per 9.1.5 comes first, and based on that the AHJ could approve forgoing NFPA 69.

10) For 9.6.5.6.5: An explosion of a "box in a box" was edited to clarify and explain this concept.

11) For 9.6.5.6.6: This section is no longer needed with edits in prior sections. Explosion requirements for a box in a box have been updated.

12) For 9.6.5.6.7: Clarity has been added for standby power tied to the new Section 4.10. and for locations that a failed condition must be annunciated for first responder protection. Additional sections were added for the survivability evaluation of the NFPA 69 system; interaction requirements between suppression system; and NFPA 69 system and inspection requirements.

13) For 9.6.5.6.8: NFPA 68 and explosion panels are not a viable option for explosion mitigation in duct work and HVAC system internal to a BESS which creates a box in a box type deflagration.

any BESS configuration.



This revision:

1) clarifies the exempt report requirements and adds standards as a condition of , and clarifies the application to ESS walk-in units and ESS cabinets It eliminates the reference to UL 1973 as a qualifier since it does not prevent the hazard.

2) For A9.6.5.6: Explosion control has never been an issue with lead-acid or nickelcadmium batteries. If ventilation requirements as outlined in 9.6.1 are ignored, then a possible explosive situation could develop over time. However, requiring specific explosion control or deflagration equipment is not necessary.

3) For 9.6.5.6.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

4) For 9.6.5.6.1.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

5) For 9.6.5.6.1.2: Uninterruptable was corrected as a typo. item 4 was deleted with better clarification of Item 5. This adds clarifying conditions that support the exclusion of selected technologies by identifying the standards of IEEE 1635 and ASHRAE 21. It makes the conditions of exception more stringent. Safe is removed as it is not defined.

6) For 9.6.5.6.13: The standard does not identify how the gas composition and volume of a thermal runaway event is to be determined for the purpose of use in and NFPA 68 or NFPA 69 solution.

7) For 9.6.5.6.3: This change removes multiple area designations as they just cause confusion especially as technologies change. The requirement is simplified to apply to all ESS. The option for NFPA 68 compliance is removed as for large scale gas deflagrations, they have not shown to be effective at mitigating the pressure release.

8) For A.9.6.5.6.3: Removal of NFPA 68 as in option in 9.6.5.6.3 requires additional clarification and modification in the annex. Information was added that still allows NFPA 68 as a supplementary option to NFPA 69 solutions.

9) For 9.6.5.6.4: The adds the new defined term of registered designed professional. NFPA 68 is not viable as a standalone option. These requirements are reversed so that the design and testing per 9.1.5 comes first, and based on that the AHJ could approve forgoing NFPA 69.

10) For 9.6.5.6.5: An explosion of a "box in a box" was edited to clarify and explain this concept.

11) For 9.6.5.6.6: This section is no longer needed with edits in prior sections. Explosion requirements for a box in a box have been updated.

12) For 9.6.5.6.7: Clarity has been added for standby power tied to the new Section 4.10. and for locations that a failed condition must be annunciated for first responder protection. Additional sections were added for the survivability evaluation of the NFPA 69 system; interaction requirements between suppression system; and NFPA 69 system and inspection requirements.

13) For 9.6.5.6.8: NFPA 68 and explosion panels are not a viable option for explosion mitigation in duct work and HVAC system internal to a BESS which creates a box in a box type deflagration.

any BESS configuration.





# **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Paul Hayes **Organization:** The Hiller Companies/American

855 Explosion Task Group 855 Explosion Task **Group** 855 Explosion Task **Group** 855 Explosion Task **Group** 855 Explosion Task **Group** 855 Explosion Task Group 855 Explosion Task Group 855 Explosion Task Group 855 Explosion Task **Group** 



requirements for a box in a box have been updated.

12) For 9.6.5.6.7: Clarity has been added for standby power tied to the new Section 4.10. and for locations that a failed condition must be annunciated for first responder protection. Additional sections were added for the survivability evaluation of the NFPA 69 system; interaction requirements between suppression system; and NFPA 69 system and inspection requirements.

13) For 9.6.5.6.8: NFPA 68 and explosion panels are not a viable option for explosion mitigation in duct work and HVAC system internal to a BESS which creates a box in a box type deflagration.



855 Explosion Task

855 Explosion Task

855 Explosion Task

855 Explosion Task

**Group** 

**Group** 

**Group** 

**Group** 

**Group** 

**Group** 

Public Input No. 79-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.7] 855 Explosion Task Public Input No. 81-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 82-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.2 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 83-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.3.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 84-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.3.2.6 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 85-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.5.6.7] 855 Explosion Task Public Input No. 64-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.8] Public Input No. 65-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] Public Input No. 66-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] Public Input No. 67-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 4.2.1.3] Public Input No. 70-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.1.5.1.2] Public Input No. 71-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.1.1] Public Input No. 72-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.1.2] Public Input No. 73-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.3] Public Input No. 74-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. A.9.6.5.6.3] Public Input No. 75-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.4] Public Input No. 76-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.5] Public Input No. 77-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.6] Public Input No. 78-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.9] Public Input No. 79-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.7] Public Input No. 81-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 82-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.2 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

# **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Paul Hayes **Organization:** The Hiller Companies/American **Affiliation:** none **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Thu Apr 27 17:03:03 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA

# **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-109-NFPA 855-2023

This revision:

1) clarifies the exempt report requirements and adds standards as a condition of , and clarifies the application to ESS walk-in units and ESS cabinets It eliminates the reference to UL 1973 as a qualifier since it does not prevent the hazard.

2) For A9.6.5.6: Explosion control has never been an issue with lead-acid or nickelcadmium batteries. If ventilation requirements as outlined in 9.6.1 are ignored, then a possible explosive situation could develop over time. However, requiring specific explosion control or deflagration equipment is not necessary.

3) For 9.6.5.6.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

4) For 9.6.5.6.1.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

5) For 9.6.5.6.1.2: Uninterruptable was corrected as a typo. item 4 was deleted with better clarification of Item 5. This adds clarifying conditions that support the exclusion of selected technologies by identifying the standards of IEEE 1635 and ASHRAE 21. It makes the conditions of exception more stringent. Safe is removed as it is not defined.

6) For 9.6.5.6.13: The standard does not identify how the gas composition and volume of a thermal runaway event is to be determined for the purpose of use in and NFPA 68 or NFPA 69 solution.

7) For 9.6.5.6.3: This change removes multiple area designations as they just cause confusion especially as technologies change. The requirement is simplified to apply to all ESS. The option for NFPA 68 compliance is removed as for large scale gas deflagrations, they have not shown to be effective at mitigating the pressure release.

8) For A.9.6.5.6.3: Removal of NFPA 68 as in option in 9.6.5.6.3 requires additional clarification and modification in the annex. Information was added that still allows NFPA 68 as a supplementary option to NFPA 69 solutions.

9) For 9.6.5.6.4: The adds the new defined term of registered designed professional. NFPA 68 is not viable as a standalone option. These requirements are reversed so that the design and testing per 9.1.5 comes first, and based on that the AHJ could approve forgoing NFPA 69.

10) For 9.6.5.6.5: An explosion of a "box in a box" was edited to clarify and explain this concept.

11) For 9.6.5.6.6: This section is no longer needed with edits in prior sections. Explosion requirements for a box in a box have been updated.

12) For 9.6.5.6.7: Clarity has been added for standby power tied to the new Section 4.10. and for locations that a failed condition must be annunciated for first responder protection. Additional sections were added for the survivability evaluation of the NFPA 69 system; interaction requirements between suppression system; and NFPA 69 system and inspection requirements.

13) For 9.6.5.6.8: NFPA 68 and explosion panels are not a viable option for explosion mitigation in duct work and HVAC system internal to a BESS which creates a box in a box type deflagration.

any BESS configuration.



855 Explosion Task

855 Explosion Task

855 Explosion Task

**Group** 

**Group** 

**Group** 



# **Submitter Information Verification**



## **Committee Statement**



This revision:

1) clarifies the exempt report requirements and adds standards as a condition of , and clarifies the application to ESS walk-in units and ESS cabinets It eliminates the reference to UL 1973 as a qualifier since it does not prevent the hazard.

2) For A9.6.5.6: Explosion control has never been an issue with lead-acid or nickel-

cadmium batteries. If ventilation requirements as outlined in 9.6.1 are ignored, then a possible explosive situation could develop over time. However, requiring specific explosion control or deflagration equipment is not necessary.

3) For 9.6.5.6.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

4) For 9.6.5.6.1.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

5) For 9.6.5.6.1.2: Uninterruptable was corrected as a typo. item 4 was deleted with better clarification of Item 5. This adds clarifying conditions that support the exclusion of selected technologies by identifying the standards of IEEE 1635 and ASHRAE 21. It makes the conditions of exception more stringent. Safe is removed as it is not defined.

6) For 9.6.5.6.13: The standard does not identify how the gas composition and volume of a thermal runaway event is to be determined for the purpose of use in and NFPA 68 or NFPA 69 solution.

7) For 9.6.5.6.3: This change removes multiple area designations as they just cause confusion especially as technologies change. The requirement is simplified to apply to all ESS. The option for NFPA 68 compliance is removed as for large scale gas deflagrations, they have not shown to be effective at mitigating the pressure release.

8) For A.9.6.5.6.3: Removal of NFPA 68 as in option in 9.6.5.6.3 requires additional clarification and modification in the annex. Information was added that still allows NFPA 68 as a supplementary option to NFPA 69 solutions.

9) For 9.6.5.6.4: The adds the new defined term of registered designed professional. NFPA 68 is not viable as a standalone option. These requirements are reversed so that the design and testing per 9.1.5 comes first, and based on that the AHJ could approve forgoing NFPA 69.

10) For 9.6.5.6.5: An explosion of a "box in a box" was edited to clarify and explain this concept.

11) For 9.6.5.6.6: This section is no longer needed with edits in prior sections. Explosion requirements for a box in a box have been updated.

12) For 9.6.5.6.7: Clarity has been added for standby power tied to the new Section 4.10. and for locations that a failed condition must be annunciated for first responder protection. Additional sections were added for the survivability evaluation of the NFPA 69 system; interaction requirements between suppression system; and NFPA 69 system and inspection requirements.

13) For 9.6.5.6.8: NFPA 68 and explosion panels are not a viable option for explosion mitigation in duct work and HVAC system internal to a BESS which creates a box in a box type deflagration.

# **Public Input No. 40-NFPA 855-2023 [ New Section after 9.6.6.2.5 ]**

#### **9.6.7\*** Abnormal Toxic and highly toxic emission detection

**Where required elsewhere** in this standard, detection and protection shall be provided for toxic and highly toxic emission during abnormal charging or thermal runaway in accordance with this section.

#### **A.9.6.7**

**During failure conditions such as thermal runaway, fire, and abnormal faults, some ESS, in particular electrochemical baƩeries and capacitors, begin producing toxic and highly toxic emissions, which can include mixtures of CO, H 2 , ethylene, methane, benzene, HF, HCl, sulfur dioxide, NO, NO ₂ , ammonia, hydrogen sulfide, arsine, sƟbine, formaldehyde, metal oxides, heavy metals, and HCN, etc. Among other things, these emissions can present a health hazard that needs to be addressed. Toxic** emissions almost always necessitate the use of SCBA (and possibly additional PPE) for anyone getting **near a baƩery fire. At a bare minimum, sensing for toxic gases expected from the failure of the** particular type of ESS should be done with permanent or portable equipment before entering the area without SCBA. Toxic emissions from the battery failure also necessitate the use of appropriate **PPE during cleanup later on after first response. [PH1]** 

**[PH1] Move to separate chapter on toxic abnormal**

## **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

Toxic emissions are not adequately addressed in the current addition of 855. A NFPA 855 Task Group was formed for the evaluation of current toxic code requirements and to provide recommendations for changes to the code. Information on the generation and emission of gases is still limited. The addition of a new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions. Information will be amended based on current research on toxics.

## **Related Public Inputs for This Document**



#### **Relationship**

group group group group group 855 Toxics task group group group







## **Submitter Information Verification**



## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** CI-106-NFPA 855-2023 **Statement:** The technical committee is seeking public comment on this for the Second Draft,

> Information on the generation and emission of gases is still limited. A new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions.
# **Public Input No. 41-NFPA 855-2023 [ New Section after 9.6.6.2.5 ] 9.6.7.1 Protection against the release of toxic and highly toxic gas emission during normal operation shall be in accordance with 4.6.11 . Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input** Toxic emissions are not adequately addressed in the current addition of 855. A NFPA 855 Task Group was formed for the evaluation of current toxic code requirements and to provide recommendations for changes to the code. Information on the generation and emission of gases is still limited. The addition of a new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions. Information will be amended based on current research on toxics. **Related Public Inputs for This Document Related Input Relationship** Public Input No. 31-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] 855 Toxics task group Public Input No. 32-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] 855 Toxics task group Public Input No. 33-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] 855 Toxics task group Public Input No. 34-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] 855 Toxics task group Public Input No. 35-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 4.6.11] 855 Toxics task group Public Input No. 42-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] 855 Toxics task group Public Input No. 43-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] 855 Toxics task group Public Input No. 44-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] 855 Toxics task group Public Input No. 45-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] 855 Toxics task group Public Input No. 46-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] 855 Toxics task group Public Input No. 47-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.2.3.3] 855 Toxics task group Public Input No. 48-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 15.10] 855 Toxics task group Public Input No. 49-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. C.4.2] 855 Toxics task group Public Input No. 50-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.7.3.7.2] 855 Toxics task group Public Input No. 51-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.11.5] 855 Toxics task group







Public Input No. 32-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] 855 Toxics task

group group

group

group

Public Input No. 33-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] 855 Toxics task Public Input No. 34-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] 855 Toxics task Public Input No. 35-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 4.6.11] 855 Toxics task Public Input No. 43-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] 855 Toxics task Public Input No. 44-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] 855 Toxics task Public Input No. 45-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] 855 Toxics task Public Input No. 46-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] 855 Toxics task Public Input No. 47-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.2.3.3] 855 Toxics task Public Input No. 48-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 15.10] 855 Toxics task Public Input No. 49-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. C.4.2] 855 Toxics task Public Input No. 50-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.7.3.7.2] 855 Toxics task Public Input No. 51-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.11.5] 855 Toxics task Public Input No. 52-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.11.8.5] 855 Toxics task Public Input No. 53-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 54-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.2 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 55-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.3.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 56-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 40-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] 855 Toxics task Public Input No. 41-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] 855 Toxics task Public Input No. 36-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. A.4.6.11] 855 Toxics task Public Input No. 37-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. A.9.1.5.1] 855 Toxics task Public Input No. 38-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. A.9.6.5.1] 855 Toxics task Public Input No. 39-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.1.2] 855 Toxics task Public Input No. 31-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] Public Input No. 32-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] Public Input No. 33-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] Public Input No. 34-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27]

Public Input No. 35-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 4.6.11]

group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group group group group group group group



## **Submitter Information Verification**



**Statement:** The technical committee is seeking public comment on this for the Second Draft,

Information on the generation and emission of gases is still limited. A new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions.



#### **9.6.7.3\***

**The test report shall be accompanied by a supplemental report prepared by a registered design professional with experƟse in fire protecƟon engineering that provides interpretaƟon of the test data in relaƟon to the installaƟon requirements for the ESS**

#### **A.9.6.7.3**

**It is recommended that the effects of toxic emissions are considered where there are significant exposures to nearby populations. Plume models can be used to determine potential consequences for scenarios of interest. Plume models should be selected based on appropriate scenarios derived from experimental data. Model outputs must be presented in a way that they can be used to efficiently address the hazards of concern (i.e., toxicity and flammability).**

## **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

Toxic emissions are not adequately addressed in the current addition of 855. A NFPA 855 Task Group was formed for the evaluation of current toxic code requirements and to provide recommendations for changes to the code. Information on the generation and emission of gases is still limited. The addition of a new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions. Information will be amended based on current research on toxics.

## **Related Public Inputs for This Document**



#### **Relationship**

group group group group group group group group group group



group group group group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group group group group group group group group

Public Input No. 51-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.11.5] Public Input No. 52-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.11.8.5] Public Input No. 53-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 54-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.2 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 55-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.3.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 56-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

# **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Paul Hayes



## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** CI-106-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** The technical committee is seeking public comment on this for the Second Draft,

Information on the generation and emission of gases is still limited. A new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions.



#### **9.6.7.4\***

**toxic and highly toxic emission detection shall not be required based on fire and explosion testing in accordance with 9.1.5 and a plume study demonstraƟng that toxic and highly toxic emission concentraƟons cannot exceed 25% IDLH.**

## **A.9.6.7.4**

## **About Plume Models:**

**Plume modeling is performed to determine the dispersion extents of flammable and toxic vent gases** or products of combustion. Plume models may be required by a utility, customer or AHJ to provide **informaƟon about possible consequences of a release of material. Plume models may be used to understand potenƟal first responder exposures, inform emergency response planning and/or provide informaƟon about potenƟal environmental consequences. Plume models can inform** minimum approach distance (MAD) and safe staging area locations.

## **Plume Modeling Methodology:**

A plume model will provide information on possible events based on possible incidents and weather conditions. Since incidents may have unique failures and occur in varied weather conditions, plume **studies do not determine the precise outcome of a specific event.**

**Modeling should be performed using accepted plume modeling tools or computational fluid** dynamics models, and should evaluate the impact of wind and environmental conditions on the **results.**

#### **Source Term:**

The selection of scenarios should be based on the most likely failure conditions as well as the

highest consequence failure conditions that are reasonably expected to occur. The model

should consider dispersion created by a forced ventilation system that may be installed for NFPA **69 purposes. Source term modeling should take into account the temperature of the gases and** the heat release rate of a fire. Depending on expected failure conditions, separate plume models **may need to be created to consider fire and non-fire conditions. Plume modeling should include something similar to a probable worst‐case scenario, which can be used for emergency planning.**

## **Weather Conditions**

Plume model results depend on weather conditions at the time of release. Plume models should use reasonable worst-case weather conditions based on historical weather conditions at the site. Alternatively worst case conditions of wind at 10m at 1.5 m/s and class F stability may be used.

## **Plume Model Outputs:**

**The modeling should clearly show the extent of any hazardous exposures under varying wind** conditions and identify any potential consequences extending outside project boundaries. For **toxicity, the model output should provide the toxic gas components (or an equivalent toxic gas** mixture) in ppm as function of distance from the source and time. For flammability, the model output should provide the flammable gas mixture in percent of LFL as function of distance from the source and time. Cloud shapes may be plotted for fixed values of toxic concentration and flammable concentration to identify hazardous areas and areas where ignition source control may be needed, respectively. Appropriate elevations shall be selected for model output given the objective of the analysis. For example, providing gas concentrations at 6-feet elevation may be appropriate when evaluating first responder safety whereas ground level concentrations may be appropriate for **environmental assessments.**

## **First responder use of plume studies:**

A plume study can be great information for first responders. Similar to structure fire size-up to "read the smoke", the plume and hazards related to the battery event will help identify the level of hazard

**on initial arrival. A worst case most probable scenario provides a starting point for monitoring and** consideration for protective action. Ideally, the design basis failure should not require protective actions for the public located beyond the property line of the facility unless with prior approval by the AHJ. When the AHJ approves release levels that may require protective actions based on the design basis plume study, an Annex shall be added to the regional emergency operating plan to address this **hazard.**

MonitoringThe plume model will help first responders identify starting points for immediate and **follow‐up monitoring. First responders should monitor for CO, LFL, and HF at a minimum. CO is most** common and easier to detect airborne effluents. As battery chemistry changes the toxic material may **change but CO and LFL should be monitored in all cases.**

**Minimum Approach Distance**

**Plume models may be used to inform the MAD to be used for emergency incidents. The MAD should** be at a distance at which the concentrations generated by the plume are not expected to exceed IDLH or AEGL-2 values for 60 minute exposure. If the incident is expected to last a long time, then the concentration could be based on longer time period exposures and the distance may be increased.

# **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

Toxic emissions are not adequately addressed in the current addition of 855. A NFPA 855 Task Group was formed for the evaluation of current toxic code requirements and to provide recommendations for changes to the code. Information on the generation and emission of gases is still limited. The addition of a new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions. Information will be amended based on current research on toxics.

## **Related Public Inputs for This Document**



**Relationship** group group

855 Toxics task

855 Toxics task

855 Toxics task

855 Toxics task

group





# **Submitter Information Verification**



## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** CI-106-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** The technical committee is seeking public comment on this for the Second Draft,

Information on the generation and emission of gases is still limited. A new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions.

Г

I



855 Toxics task

group





Г





group group group group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group group



# **Submitter Information Verification**



## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** CI-106-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** The technical committee is seeking public comment on this for the Second Draft,

Information on the generation and emission of gases is still limited. A new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions.









FESS installations shall comply with the requirements of Chapters 4 through 8, except as specified in Table 13.2.

Table 13.2 FESS Technology-Specific Requirements





# **Additional Proposed Changes**



## **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

Substantiation: The table, in its current form, is not clear as to whether the referenced sections apply or not. It is difficult to know without further explanation. The submitted revised table is intended to make the table easier to interpret. Table 16-2 has been used as a template and its format has been applied to table 13.2 to help with clarity. Note: where the original entry in Table 13.2 for the "Chapter 13 Modifications" column indicates "N/A" only, the entry in the "Applicable Chapter Reference" column has interpreted as not applicable.

## **Submitter Information Verification**









I



vibration in the design of the flywheel mounting so that they do not create stress on the bearings.



standard.










Substantiation (13.4.2): The AHJ may not be qualified for these activities, so it is recommended to change "AHJ" to "operator". Also, revise the wording to make the confirmation conditional because not all flywheels run in a vacuum.

# **Submitter Information Verification**



# **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-33-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** For 13.4.1, it is often not practical to monitor or check bearing wear. Condition monitoring in this case means that there is a system or procedure in place for routine surveillance of bearing related FESS measurements and messages. Also, the wording was revised to be more general because bearings may be made from other than mechanical technologies such as magnetic or air bearings.

> For 13.4.1, the AHJ may not be qualified for these activities, so "AHJ" was changed to "operator".

Existing A.13.4 was moved to match the corresponding Section 13.4.1.





14.2 - Collection Locations.

### $[AB5]$

**14.2 <b>14.4** Prevention and Mitigation.

A fire safety plan that provides for the prevention of fire incidents and includes emergency response actions to be taken upon detection of a fire or possible fire involving lithium-ion or lithium metal **battery storage early detection mitigation measures** shall be provided to the AHJ for review and **approval.**

## **A** 14.2 14.4 Prevention and Mitigation.

The fire safety plan should be comprehensive and provide details on the following: locations of the battery storage including a map of each location within the facility; the types of batteries being stored in each location; the maximum quantity (Wh and mass) that may be stored in each location; **the building or supplemental fire protection measures in place; the maximum permitted battery** State of Charge for the location based on the intended usage; as well as information on fire **department access and emergency response procedures. The plan should also include appropriate emergency contact information for the owners/operators of the storage facility as well as subject** matter experts that the fire service can get in contact with. Prevention and mitigation of incidents is primarily accomplished by limiting the quantity of LIB stored (fuel load), proximity to ignition sources, and provision of appropriate fire detection and suppression systems.

## **14.2.1**

Battery storage areas shall be at least 5 ft (1.5 m) from the structure, other combustibles, exits and exit pathways, and fire areas or separated by a listed fire rated separation unless **otherwise modified by this chapter.**

### **14.2.1.1**

Spacing may be reduced based on large-scale fire testing accompanied by an **engineering report that has demonstrated that these requirements may be reduced.**

### **14.2.2**

**BaƩeries shall be stored at a state of charge below 30% [nr6] unless otherwise modified by this chapter.**

14.3 Collection.

**All areas located indoors in any occupancy where**

**used lithium**

**used lithium metal or lithium‐**

### **ion batteries**

**ion batteries are collected from employees or the public** 

### **shall comply with**

**shall comply with 14.**

**2**

```
3 .1
```
**through**

 **through 14.**

```
2
3 .3 .
14.
2
3 .1 *
Individual
containers shall
containers shall  not
exceed 7
exceed 7 .5 ft \frac{3}{2} (0.21 m \frac{3}{2}) in
size each
size each , with an aggregate limit of 15 ft \frac{3}{2} (0.42 m \frac{3}{2}).
A. 14.
2
3 .
2 
Containers shall comply
1  
Batteries have been safely collected in one or two 55 gal (208 L) drums (or similarly sized bins or
containers) for decades without any significant fire or life safety events.
14.3.2 
Containers shall comply  with all of the following:
         (1)  Have a minimum of 3 Ō (0.9 m) of open space from other baƩery collecƟon containers
         and combusƟble materials
         (2) Be located a minimum of 5 ft (1.5 m) from exits from the room, space, or building
        (3) Be open-top and noncombustible or approved for battery collection use
14.2.3
Where combustible
         (4) Where c ombusƟble [AB7] materials are located within the space between
         collection containers, the containers shall be spaced a minimum 10 ft (3 m) apart
.Batteries stored indoors shall be stored in accordance with one or more of the methods
provided for in
         [AB8]
14.
3 Indoor Storage Locations
4 Indoor Storage .
```
**14. 3 4 . 1** General. **14.3.1.1 2.1 Manufacturing – Electrode and Cell Fabrication Batteries shall be permitted to be stored in rooms or spaces complying with 14.3.2.1 through .1 and 14.3.2. 1.3 . 14. 4 . 2.1.1 Limit storage areas to no greater than 200 sq.ft. 14. 4.2.2.2 Limit storage height to no greater than 6 ft. 14.4.2.2. 3 .1.2 Battery terminals shall be protected either through battery design methods or a protective packaging method to prevent short-circuit of the battery.** 14.3.2 - Storage Methods. **14.3.2.1** Rooms or Spaces. **Batteries shall be permitted to be stored in rooms or spaces complying with 14.3.2.1.1 and 14.3.2.1.3 . 14.3.2.1.1 The rooms or spaces shall be separated from the remainder of the building areas by fire barriers with a 2-hour fire resistance rating and with horizontal assemblies with a 2-hour fire resistance rating constructed in accordance with the local building code.**

# **14.3.2.1.2**

# **The rooms**

**Separate multiple storage areas be aisles not less than 10 ft wide.**

# **14.4.2.2.4**

**Limit state of charge to less than or equal to 60% (based on max use voltage).**

# **14.4.2.2.5**

**The rooms or spaces shall be provided with a fire alarm system activated by detection devices installed in accordance with** *NFPA 72* **.**

# **14.4.2.2.6**

**The basis of design for an automatic sprinkler system or other listed suppression system shall be based on full-scale fire testing.** 

**14.4.2.2 Manufacturing – Formation/Cell Finishing**

# **A.14.4.2.2**

**The primary stages of lithium ion battery manufacturing are electrode manufacturing, cell production, and cell finishing. Each stage of manufacturing consists of numerous sub-processes. Of the primary stages of lithium ion battery manufacturing, the greatest risk of fire and explosion is present in cell finishing (e.g., charge/discharge, formation, and aging). During this final stage cell electrochemistry activation occurs. During cell finishing the batteries are stored uncartoned in large rooms with racking for days and weeks at a time. This racking requires specialized fire protection to prevent thermal runaway events from spreading to adjacent materials and spaces. The specific details of the storage configuration, packaging, and battery all impact the fire hazard and protection strategies should be evaluated independently. Battery details to consider include chemistry, format, electrical capacity and state-of-charge).**

# **14.4.2.2.1**

The rooms or spaces shall be provided with a fire alarm system activated by an air-aspirating smoke **detector system or a radiant-energy detection system with occupant notification** approved detection **devices installed in accordance with**  *NFPA 72* **.**

# **14.4.2.2.2**

**The rooms or spaces shall be provided with an automatic sprinkler system designed and installed in accordance with NFPA 13. The basis of design for an automaƟc sprinkler system or other approved** suppression system shall be based on full-scale fire testing.

# **14.4.2.2.3**

Sprinklers used for protection of lithium ion batteries shall be listed for storage.

# **14.4.2.2.4 (** *NFPA 13 2022 extract from 24.1.6* **)**

**A series of large‐scale fire tests involving challenging test scenarios that address the range of** variables associated with the intended application of the sprinkler shall be conducted to evaluate the ability of the sprinkler to protect storage fire risks that are representative of those described in the manufacturer's installation and design parameter instructions and referenced in the listing.

**14.4.2.2.5 (** *NFPA 13 2022 extract 24.1.7* **)**

The manufacturer's installation and design parameter instructions for these sprinklers shall specify in a standardized manner the end-use limitations and sprinkler system design criteria including at least **the following:**

- **(1) Commodity or commodiƟes to be protected**
- **(2) Storage arrangements allowed**
- **(3) Installation guidelines including obstruction and ceiling construction limitations**
- **(4) Maximum ceiling and storage heights with associated minimum operating pressures and number of sprinklers required to be included in the hydraulic calculation**
- **(5) Hose stream allowance and duraƟon**

**14.4.2.2.6 (** *NFPA 13 2022 extract 24.1.8* **)**

**The number of sprinklers to be used in the sprinkler system design shall be based on the worst‐case result obtained from the full‐scale fire test series increased by a minimum 50 percent.**

# **14.4.2.3 Storage ‐ General**

# **A14.4.2.3**

**Batteries in bulk warehouse storage, whether or not integrated into battery containing devices, will typically be packaged according the transportation requirements. Very few large scale fire tests have** been conducted to evaluate storage of lithium-ion batteries in bulk storage. The specific details of the storage configuration, packaging, and battery all impact the fire hazard and protection strategies should be evaluated independently. Battery details to consider include chemistry, format, electrical **capacity and state‐of‐charge).**

# **14.4.2.3.1**

**The rooms or spaces shall be provided with a fire alarm system activated by an air-aspirating smoke** 

**detector system**

**or a**

**or a radiant-energy detection** 

**system with occupant notification**

**system with occupant noƟficaƟon approved detecƟon devices installed in accordance**

**with**

**with**  *NFPA 72* **.**

**14.**



```
containers complying with  14.3.2.2.1
and
 and  14.3.2.2.3 .
14.3.2.2.
1 
1 
The prefabricated portable buildings or containers shall be listed or approved with a 2‐hour fire
resistance rating.
14.3.2.2.
2 
2 
The prefabricated portable buildings or containers shall be provided with a fire alarm system
activated by an air-aspirating smoke detector system or a radiant-energy detection system with
occupant noƟficaƟon installed in accordance
with
with  NFPA 72 .
14.3.2.2.
3 -3 
The prefabricated portable buildings or containers shall be provided with an approved automatic fire
sprinkler system installed in accordance with NFPA 13.
14.3.2.
3 Metal
3 Metal  Drums.
Batteries shall be permitted to be stored in metal drums with batteries separated from each other by
vermiculite or other approved material or in containers approved for battery collection and storage
activities complying with
acƟviƟes complying with  14.3.2.3.1
and
 and  14.3.2.3.3 .
14.3.2.3.
1 
1 
Each area containing such metal drums or approved containers
shall be
shall be  both of the following:
```




# **14.5.1.1**

**The potential for a deflagration involving the off-gassing of flammable gases during a thermal runaway shall be analyzed.**

## **14.5.1.2**

**Explosion protection shall be installed if the potential for a deflagration involving the offgassing of flammable gases during a thermal runaway exists.**

**14.5.2**

**A written hazard analysis prepared by a registered design professional with expertise in fire protection engineering shall be submitted to the AHJ for review and approval.**

**14.6** – Outdoor Storage Location.





**Submittal Date:** Thu Jun 01 16:48:52 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA

# **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** The inclusion of the manufacturing process exceeded the current scope of storage. The issue involving fire suppression design is not specific to the protection of lithium-ion or lithium metal storage, it involves ESS indoor installations as well so a more general proposal to provide guidance should target Chapter 4. Excluding lithium metal batteries from the chapter is a problem since small format lithium metal batteries are currently part of the battery stream both new and as waste. There is also a new solid state lithium metal producer of ESS. To properly assess the impacts of the exemptions the proposed text needs to be modified and refined then submitted as a Public Comment.

# **Collection and Storage of Lithium-ion Batteries**

**Types, SOC, structure, battery pack, li metal separate from li-ion? Definition that they are different!**

# **14.1 General.**

The requirements of this chapter shall apply to areas associated with the collection or storage of lithium-ion batteries.

(Add annex material about Lithium metal vs Lithium ion differences?)

## **14.1.1**

The following areas shall be exempt from the requirements of this chapter:

 $*$ (1) Areas where new or refurbished batteries are installed in or packed for use with devices, equipment, or vehicles they are designed to power

A.14.1.1(1). Such areas include portions of retail establishments and other similar operations where a limited number of batteries are packaged and displayed for installation in devices, equipment, and vehicles e.g., an individually packaged battery sold for use in a circular saw. Such areas could also include batteries that are contained within the retail packaging of a particular device, equipment or vehicle, e.g. a battery included in the packaging of the circular saw. The areas are not intended to include the large-scale bulk storage of batteries such as would be found in warehouses.

(2) Areas where new or refurbished batteries rated at no more than 300 Watt-hours (1.08 MJ) and lithium metal batteries containing no more than 25 g of lithium metal are in their original retail packaging

# **14.214.4 Prevention and Mitigation.**

A fire safety plan that provides for the prevention of fire incidents and includes emergency response actions to be taken upon detection of a fire or possible fire involving lithium-ion or lithium metal battery storageearly detection mitigation measures shall be provided to the AHJ for review and approval.

# **A14.214.4 Prevention and Mitigation.**

The fire safety plan should be comprehensive and provide details on the following: locations of the battery storage including a map of each location within the facility; the types of batteries

**Commented [AB1]:** Do we want to include manufacturing/assembling areas?

**Commented [AB2]:** Will move this down to provide an exemption in 14.4 for indoor storage

**Commented [AB3]:** Plan is to remove this and perhaps add an NFPA 13 type "equivalency" section in chapter 1 (or here) as appropriate - AB to look into

**Commented [AB4]:** MP to work on an annex to better explain what we mean

**Commented [AB5]:** Similar to #1, this will get moved down to 14.4 to provide exemptions for indoor storage

being stored in each location; the maximum quantity (Wh and mass) that may be stored in each location; the building or supplemental fire protection measures in place; the maximum permitted battery State of Charge for the location based on the intended usage; as well as information on fire department access and emergency response procedures. The plan should also include appropriate emergency contact information for the owners/operators of the storage facility as well as subject matter experts that the fire service can get in contact with. Prevention and mitigation of incidents is primarily accomplished by limiting the quantity of LIB stored (fuel load), proximity to ignition sources, and provision of appropriate fire detection and suppression systems.

### **14.2.1**

Battery storage areas shall be at least 5 ft (1.5 m) from the structure, other combustibles, exits and exit pathways, and fire areas or separated by a listed fire rated separation unless otherwise modified by this chapter.

## **14.2.1.1**

Spacing may be reduced based on large-scale fire testing accompanied by an engineering report that has demonstrated that these requirements may be reduced.

#### **14.2.2**

Batteries shall be stored at a state of charge below 30% unless otherwise modified by this chapter.

# **14.3 Collection.**

All areas located indoors in any occupancy where used lithium metal or lithium-ion batteries are collected from employees or the public shall comply with **[14.3.1](https://link.nfpa.org/publications/855/2023/chapters/14#ID008550001380)** through **[14.3.3](https://link.nfpa.org/publications/855/2023/chapters/14#ID008550001382)**.

#### **[14.3.1\\*](https://link.nfpa.org/publications/855/2023/annexes/A/groups/14#ID008550002960)**

Individual containers shall not exceed 7.5 ft<sup>3</sup> (0.21 m<sup>3</sup>) in size each, with an aggregate limit of 15 ft<sup>3</sup> (0.42 m<sup>3</sup>).

#### **A.14.3.1**

Batteries have been safely collected in one or two 55 gal (208 L) drums (or similarly sized bins or containers) for decades without any significant fire or life safety events.

#### **14.3.2**

Containers shall comply with all of the following:

**Commented [nr6]:** This could be increased potentially to 60%, however I think this would need to be verified by publicly released test data across a range of chemistries, technologies, form factors, and battery "condition".

(1) Have a minimum of 3 ft (0.9 m) of open space from other battery collection containers and combustible materials

(2) Be located a minimum of 5 ft (1.5 m) from exits from the room, space, or building

(3) Be open-top and noncombustible or approved for battery collection use(4) Where combustible materials are located within the space between collection containers, the containers shall be spaced a minimum 10 ft  $(3 \text{ m})$  apart

# **14.4 Indoor Storage.**

**14.4.2.1 Manufacturing – Electrode and Cell Fabrication** Batteries shall be permitted to be stored in rooms or spaces complying with **[14.3.2.1.1](https://link.nfpa.org/publications/855/2023/chapters/14#ID008550001389)** and **[14.3.2.1.3](https://link.nfpa.org/publications/855/2023/chapters/14#ID008550001684)**.

### **14.4.2.1.1**

Limit storage areas to no greater than 200 sq.ft.

### **14.4.2.2.2**

Limit storage height to no greater than 6 ft.

## **14.4.2.2.3**

Separate multiple storage areas be aisles not less than 10 ft wide.

## **14.4.2.2.4**

Limit state of charge to less than or equal to 60% (based on max use voltage).

#### **14.4.2.2.5**

The rooms or spaces shall be provided with a fire alarm system activated by detection devices installed in accordance with *NFPA 72*.

### **14.4.2.2.6**

The basis of design for an automatic sprinkler system or other listed suppression system shall be based on full-scale fire testing.

## **14.4.2.2 Manufacturing – Formation/Cell Finishing**

**Commented [AB7]:** This is really an extension of the list above.

**Commented [AB8]:** During our reorganization, we will likely want to move some of our current language about drums, containers, etc. into this section. To be discussed at a later meeting.

## **A.14.4.2.2**

The primary stages of lithium ion battery manufacturing are electrode manufacturing, cell production, and cell finishing. Each stage of manufacturing consists of numerous subprocesses. Of the primary stages of lithium ion battery manufacturing, the greatest risk of fire and explosion is present in cell finishing (e.g., charge/discharge, formation, and aging). During this final stage cell electrochemistry activation occurs. During cell finishing the batteries are stored uncartoned in large rooms with racking for days and weeks at a time. This racking requires specialized fire protection to prevent thermal runaway events from spreading to adjacent materials and spaces. The specific details of the storage configuration, packaging, and battery all impact the fire hazard and protection strategies should be evaluated independently. Battery details to consider include chemistry, format, electrical capacity and state-of-charge).

#### **14.4.2.2.1**

The rooms or spaces shall be provided with a fire alarm system activated by an air-aspirating smoke detector system or a radiant-energy detection system with occupant notification approved detection devices installed in accordance with *NFPA 72*.

### **14.4.2.2.2**

The rooms or spaces shall be provided with an automatic sprinkler system designed and installed in accordance with NFPA 13. The basis of design for an automatic sprinkler system or other approved suppression system shall be based on full-scale fire testing.

#### **14.4.2.2.3**

Sprinklers used for protection of lithium ion batteries shall be listed for storage.

### **14.4.2.2.4** (*NFPA 13 2022 extract from 24.1.6*)

A series of large-scale fire tests involving challenging test scenarios that address the range of variables associated with the intended application of the sprinkler shall be conducted to evaluate the ability of the sprinkler to protect storage fire risks that are representative of those described in the manufacturer's installation and design parameter instructions and referenced in the listing.

#### **14.4.2.2.5** (*NFPA 13 2022 extract 24.1.7*)

The manufacturer's installation and design parameter instructions for these sprinklers shall specify in a standardized manner the end-use limitations and sprinkler system design criteria including at least the following:

- (1) Commodity or commodities to be protected
- (2) Storage arrangements allowed
- (3) Installation guidelines including obstruction and ceiling construction limitations
- (4) Maximum ceiling and storage heights with associated minimum operating pressures and number of sprinklers required to be included in the hydraulic calculation
- (5) Hose stream allowance and duration

#### **14.4.2.2.6 (***NFPA 13 2022 extract 24.1.8***)**

The number of sprinklers to be used in the sprinkler system design shall be based on the worstcase result obtained from the full-scale fire test series increased by a minimum 50 percent.

#### **14.4.2.3 Storage - General**

#### **A14.4.2.3**

Batteries in bulk warehouse storage, whether or not integrated into battery containing devices, will typically be packaged according the transportation requirements. Very few large scale fire tests have been conducted to evaluate storage of lithium-ion batteries in bulk storage. The specific details of the storage configuration, packaging, and battery all impact the fire hazard and protection strategies should be evaluated independently. Battery details to consider include chemistry, format, electrical capacity and state-of-charge).

### **14.4.2.3.1**

The rooms or spaces shall be provided with a fire alarm system activated by an air-aspirating smoke detector system or a radiant-energy detection system with occupant notification approved detection devices installed in accordance with *NFPA 72*.

#### **14.4.2.3.2**

The rooms or spaces shall be provided with an automatic sprinkler system designed and installed in accordance with NFPA 13. The basis of design for an automatic sprinkler system or other approved suppression system shall be based on full-scale fire testing.

#### **14.4.2.3.3**

Sprinklers used for protection of lithium ion batteries shall be listed for storage.

### **14.4.2.3.4** (*NFPA 13 2022 extract from 24.1.6*)

A series of large-scale fire tests involving challenging test scenarios that address the range of variables associated with the intended application of the sprinkler shall be conducted to evaluate the ability of the sprinkler to protect storage fire risks that are representative of those described in the manufacturer's installation and design parameter instructions and referenced in the listing.

### **14.4.2.3.5** (*NFPA 13 2022 extract 24.1.7*)

The manufacturer's installation and design parameter instructions for these sprinklers shall specify in a standardized manner the end-use limitations and sprinkler system design criteria including at least the following:

- (1) Commodity or commodities to be protected
- (2) Storage arrangements allowed
- (3) Installation guidelines including obstruction and ceiling construction limitations
- (4) Maximum ceiling and storage heights with associated minimum operating pressures and number of sprinklers required to be included in the hydraulic calculation
- (5) Hose stream allowance and duration

## **14.4.2.3.6 (***NFPA 13 2022 extract 24.1.8***)**

The number of sprinklers to be used in the sprinkler system design shall be based on the worstcase result obtained from the full-scale fire test series increased by a minimum 50 percent.

### **14.3.2.2 Prefabricated Portable Structure.**

Batteries shall be permitted to be stored in prefabricated portable buildings or

containers complying with **14.3.2.2.1** and **14.3.2.2.3**.

**14.3.2.2.1**

The prefabricated portable buildings or containers shall be listed or approved with a 2-hour fire resistance rating.

**14.3.2.2.2**

The prefabricated portable buildings or containers shall be provided with a fire alarm system activated by an air-aspirating smoke detector system or a radiant-energy detection system with occupant notification installed in accordance with *NFPA 72*.

### **14.3.2.2.3**

The prefabricated portable buildings or containers shall be provided with an approved automatic fire sprinkler system installed in accordance with NFPA 13. **14.3.2.3 Metal Drums.**

Batteries shall be permitted to be stored in metal drums with batteries separated from each other by vermiculite or other approved material or in containers approved for battery collection and storage activities complying with **14.3.2.3.1** and **14.3.2.3.3**.

## **14.3.2.3.1**

Each area containing such metal drums or approved containers shall be both of the following:

 $\bullet$  (1)

Not exceeding 900 ft<sup>2</sup> (61 m<sup>2</sup>) in area

 $\bullet$  (2)

Separated from other battery storage areas by a minimum of 10 ft (3 m)

# **14.3.2.3.2**

Each area containing metal drums or approved containers with batteries shall be provided with a fire alarm system activated by an air-aspirating smoke detector system or a radiant-energy detection system with occupant notification installed in accordance with *NFPA 72*.

## **14.3.2.3.3**

Each area containing metal drums or approved containers with batteries shall be provided with

an approved automatic fire sprinkler system installed in accordance with NFPA 13. **14.3.2.4 Containers Approved for Transportation.**

Batteries shall be permitted to be stored in containers approved for use in transportation that will prevent an event from propagating beyond the container complying

# with **14.3.2.4.1** and **14.3.2.4.3**.

**14.3.2.4.1**

Each area containing the approved transportation containers shall be both of the following:

(1). Not exceeding 900 ft<sup>2</sup> (61 m<sup>2</sup>) in area

(2). Separated from other battery storage areas by a minimum of 10 ft (3 m)

## **14.3.2.4.2**

Each area containing the approved transportation containers shall be provided with a fire alarm system activated by an air-aspirating smoke detector system or a radiant-energy detection system with occupant notification installed in accordance with *NFPA 72*.

## **14.3.2.4.3**

Each area containing the approved transportation containers shall be provided with an approved automatic fire sprinkler system installed in accordance with NFPA 13.

#### **14.4 Prevention and Mitigation.**

A plan that provides for the prevention of fire incidents and includes early detection mitigation measures shall be provided to the AHJ for review and approval.

# **14.5 Outdoor Storage.**

**14.5.1** Outdoor storage locations for lithium metal or lithium-ion batteries shall comply with the following:

(1. Individual pile sizes shall be limited to 900 ft<sup>2</sup> (83.6 m<sup>2</sup>) in area separated from other piles by 10 ft (3 m).

(2) Piles located outdoors shall be separated by a minimum 20 ft (6.1 m) from the following exposures:

- (a). Lot lines
- (b). Public ways
- (c). Buildings
- (d). Other storage
- (e). Hazardous materials
- (f). Other exposure hazards

**14.5.2** Clearances shall be permitted to be reduced to 3 ft (0.9 m) where a 3-hour freestanding fire barrier, suitable for exterior use, and extending 5 ft (1.5 m) above and extending 5 ft (1.5 m) beyond the physical boundary of the pile is provided to protect the exposure.

**Commented [AB9]:** Stopped here. I recommend we reorganize the chapter to flow better. Have a section for collection (14.3), indoor storage (14.4) and outdoor storage (14.5). We can work on moving the sections around at a later time.

**14.5.3 Weather Protection.** Where weather protection is provided for sheltering outdoor battery storage areas, such areas shall be considered outdoor storage areas if all of the following conditions are met:

(1) Supports and walls shall not obstruct more than one side or more than 25 percent of the perimeter of the storage area.

(2) The distance from the structure and the structural supports to buildings, lot lines, public ways, or means of egress to a public way shall be not less than the distance required by **14.6.1** for outdoor storage of batteries without weather protection.

(3) The structure shall be of approved noncombustible construction and not exceed 3,600 ft<sup>2</sup> (334.5 m<sup>2</sup>) in area.

**14.5.4** Outdoor storage areas with an aggregate area greater than 400 ft<sup>2</sup> (37.1 m<sup>2</sup>) shall be provided with a fire alarm system activated by a radiant-energy detection system with occupant notification installed in accordance with *NFPA 72*.

## **14.6 Explosion Protection.**

14.6.1 Deflagration Potential.

14.6.1.1 The potential for a deflagration involving the off-gassing of flammable gases during a thermal runaway shall be analyzed.

14.6.1.2 Explosion protection shall be installed if the potential for a deflagration involving the off-gassing of flammable gases during a thermal runaway exists.

14.6.2 A written hazard analysis prepared by a registered design professional with expertise in fire protection engineering shall be submitted to the AHJ for review and approval.

Г

I







**Statement:** There is a need to correlate the detection technologies with NFPA 72. Specifying "airaspirating" as the method of smoke detection was inappropriate, other forms of smoke detection can be utilized based upon the conditions present at the location.



**Statement:** There is a need to correlate the detection technologies with NFPA 72. Specifying "airaspirating" as the method of smoke detection was inappropriate, other forms of smoke detection can be utilized based upon the conditions present at the location.



**Resolution:** FR-164-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** There is a need to correlate the detection technologies with NFPA 72. Specifying "airaspirating" as the method of smoke detection was inappropriate, other forms of smoke detection can be utilized based upon the conditions present at the location.


## **14.3.2.4.2**

Each area containing the approved transportation containers shall be provided with a fire alarm system activated by an air-aspirating smoke detector system or a , thermal image, or radiantenergy detection system with occupant notification installed in accordance with *NFPA 72*.

# **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

NFPA 72 2025 edition First Draft incorporated a new definition and requirements for "thermal image fire detectors." While thermal image detectors are technically radiant energy sensing detectors, NFPA 72 has previously limited radiant energy detectors to non-imaging flame or spark detectors (UV-IR, triple IR). The SIG-IDS TC decided to add thermal image fire detector requirements into their own section rather than rewrite the existing radiant energy detector section. In any case, as the term radiant energy detectors is used within NFPA 855, thermal imaging is the appropriate term and technology for detecting overheating energy storage systems at an early stage. There is currently a new UL STP working on a new standard for video and thermal imaging fire detectors (UL/ULC 2684) and this is scheduled to be completed prior to the next edition of NFPA 855.

## **Related Public Inputs for This Document**

#### **Related Input Relationship**

Public Input No. 2-NFPA 855-2022 [Section No. 14.6.4] Public Input No. 3-NFPA 855-2022 [Section No. 14.3.2.1.2] Public Input No. 4-NFPA 855-2022 [Section No. 14.3.2.2.2] Public Input No. 6-NFPA 855-2022 [Section No. 14.3.2.3.2] Public Input No. 7-NFPA 855-2022 [Section No. 4.8.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 8-NFPA 855-2022 [Section No. 9.6.1] Public Input No. 9-NFPA 855-2022 [Section No. 9.5.3.1.1.2] Public Input No. 10-NFPA 855-2022 [Section No. 9.5.3.1.2]

## **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Scott Lang **Organization:** Honeywell International **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Tue Nov 29 13:15:49 EST 2022 **Committee:** ESS-AAA

## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-165-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** There is a need to correlate the detection technologies with NFPA 72. Specifying "airaspirating" as the method of smoke detection was inappropriate, other forms of smoke detection can be utilized based upon the conditions present at the location





**Statement:** There is a need to correlate the detection technologies with NFPA 72.

ı

I





### **15.12\* Test Reports**

ESS installed in accordance with Chapter 15 shall be provided with a product-level evaluation by an approved qualified person with expertise in energy storage as a supplemental safety document to be used by the AHJ and the installing contractors.

#### **A.15.12**

The test report will provide information that, among other things, describes the size and energy capacity rating of the unit being tested, model numbers of the modules and ESS units, the orientation of ESS in the test facility, and the proximity of the ESS unit under test to adjacent ESS, walls, and monitoring sensors. The test report also includes a complete set of test results and measurements. For example, a complete UL 9540A test report that includes a unit‐level test should also include the UL 9540A cell and module‐level test.

## **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

Under the direction of the NFPA 855 Committee, a task group was formed to address issues with the current NFPA 855 Chapter 15.3.1. Spacing and engineering requirements for fire and explosion reference to chapter 9 requirements. This proposed input intends to correct a previously unknown existing issue.

This change would eliminate the requirement for a registered design professional with fire protection engineering expertise and replace that with language similar to what is currently found in NFPA 1, Section 1.16.1 when technical assistance is required by the AHJ (the IFC has similar language in 104.8.2). This allows the current language to be onerous for the smaller residential installations. It allows an approved third party with expertise in energy storage to review the documents and provide the supplemental report. As written, an installer could do the same installation at several homes in a jurisdiction, and they would need a registered design professional (e.g., FPE) for each installation. The new Section matches how this topic (technical assistance for supplemental reports) is addressed in NFPA 1 Fire Code. provides direction specific to chapter 15.

## **Related Public Inputs for This Document**

### **Related Input Relationship**

Public Input No. 28-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 15.3.1] Coordination of evaluation

Public Input No. 30-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 15.3.1]

Public Input No. 28-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 15.3.1] Public Input No. 30-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 15.3.1]

## **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Paul Hayes **Organization:** The Hiller Companies/American **Affiliation:** none

requirments

Coordination of evaluation requirments

**Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Sat Apr 22 11:25:09 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA

# **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** The Technical Committee reaffirms the acceptance of TIA 23-1.



### **15.13 Fire and Explosion Testing.**

## **15.13.1\***

**Where required by 15.3.1, fire and explosion testing shall be conducted on a representative ESS in accordance with UL 9540A or equivalent test standards.**

## **A.15.13.1**

A UL 9540A test or equivalent test should evaluate the fire characteristics of the composition of gases generated at the cell, module, and unit and installation levels for ESS undergoing thermal runaways, such as what might occur due to a fault, physical damage, or exposure hazard. The evaluation of the fire characteristics during fire vent testing at the unit level installation level testing should document **whether the fire event propagates to the neighboring ESS units and include radiant heat flux measurements at enclosing wall surfaces and at various distances from the ESS being tested at the unit level. The fire and explosion testing data is intended to be used by manufacturers, system** designers, and AHJs to determine if the required separation distance for an ESS installation can be **reduced.**

## **15.13.1.1**

**The complete UL 9540A or equivalent test report shall be provided to the Authority Having Jurisdiction, including the cell, module, and unit level.** 

## **15.13.1.2**

Lead-acid and nickel-cadmium batteries used in standby power systems and listed to UL 1973 shall not require UL 9540A testing when installed with a charging system listed to UL 1012, UL 60950-1, or **UL 62368‐1, or a UPS listed to UL 1778.**

## **15.13.1.3**

The testing shall be conducted, witnessed, and reported by an approved testing laboratory to **characterize the composition of the gases generated and show that a fire involving one ESS unit will not propagate to an adjacent unit.**

## **15.13.1.4\***

**The representative cell, modules, and units tested, including any optional integral fire suppression** system, shall match the intended installation configuration other than the addition of the cell failure mechanism utilized for cell thermal runaway initiation.

## **A.15.13.1.4**

**changes in an installaƟon configuraƟon, including the internal architecture of modules and units that** don't match the parameters tested, such as size and separation, cell type, or energy density, should only be accepted if it can be shown that the configuration provides equivalent results. For example, scaling such as height, depth, and spacing need to conform to the configuration of the test. Changes **also might include mulƟple levels of units on top of each other, located on a mezzanine floor above,** or back-to-back units. These configurations might have yet to be evaluated in the test.

## **15.13.1.5**

**The testing shall include evaluating deflagration mitigation measures when designed into ESS cabinets.**

# **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

Under the direction of the NFPA 855 Committee, a task group was formed to address issues with the

current NFPA 855 Chapter 15.3.1. Spacing and engineering requirements for fire and explosion reference to chapter 9 requirements. This proposed input intends to correct a previously unknown existing issue.

This input would eliminate the requirement for a registered design professional with fire protection engineering expertise and replace that with language similar to what is currently found in NFPA 1, Section 1.16.1 when technical assistance is required by the AHJ (the IFC has similar language in 104.8.2). This allows the current language to be onerous for the smaller residential installations. It allows an approved third party with expertise in energy storage to review the documents and provide the supplemental report. As written, an installer could do the same installation at several homes in a jurisdiction, and they would need a registered design professional (e.g., FPE) for each installation. The new Section matches how this topic (technical assistance for supplemental reports) is addressed in NFPA 1 Fire Code. The input keeps the evaluation requirements specific to Chapter 15

# **Related Public Inputs for This Document**

## **Related Input Relationship**

Public Input No. 28-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 15.3.1] Coordination of evaluation

Public Input No. 29-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 15.3.1] Public Input No. 28-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 15.3.1] Public Input No. 29-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 15.3.1]

requirments Coordination of evaluation requirments

# **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Paul Hayes



# **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-102-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** The Technical Committee reaffirms the acceptance of TIA 23-1.

Additional information is added for the acceptable listing requirements for standby power exception. Most residential systems use a UL 1741 listed inverter/charger and needs to be references in the exception. The Canadian standard is also added.



**Resolution:** FR-101-NFPA 855-2023 **Statement:** The Technical Committee reaffirms the acceptance of TIA 23-1.



Г







Г

1







Within utility closets, basements and storage or utility spaces The 40 kWh limit is unchanged from the current version of NFPA 855. That language clarifies that the 40 kWh limit does not apply to spaces or closets located within garages or accessory structures. It only applies to "within the dwelling."

### In attached garages

As the ESS industry has gained more experience with the needs of their customers and the grid, and the building safety community has gained more experience with ESS, it is becoming clear that the arbitrary capacity restrictions in the residential code are a hindrance to the deployment of clean energy technologies and are unneeded for safety. Hundreds of thousands of residential batteries have been installed and constructed to product standards leading to greater levels of safety. Taken together, these facts support a reasonable increase in kWh capacity to align with other anticipated hazards and fuel loads that may be present in a residential garage.

A modest increase in the allowable aggregate ESS capacity from 80 kWh to 100 kWh does not pose a significant elevated fire risk in the garage. Manufacturers design ESS to well-established safety standards. They have demonstrated proven track records of operating without igniting in homes, and are built in a way to resist adding fuel to fires from other sources. In the rare event of an ESS fire, a fire from 100 kWh of energy storage does not pose a significantly greater threat to occupant safety and is not significantly more difficult to extinguish than a fire from 80 kWh of energy storage.

The fuel energy density and heat release rate potential presented by a 100-kWh energy storage system are comparable to that of vehicles parked in garages. 100 kWh is a typical capacity of currently available electric vehicles (EVs), which use lithium-ion chemistries as do many stationary ESS. EVs also present significant additional fuel load through materials like upholstered seating and plastic trim. Internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles have fuel, engine lubricants, and other components with the potential for very significant heat release rates. While the fuel load in a vehicle fueled by a gaseous fuel such as CNG or hydrogen can be less than that of a 100-kWh ESS in total energy output, the dynamics of a designed quick release of a gaseous fuel due to fire exposure in an attached garage can pose a significant concentrated fire exposure, or potentially a deflagration hazard risk to occupants and emergency responders.

This proposal allows homes to add an aggregate of 100 kWh of energy storage to an attached garage, while keeping the content fuel loads at safe levels. While actual fuel loads in garages can vary widely, this can be demonstrated using typical and conservative figures:

A reasonable fuel load for a garage is approximately 22,300 MJ. This assumes the garage is  $20' \times 20'$ and that a reasonable fuel load density is 600 MJ/m . Parking two gasoline powered cars in the garage makes up approximately 10,600 MJ of fuel load. Other garage items can make up approximately 3,300 MJ of fuel load. The remaining fuel load available to an ESS (22,300 MJ minus 10,600 MJ minus 3,300 MJ) is 8,400 MJ. 8,400 MJ is equivalent to an ESS with an aggregate capacity of 100 kWh, assuming the ESS has a fuel load of 84 MJ/kWh.

On or within 3 feet (914 mm) of exterior walls of dwellings and attached garages ESS on the exterior side of exterior walls pose less of a safety risk than ESS inside attached garages. Typical exterior home construction provides sufficient protection from a thermal event. The product safety standard has specific requirements when ESS is intended for wall mounting, near exposures, where surface temperature measurements on wall surfaces do not exceed 97°C (175°F) of temperature rise above ambient per 9.2.15.

#### In detached garages and detached accessory structures

This scenario poses minimal risk to occupant safety, considering the distance from the dwelling and testing required of ESS. ESS in detached structures pose less of a safety risk than ESS on the exterior side of the dwelling. If an ESS with an aggregate rating of 200 kWh on the exterior side of the dwelling is considered reasonable, then an ESS with an aggregate rating of 200 kWh should be reasonable for ESS in detached structures. 600 kWh matches Table 1207.5 of the IFC. ESS in structures separated from the dwelling by 10 feet do not pose demonstrable risk to occupants.

## Outdoors on the ground

This scenario poses minimal risk to occupant safety, considering the distance from the dwelling and the testing required of ESS. Ground mount ESS pose less of a safety risk than ESS on the exterior

side of the dwelling. If an ESS with an aggregate rating of 200 kWh on the exterior side of the dwelling is considered reasonable, then an ESS with an aggregate rating of 200 kWh should be reasonable for ESS mounted on the ground.

Additionally, 200 kWh is equivalent to two typical EVs that can be parked anywhere on the property.

600 kWh matches Table 1207.5 of the IFC. ESS separated from property lines and the dwelling by 10 feet does not pose a demonstrable risk to occupants.

## **Endnotes**

1. Tesla Model X has a capacity of 100 kWh. Tesla Model S has a capacity of 70-85 kWh. Chevy Bolt has a capacity of 66 kWh. The electric Ford F150 has a capacity of 110-130 kWh or 150-180 kWh with extended range. Sources: ttps://www.forbes.com/wheels/cars/tesla/model-x/, https://www.tesla.com/sites/default/files/tesla-model-s.pdf, https://media.chevrolet.com/media/us/en /chevrolet/vehicles/bolt-ev/2021.tab1.html, https://www.forbes.com/wheels/news/2022-ford-f-150 lightning-ev-pickup-debuts-300-mile-range-priced-at-40k.

2. Builders' websites show the typical two-garage is around 20' x 20'. For example, HWS Garages' website states that "The average 2-car garage size is anywhere from 18' x 20' to 22' x 22'." While some garages are one-car and some are three-car, a poll conducted by Garage Living shows that 61 percent of garages are two-car. Sources: www.hwsgarage.com/average-garage-sizes/ and www.garageliving.com/blog/home-garage-stats.

3. The average fuel load of a living room is 600 MJ/m . 600 MJ/m^2 is also the business standard in NFPA 557. Sources: Alex Bwalya et al., "A Pilot Survey of Fire Loads in Canadian Homes," National Research Council Canada, March 9, 2004; National Fire Protection Association, "NFPA 557: Standard for Determination of Fire Loads for Use in Structural Fire Protection Design," 2020 Edition, Section 6.1.3.

4. 10,577 MJ (rounded to 10,600 MJ) assumes a small car (2,909 MJ) and large car (7,648 MJ). Sources: Mohd Tohir and Michael Spearpoint, "Distribution analysis of the fire severity characteristics of single passenger road vehicles using heat release rate data," Fire Science Reviews, 2013. Also see M.J. Spearpoint, et. al., "Fire load energy densities for risk-based design of car parking buildings," Case Studies in Fire Safety, 29 April 2015.

5. 3,341 MJ (rounded to 3,300 MJ) is equivalent to half the fuel load items in a typical basement living room. Source: Bwalya, A.C., et. al., "Survey Results of Combustible Contents and Floor Areas in Multi-Family Dwellings," National Research Council Canada, 24 October 2008.

6. 84 MJ/kWh is derived from the estimated fuel load of the gases released by an ESS in thermal runaway (44 MJ/kWh) and the estimated fuel load of the burnable contents inside the ESS (40 MJ/kWh). 44 MJ/kWh was derived from reviewing several studies referenced below. 40 MJ/kWh was derived from multiplying 2 kg/kWh (a conservative figure for burnable contents inside the ESS – the weight of internal contents for some ESS is 1.0-1.5 kg/kWh) by 20 MJ/kg (the typical fuel load of a computer). Sources for fuel load of gases: Frederik Larsson, "Toxic fluoride gas emissions from lithiumion battery fires," Scientific Reports, 30 August 2017; David Sturk et. al., "Fire Tests on E-vehicle Battery Cells and Packs," Traffic Injury Prevention, 25 February 2015. Sources for kg/kWh weight of internal burnable contents: Tesla, SimpliPhi, and Solaredge. Source for fuel load of a computer: Alex Bwalya et al., "A Pilot Survey of Fire Loads in Canadian Homes," National Research Council Canada, March 9, 2004.

Cost Impact: The code change proposal will not increase or decrease the cost of construction It clarifies how the maximum thresholds are applied. Allows for more ESS while maintaining a level of safety.

## **Related Public Inputs for This Document**

**Related Input Relationship** 

Public Input No. 343-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 15.5.1]

# **Submitter Information Verification**



# **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** The proposal covered a fundamental change to the various spaces, based on adoption in California. There was much discussion on the aggregate amount allowed in the various areas. There was concern over the total of 600 kwh in certain applications as well as application of the basement and dwelling spaces.

**NFPA 855, 2026 Edition Public Input # \_\_\_ Proponents: Mark Rodriguez, SunRun Jeff Spies, Planet Plansets Joseph H. Cain, P.E., Solar Energy Industries Association** 

#### **15.5 Energy Ratings.**

**15.5.1** Individual ESS units shall have a maximum stored energy rating of 20 kWh.

**15.5.2** The aggregate rating *of the ESS shall not exceed the following for each location listed:* The ratings of the ESS in each location shall not exceed the ratings in Table 15.5.2.

1. 40 kWh within utility closets and storage or utility spaces.

2. 80 kWh in attached or detached garages and detached accessory structures.

3. 80 kWh on exterior walls.

4. 80 kWh outdoors on the ground.

#### **Table 15.5.2 Maximum Ratings of ESS**



**Commented [1]:** FYI - Change to 9540 will allow larger unit sizes based on 9540A results.

**Commented [2]:** will submit in a separate<br>proposal: "Individual ESS units shall have a maximum rating based on its listing."

**Commented [3]:** Could maybe merge the outdoor ground (3ft from property line) with this?



For SI: 1 foot = 304.8 mm

**15.5.3** The total aggregate ratings of ESS on the property shall not exceed 600 kWh.

**15.5.3 15.5.4** ESS installations exceeding the individual or aggregate ratings allowed by 15.5.1 or 15.5.2 through 15.5.3 shall comply with Chapters 4 through 9.

**15.5.415.5.5** The use of an electric-powered vehicle to power the dwelling while parked shall comply with section 15.11.

**Reason:** The proposed changes to section 15.5 clarify the original intent for this section, which was to provide a maximum threshold for each location. It was not the intent to limit installations to one location on the property, or to limit to only 80 kWh for all ESS installed on the property. Providing the various maximum thresholds in tabular form provides an easier method for the code user to determine the limits for each location.

#### **Within utility closets, basements and storage or utility spaces**

The 40 kWh limit is unchanged from the current version of NFPA 855. That language clarifies that the 40 kWh limit does not apply to spaces or closets located within garages or accessory structures. It only applies to "within the dwelling."

#### **In attached garages**

As the ESS industry has gained more experience with the needs of their customers and the grid, and the building safety community has gained more experience with ESS, it is becoming clear that the arbitrary capacity restrictions in the residential code are a hindrance to the deployment of clean energy technologies and are unneeded for safety. Hundreds of thousands of residential batteries have been installed and constructed to product standards leading to greater levels of safety. Taken together, these facts support a reasonable increase in kWh

capacity to align with other anticipated hazards and fuel loads that may be present in a residential garage.

A modest increase in the allowable aggregate ESS capacity from 80 kWh to 100 kWh does not pose a significant elevated fire risk in the garage. Manufacturers design ESS to wellestablished safety standards. They have demonstrated proven track records of operating without igniting in homes, and are built in a way to resist adding fuel to fires from other sources. In the rare event of an ESS fire, a fire from 100 kWh of energy storage does not pose a significantly greater threat to occupant safety and is not significantly more difficult to extinguish than a fire from 80 kWh of energy storage.

The fuel energy density and heat release rate potential presented by a 100-kWh energy storage system are comparable to that of vehicles parked in garages. 100 kWh is a typical capacity of currently available electric vehicles (EVs), which use lithium-ion chemistries as do many stationary ESS. EVs also present significant additional fuel load through materials like upholstered seating and plastic trim. Internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles have fuel, engine lubricants, and other components with the potential for very significant heat release rates. While the fuel load in a vehicle fueled by a gaseous fuel such as CNG or hydrogen can be less than that of a 100-kWh ESS in total energy output, the dynamics of a designed quick release of a gaseous fuel due to fire exposure in an attached garage can pose a significant concentrated fire exposure, or potentially a deflagration hazard risk to occupants and emergency responders.

This proposal allows homes to add an aggregate of 100 kWh of energy storage to an attached garage, while keeping the content fuel loads at safe levels. While actual fuel loads in garages can vary widely, this can be demonstrated using typical and conservative figures:

A reasonable fuel load for a garage is approximately 22,300 MJ. This assumes the garage is 20' x 20' and that a reasonable fuel load density is 600 MJ/m . Parking two gasoline powered cars in the garage makes up approximately 10,600 MJ of fuel load. Other garage items can make up approximately 3,300 MJ of fuel load. The remaining fuel load available to an ESS (22,300 MJ minus 10,600 MJ minus 3,300 MJ) is 8,400 MJ. 8,400 MJ is equivalent to an ESS with an aggregate capacity of 100 kWh, assuming the ESS has a fuel load of 84 MJ/kWh.

#### **On or within 3 feet (914 mm) of exterior walls of dwellings and attached garages**

ESS on the exterior side of exterior walls pose less of a safety risk than ESS inside attached garages. Typical exterior home construction provides sufficient protection from a thermal event. The product safety standard has specific requirements when ESS is intended for wall mounting, near exposures, where surface temperature measurements on wall surfaces do not exceed 97°C (175°F) of temperature rise above ambient per 9.2.15.

#### **In detached garages and detached accessory structures**

This scenario poses minimal risk to occupant safety, considering the distance from the dwelling and testing required of ESS. ESS in detached structures pose less of a safety risk than ESS on the exterior side of the dwelling. If an ESS with an aggregate rating of 200 kWh on the exterior side of the dwelling is considered reasonable, then an ESS with an aggregate rating of 200 kWh should be reasonable for ESS in detached structures. 600 kWh matches Table 1207.5 of the IFC. ESS in structures separated from the dwelling by 10 feet do not pose demonstrable risk to occupants.

#### **Outdoors on the ground**

This scenario poses minimal risk to occupant safety, considering the distance from the dwelling and the testing required of ESS. Ground mount ESS pose less of a safety risk than ESS on the exterior side of the dwelling. If an ESS with an aggregate rating of 200 kWh on the exterior side of the dwelling is considered reasonable, then an ESS with an aggregate rating of 200 kWh should be reasonable for ESS mounted on the ground.

Additionally, 200 kWh is equivalent to two typical EVs that can be parked anywhere on the property.

600 kWh matches Table 1207.5 of the IFC. ESS separated from property lines and the dwelling by 10 feet does not pose a demonstrable risk to occupants.

#### **Endnotes**

1. Tesla Model X has a capacity of 100 kWh. Tesla Model S has a capacity of 70-85 kWh. Chevy Bolt has a capacity of 66 kWh. The electric Ford F150 has a capacity of 110-130 kWh or 150-180 kWh with extended range. Sources: ttps://www.forbes.com/wheels/cars/tesla/model-x/, https://www.tesla.com/sites/default/files/tesla-model-s.pdf,

https://media.chevrolet.com/media/us/en/chevrolet/vehicles/bolt-ev/2021.tab1.html, https://www.forbes.com/wheels/news/2022-ford-f-150-lightning-ev-pickup-debuts-300-milerange-priced-at-40k.

2. Builders' websites show the typical two-garage is around 20' x 20'. For example, HWS Garages' website states that "The average 2-car garage size is anywhere from 18' x 20' to 22′ x 22'." While some garages are one-car and some are three-car, a poll conducted by Garage Living shows that 61 percent of garages are two-car. Sources: www.hwsgarage.com/averagegarage-sizes/ and www.garageliving.com/blog/home-garage-stats.

3. The average fuel load of a living room is 600 MJ/m . 600 MJ/m^2 is also the business standard in NFPA 557. Sources: Alex Bwalya et al., "A Pilot Survey of Fire Loads in Canadian Homes," National Research Council Canada, March 9, 2004; National Fire Protection Association, "NFPA 557: Standard for Determination of Fire Loads for Use in Structural Fire Protection Design," 2020 Edition, Section 6.1.3.

4. 10,577 MJ (rounded to 10,600 MJ) assumes a small car (2,909 MJ) and large car (7,648 MJ). Sources: Mohd Tohir and Michael Spearpoint, "Distribution analysis of the fire severity characteristics of single passenger road vehicles using heat release rate data," Fire Science

Reviews, 2013. Also see M.J. Spearpoint, et. al., "Fire load energy densities for risk-based design of car parking buildings," Case Studies in Fire Safety, 29 April 2015.

5. 3,341 MJ (rounded to 3,300 MJ) is equivalent to half the fuel load items in a typical basement living room. Source: Bwalya, A.C., et. al., "Survey Results of Combustible Contents and Floor Areas in Multi-Family Dwellings," National Research Council Canada, 24 October 2008.

6. 84 MJ/kWh is derived from the estimated fuel load of the gases released by an ESS in thermal runaway (44 MJ/kWh) and the estimated fuel load of the burnable contents inside the ESS (40 MJ/kWh). 44 MJ/kWh was derived from reviewing several studies referenced below. 40 MJ/kWh was derived from multiplying 2 kg/kWh (a conservative figure for burnable contents inside the ESS – the weight of internal contents for some ESS is 1.0-1.5 kg/kWh) by 20 MJ/kg (the typical fuel load of a computer). Sources for fuel load of gases: Frederik Larsson, "Toxic fluoride gas emissions from lithium-ion battery fires," Scientific Reports, 30 August 2017; David Sturk et. al., "Fire Tests on E-vehicle Battery Cells and Packs," Traffic Injury Prevention, 25 February 2015. Sources for kg/kWh weight of internal burnable contents: Tesla, SimpliPhi, and Solaredge. Source for fuel load of a computer: Alex Bwalya et al., "A Pilot Survey of Fire Loads in Canadian Homes," National Research Council Canada, March 9, 2004.

**Cost Impact:** The code change proposal will not increase or decrease the cost of construction It clarifies how the maximum thresholds are applied. Allows for more ESS while maintaining a level of safety.





## **15.5.2**

The aggregate rating of the ESS shall not exceed the following for each location listed:

- 1. 40 kWh for Li-based batteries, flow batteries, electric double-layer capacitors (EDLC), or battery types not otherwise listed in this requirement within utility closets, basements, and storage or utility spaces
- 2. 80 kWh for Li-based or flow batteries, EDLC, or battery types not otherwise listed in this requirement in attached or detached garages, or where outdoor wall-mounted to the primary residential structure, or when on or in-and detached-accessory structures (such as detached garages, sheds, etc.) or ground-mounted within 10 feet of the primary residential structure
- 3. 250 80 kWh for Li-based or flow batteries or EDLC or battery types not listed in this requirement where outdoor wall ground-mounted or on or in accessory structures 10 feet or more away from the primary residential structure
- 4. 250 80 kWh regardless of location on the residential property when using lead-acid, Ni-Cd, Ni-MH, Ni-Zn, NaNiCl, or rechargeable zinc manganese dioxide technologies where outdoor ground mounted





# **Public Input No. 345-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. 15.7 ] 15.7** Fire Detection. **15.7.1** Rooms and areas within dwelling units, basements, and attached garages in which ESS are installed shall be protected by interconnected smoke alarms in accordance with the local building code. **15.7.2** A heat detector or alarm, listed and interconnected to the smoke alarms, shall be installed in locations within dwelling units and attached garages where smoke alarms cannot be installed in accordance with their listing. **15.7.3** A fire detection system complying with NFPA 72 shall be installed in locations within dwelling units and attached garages where the interconnection to existing systems in 15.7.2 is not feasible or where invasive techniques would be required to install new fire detection devices in existing finished construction. Battery-powered and wirelessly-interconnected devices shall be permitted. **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input** Reason statement: The reality of interconnected fire detection devices is that devices from varying manufacturers cannot be interconnected per their listings. Residential structures may have specific brands of fire detection devices with no compatible heat alarms or detectors. The listing requires interconnection to compatible devices to ensure that communication protocol functions properly. Contractors need the flexibility to comply with the intent of the code using various approved solutions, including the use of battery-powered, wirelessly interconnected devices with remote annunciators. **Submitter Information Verification Submitter Full Name:** Mark Rodriguez **Organization:** Sunrun **Affiliation:** Mark Rodriguez-Sunrun, Jeff Spies-Planet Plansets, CALSSA **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Thu Jun 01 14:27:53 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA **Committee Statement Resolution:** Noninvasive techniques are available for fire detection systems complying with NFPA 72 in dwelling units.

Г

٦






group group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group group





This Public Input was submitted by the Flow Battery Task Group TG20.

## **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Steve Edley **Organization:** NFPA 855 Task Group 20 **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Mon May 15 16:39:25 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA

### **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-100-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** This new chapter addresses flow batteries rather than integrating this content into Chapter 9 to avoid confusion. There is enough unique content associated with flow batteries, such as pumps, stacks and large volume of electrolyte, that gets addressed by this chapter.

### TG 20 PI Chapter 16 Flow Batteries

16.0 The requirements of this chapter shall apply to the installation of Flow batteries.

16.1 Flow battery installations shall comply with the requirements in chapters 4-9 and 16 as specified in Table 16.1

**Commented [CC1]:** Is this going to be a standard alone chapter?

It sounds like stand alone so there may be a need to add something to Chapter 1 like dwellings; Flow batteries shall only be required to comply with Chapter 16.

Or will it be something like the following since table has Chapter 5, 6, 7 and 8 apply in entirety; Unless modified by this chapter, the requirements of Chapters 4 through 9 shall also apply.

Not sure how Chapters 1‐3 would be used. Other chapters don't have it and it might not be necessary but. Chapter 9 has row for:

admin Yes Chapter 1‐3.

**Commented [MOU2R1]:** Done.



Table 16.1 Flow Battery Installations

**Commented [CC3]:** Need some kind of scope. 16.1 Flow batteries shall comply with the requirements of this chapter.

Or maybe something to also tie in table. 16.1 Flow batteries shall comply with the requirements in Table 16.1.

Either way it can't just have a table without a reference in a section.

**Commented [MOU4R3]:** Done

**Commented [CC5]:** Edits to match other chapters.

**Commented [MOU6R5]:** Done

#### **16.1 Hazard Mitigation Analysis.**

16.1.1\* In addition to the failure modes in 4.4.2 the hazard mitigation analysis shall evaluate the consequences of the following failures: 46. Assessment of electrolyte containment system failure.

A.16.1.1 Sensitive site concerns may warrant additional containment provisions in addition to secondary containment systems that are part of the listed system. Examples could include environmental

sensitivity or the risk associated with some elevated or rooftop installations.

#### **16.2 Operation & Maintenance**

16.2\* The owner/operator shall confirm there are procedures in place for maintaining safety during servicing of stacks, pumps, fluid delivery systems, tanks and other serviceable components of a flow battery.

A.16.2 Flow batteries containing hazardous chemicals may need drainage or isolation of certain parts of the system in order to prevent unintentional release of chemicals during disassembly.

#### **16.3 Decommissioning**

16.3.1 Procedures for decommissioning of flow batteries shall follow manufacturer's instructions.

16.3.2 If the decommissioning requires removal of electrolyte then the owner or their authorized agent shall ensure an entity has been assigned to be responsible for electrolyte removal and disposition upon decommissioning.

#### **16.4 Fire Control and Suppression**

16.4.1 Fire suppression agents used in rooms or areas that contain flow batteries shall be compatible with the flow battery materials and electrolytes.

#### **16.5 Spill Control**

16.5.1 Where spill control is provided as part of the installation an alarm system shall be provided to signal an electrolyte leak from the system.

16.5.2 Where required, alarm signals shall be transmitted to an approved location.

**Commented [CC7]:** Is the enforceable as worded? It is necessary to determine what happens when the designed fails including secondary? I take it that is complete failure of containment. Also what happens with the assessment?

**Commented [MOU8R7]:** Modified to match style of 4.4.2

#### 16.6 **Hazard Support Personnel.**

16.6.1 Where required by the AHJ for public safety, the owner or their authorized agent shall provide hazard support personnel at the owner's expense.

#### *Substantiation*

*Chapter 16: Everything in this proposed chapter is new content. The task group felt that it is important to create a dedicated flow battery chapter rather than integrating this content into Chapter 9 to avoid confusion. There is enough unique content associated with flow batteries, such as pumps, stacks and large volume of electrolyte, that gets addressed by this chapter.* 

#### *Table 16.1*

#### *Size and Separation ‐ Not applicable*

*The primary driver for this separation requirement is propagation of a thermal runaway event from one battery group to another. The prescriptive size imposes a barrier to technical innovation in the design of high energy capacity flow batteries. Flow batteries come in various configurations, as the energy capacity is separated from the power capacity in the form of electrolyte tanks and stacks. Many flow batteries have electrolyte tanks with an energy capacity far exceeding 50kWh.* 

#### *Remediation Measures ‐ Not applicable*

*The remediation measures provided in 9.6.6 were written for the fire risks and long duration events present in other technologies. These risks are not posed by flow battery failure modes. See 16.6 for additional requirements.* 

*16.1.1 and A 16.1.1: Flow batteries have large volumes of electrolyte that need to be considered in the HMA in more detail than other technologies.* 

*16.2 and A16.2: For the safety of service personnel, flow batteries require different safety measures to protect against chemical exposure.* 

*16.3.1: 8.1.3 applies, however it is important to ensure that the unique aspects associated with flow batteries are addressed.* 

*16.3.2: It was noted that several flow batteries have been decommissioned where there was not clear ownership of electrolyte removal. This language is intended to address this issue.*

*16.4.1: Some flow batteries have electrolytes that are not compatible with common fire suppression agents. This is to ensure that compatibility in fire suppression systems is addressed.* 

*16.5.1 and 16.5.2: With flow batteries having large volumes of electrolyte, annunciation for electrolyte in the spill containment system is essential because remediation measures are usually necessary.* 

*16.6.1: The remediation measures for flow batteries in the event of a major incident includes risks associated with managing large volumes of spilled electrolyte. This section is intended to address this risk and any others identified by the HMA. This addition is to address concerns identified by the committee with making Section 9.6.6 not applicable.* 





sources, and potential impact to back-up power of fire protection systems.

4. Operation of Critical radio communications and location tracking systems, with redundant back-up power.

5. Corrosion protection – Corrosive environment protection.

6. Shore connections for Fire Protection systems, including potential flex connections for barge movement with stationary hard piping for the Fire Department Connections.

7. Water application of varying salinity (Salt water, fresh water, brackish) and potential negative effects of saltwater application to equipment.

8. Transformers and transformer related hazards.

9. Thermal management of systems and safety components (temperature control).

10. Impact of stray current from batteries on to marina or responding emergency vessels.

11. Impacts from the full extent of tidal surges on Fire Department response and capabilities.

12. Ship in distress and designation of Captain of Port to take charge during an emergency situation.

A.16.5.2(3) Guidelines and standards are available that cover emergency response considerations and tactics related to these ESS deployments. These include the following:

The NFPA 1405 Guide for Land-Based Fire Departments That Respond to Marine Vessel Fires identifies the elements of a comprehensive marine fire-fighting response program including, but not limited to, vessel familiarization, training considerations, pre-fire planning, and special hazards that enable land-based fire fighters to extinguish vessel fires safely and efficiently. In general, the practices recommended in this publication apply to vessels that are covered by the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) agreement or that call at United States ports. It does not consider offshore terminals or vessels on the high sea.

The NFPA 1005 Standard for Professional Qualifications for Marine Fire Fighting for Land-Based Fire Fighters specifies the minimum job performance requirements for Land-Based Fire Fighters operating at marine fire-fighting incidents. It does not address organization/ management responsibility.

The NFPA 1660 Standard for Emergency, Continuity, and Crisis Management: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery provide fundamental criteria for all-hazards preparedness, response, and resiliency program management; the fundamental criteria for mass evacuation, sheltering, and re-entry program management; and a process for the development of pre-incident plans to assist personnel with safe and effective incident management.

A.16.5.2(4) The NFPA 301 Code for Safety to Life from Fire on Merchant Vessels addresses construction, arrangement, protection, and space utilization factors that are necessary to minimize danger to life from fire, smoke, fumes, or panic. It also provides for reasonable protection against property damage and avoidance of environmental damage consistent with the normal operation of vessels. It also identifies the minimum criteria for the design of egress facilities so as to permit prompt escape of passengers and crew to safe areas aboard vessels and, where necessary, to survival craft embarkation stations.

16.6 Locations, anchoring, and securement

16.6.1\* The locations in which ESS covered by this section are deployed or staged shall be approved by the AHJ.

A.16.6.1 Consideration should be given to the location in which the ESS is to be deployed, or staged prior to deployment so that adequate distance is provided between the ESS and

exposures. In marine deployments nearby marine traffic may represent an exposure or potential risk and should be taken into consideration.

16.6.2 The methods used to anchor or moor the vessel containing the ESS in place shall be approved and provided in accordance with recognized practices, and take into consideration wave action and tidal surges. When vessels/barges are transported and maintained at a Drydock facility for maintenance and inspection, the State of Charge shall be reduced and limited to a minimum of 30%, or lower as per manufacturer's specifications.

16.6.3 An approved fence with a locked gate or other approved barrier shall be provided to keep the general public at least 10 ft (1.5 m) from the outer enclosure of the ESS.

16.7 Electrical connections

16.7.1 Approved temporary or fixed electrical connections shall be permitted to provide power to the electrical loads.

16.7.2\* Temporary or fixed wiring for electrical power connections shall comply with NFPA 70 or equivalent codes or regulations.

A.16.7.2 If power is provided to marine related structures or vessels, marine related electrical regulations may take precedence.

16.7.3 A readily accessible disconnecting means for the ESS shall be provided in accordance with 5.2. Where required by the AHJ, disconnecting means shall be provided that are accessible both on the vessel, and on the shore or structure being supplied.

16.8 Marine environment

16.8.1\* Equipment, wiring, and enclosures shall be suitable for use in the marine environment

A.16.8.1 This requirement is intended to ensure that equipment has sufficient seals, construction, and corrosion resistance to survive the marine environment in which it is used, which may include fresh water or salt water exposures, and potential immersion due to large waves or water spray. Paint protection should follow ISO 12944:2018 "Corrosion protection of steel structures by protective paint systems".

16.8.2 Equipment, wiring and enclosures that have degraded due to exposure to the marine environment shall be repaired or replaced to provide the required protection.

16.9 Smoke and Fire Detection.

16.9.1 Systems used in required smoke and fire detection applications shall be suitable for use in the marine environment in which the vessel is deployed.

16.9.2 Where approved the smoke and fire detection systems that comply with maritime regulations shall be considered equivalent to the protection required by 4.8.

16.10 Fire Control and Suppression.

16.10.1 Systems used in required fire control and suppression applications shall be suitable for use in the marine environment in which the vessel is deployed.

16.10.2 Where approved fire control and suppression systems that comply with maritime regulations shall be considered equivalent to the protection required by 4.8.

16.11 Fire Protection and Construction for Marinas and Boatyards.

The design of Fire Protection systems for Marinas and Boatyards shall be governed by NFPA 303 and NFPA 307. Adequate setbacks and separation distances (or a passive means of protection) shall be provided between the barge/vessel and other barges/vessels or marina buildings and construction when moored.

16.12\* Multi-leveled and Stacked Barges.

A Hazard Mitigation Analysis shall be conducted for Battery Barges utilizing multiple levels, stacked systems, or dedicated use structures of BESS. The HMA shall specifically address the unique impacts of these installation orientations



**Statement:** This new chapter addresses the unique installations on sea worthy barges that is not currently addressed in the standard.





## **Public Input No. 135-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. A.4.4.1 ]**

#### **A.4.4.1**

One form of hazard mitigation analysis (HMA) is a failure mode and effects analysis (FMEA), which is a systematic technique for failure analysis. An FMEA is often the first step of a system reliability study and involves reviewing as many components, assemblies, and subsystems as possible to identify failure modes and their causes and effects. For each component, the failure modes and their resulting effects on the rest of the system are recorded. Other formal methodologies for conducting the analysis can also be used depending on the complexity and type of the system being assessed. Guidance for analysis can be found in the following standards:

- (1) IEC 60812
- (2) IEC 61025
- (3) MIL-STD-1629A

The mixing of lead-acid batteries with nickel-cadmium batteries should not present a risk of adverse interaction. An HMA might not be necessary for these installations.

Many ESS will be provided with safety equipment to meet the requirements of UL 9540, but in some circumstances additional safety equipment might need to be provided over and above what is included with the ESS. For example, an ESS installed indoors might depend upon exhaust ventilation provided with the installation in accordance with 9.6.5.1 to remove gases from the building. In this case, the HMA would need to address possible failures of such a system. It is not the intent of the HMA to evaluate the safety equipment provided as part of a listed ESS unless that equipment is installation dependent as determined by the testing to UL 9540 and UL 9540A.

To clarification of "adverse" see Section 9.4.1.3 and Section 9.6.2.3.

### **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

The two references provide information that clarifies the meaning of adverse.

#### **Submitter Information Verification**



#### **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-25-NFPA 855-2023 The proposed references to 9.4.1.3 and 9.6.2.3 do not describe adverse interactions, but simply give design parameters when technologies are mixed in the same fire area.

**Statement:** There is a need to differentiate between adverse interactions that increase safety risks and those that do not (such as those that may affect only reliability), and thus examples were provided.

## **Public Input No. 136-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. A.4.4.1 ]**

#### **A.4.4.1**

One form of hazard mitigation analysis (HMA) is a failure mode and effects analysis (FMEA), which is a systematic technique for failure analysis. An FMEA is often the first step of a system reliability study and involves reviewing as many components, assemblies, and subsystems as possible to identify failure modes and their causes and effects. For each component, the failure modes and their resulting effects on the rest of the system are recorded. Other formal methodologies for conducting the analysis can also be used depending on the complexity and type of the system being assessed. Guidance for analysis can be found in the following standards:

- (1) IEC 60812
- (2) IEC 61025
- (3) MIL-STD-1629A

The mixing of lead-acid batteries with nickel-cadmium batteries should will not present a risk of adverse interaction. An HMA might is not be necessary for these installations.

Many ESS will be provided with safety equipment to meet the requirements of UL 9540, but in some circumstances additional safety equipment might need to be provided over and above what is included with the ESS. For example, an ESS installed indoors might depend upon exhaust ventilation provided with the installation in accordance with 9.6.5.1 to remove gases from the building. In this case, the HMA would need to address possible failures of such a system. It is not the intent of the HMA to evaluate the safety equipment provided as part of a listed ESS unless that equipment is installation dependent as determined by the testing to UL 9540 and UL 9540A.

## **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

There are no possible safety interactions by mixing these two chemistries. There are life considerations if the float voltage is not compatible with both chemistries, but there will be no safety issues.

#### **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** William Cantor



### **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-25-NFPA 855-2023 The proposed references to 9.4.1.3 and 9.6.2.3 do not describe adverse interactions, but simply give design parameters when technologies are mixed in the same fire area.

**Statement:** There is a need to differentiate between adverse interactions that increase safety risks and those that do not (such as those that may affect only reliability), and thus examples were provided.

Г





# **Public Input No. 245-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. A.4.6.1 ]**

#### **A.4.6.1**

It is envisioned that equipment provided will be listed in accordance with the appropriate test standard ( UL 9540) or an equivalent AHJ approved process by a recognized laboratory . ESS that are not listed in accordance with UL 9540 should be documented and verified as meeting the provisions of this standard using the equivalency requirements in Section 1.5, where technical documentation provided shows the ESS that is proposed results in a system that is no less safe than a system meeting the construction and performance requirements of UL 9540. If nonlisted equipment is to be evaluated for compliance with UL 9540, the evaluation and documentation should be provided as part of a Limited production certification (LPC) process or an AHJ approved field evaluation conducted by an OSHA approved recognized laboratory or third-party certification organization.

In specific instances, this standard will not require equipment such as lead-acid batteries to be listed or they can be listed to UL 1973 instead of UL 9540.

### **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

While the intent of the 855 standard the requirements of the UL 9540 listing is to provide a BESS product that meets this standard through product components and fabrication production that is appropriately evaluated and found acceptable at a production level. This is not consistently happening to provide 9540 listings because of products that are stick built in the field, Products that have multiple fabrications points such as the batteries and modules that are manufactured in Asia, the containers are integrated in South American, and the finishing touches are completed on a clients site in the US. Or certain completed components are not part of the manufacturer's products such as the requirements for a UL listed inverter. Or the Batteries have been repurposed and production pathways are no longer viable to evaluate. Because of these issue production listings are not always achievable through manufacturing, so therefore it doesn't happen. Additional options are and should be available for ensuring a "listing". By providing definitions and clarification around listings, it provides a better compliance options for a system that lacks options for successful compliance.

### **Submitter Information Verification**



## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** The proposed text would provide a pathway to circumvent the required listing.





#### **A.4.6.11**

It is not the intent of 4.6.11 to address the presence of toxic and highly toxic gases-emissions that are produced during abnormal conditions, such as a fire in the building or thermal runaway (see section 9 .6.5.6). C ertain metal oxides, heavy metals, and toxic liquids or particulates that are not gasses may be emitted from various battery types.

## **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

Toxic emissions are not adequately addressed in the current addition of 855. A NFPA 855 Task Group was formed for the evaluation of current toxic code requirements and to provide recommendations for changes to the code. Information on the generation and emission of gases is still limited. The addition of a new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions. Information will be amended based on current research on toxics.

### **Related Public Inputs for This Document**



## group group

group

group

group

group

group

group

group

group

group

group

group

855 Toxics task



Public Input No. 55-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.3.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 56-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] **Submitter Information Verification Submitter Full Name:** Paul Hayes **Organization:** The Hiller Companies/American **Affiliation:** none **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Sat Apr 22 12:08:04 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA **Committee Statement Resolution:** CI-85-NFPA 855-2023 **Statement:** The technical committee is seeking public comment on this for the Second Draft,

> While many ESS technologies use toxic materials and can produce toxic byproducts (particularly during an abnormal event, such as thermal runaway or fire), there is a difference between generation or released and emission. If the toxic species is generated internal to the battery (or by fire suppression system interaction with the ESS) but is consumed internally or is combusted or reacts to form other non-toxic compounds prior to human exposure it is not considered to be "emitted".

Toxic emissions are not adequately addressed in the current addition of 855. Information on the generation and emission of gases is still limited. A new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions.



## **Public Input No. 317-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. A.4.8.1 ]**

#### **A.4.8.1**

Very early warning smoke detection systems can provide an earlier indication of a potential fire with an ESS. Smoke detectors listed to UL 268 7th edition and later are optimized for general commercial applications and are designed to comply with the new cooking nuisance smoke test (Normal Application Smoke Detection). Smoke detectors designated for Special Applications in UL 268 7th edition are designed to be used in applications that require higher sensitivity and that are less likely to be exposed to cooking nuisances. In addition, NFPA 72 permits aspirated smoke detector transport time of up to 120 seconds, consideration should be given to keeping the transport time below 90 seconds for earlier warning. In addition to detectors on the ceiling, consider placing smoke detectors or air sampling ports in the path of airflow within the ESS including within electrical cabinets. Detectors outside of the return air envelope are likely to have a delayed response since the fire will have to grow to such a size that it can overcome the forces of the mechanically generated airflow.

For lithium-ion ESS, a smoke detection system can be supplemented by a listed or approved off-gas detection system. Off-gas detection can increase the effectiveness of the smoke detection system for providing early response of an off-normal condition.

Gas detection technology can also provide additional information on conditions inside the ESS enclosure.

## **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

Provides additional guidance on the changes regarding smoke detector technology and approvals as it relates to ESS. It also emphasizes that the location of and type of smoke detector may impact the transport and response time.

## **Submitter Information Verification**



## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-91-NFPA 855-2023 **Statement:** The appendix language is revised to account for the updates to UL 268.







I






#### **A.9.1.5.1**

# **A**

UL 9540A test or equivalent test should evaluate the fire characteristics of the composition of gases generated at cell level, module level, and unit and installation levels for an indoor installation of an ESS that undergoes thermal runaway, such as what might occur due to a fault, physical damage, or exposure hazard. The evaluation of the fire characteristics during fire vent testing at the unit level and indoor installation level testing should document whether the fire event propagates to the neighboring ESS units and include radiant heat flux measurements at enclosing wall surfaces and at various distances from the ESS being tested at the unit level. **.9.1.5.1** 

The test methodology in UL 9540A determines the capability of a battery technology to undergo thermal runaway and then evaluates the fire and explosion hazard characteristics of those battery energy storage systems that have demonstrated a capability to undergo thermal runaway .

The test sequence in UL 9540A includes, in order, cell, module, unit and installation level tests. If the following individual test results are obtained no further testing in the sequence is needed.

**Cell level test** – Thermal runaway cannot be induced in the cell and the cell vent gas is nonflammable in air in accordance with ASTM E918.

**Module level test** – The effects of thermal runaway are contained by the module design, and cell vent gas (based on the cell level test) is nonflammable

**Unit level test** - All of the following results are obtained:

- (1) Target BESS temperatures less than cell surface temperature at gas venting, and meets the heat flux limits for means of egress.
- (2) Temperature increase of target walls less than 97 °C (175 °F)
- (3) No explosion hazards exhibited by the product
- (4) No flaming beyond outer dimensions of BESS unit (indoor, wall mount)

**Installation level test** – Acceptable performance includes all of the following:

- (1) Target BESS temperatures less than cell surface temperature at gas venting, and meets the heat flux limits for means of egress.
- (2) Temperature increase of target walls less than 97 °C (175 °F)
- (3) The flame indicator does not propagate flames beyond the width of the initiating BESS
- (4) No flaming outside the test room, and meets the heat flux limits for the means of egress.

The data generated by the fire and explosion testing is intended to be used by manufacturers, system designers, and AHJs to determine the need for fire and explosion protection required for an ESS installation.

**Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

This proposal reflects criteria in the scope of UL 9540A, including the individual test performance criteria in Figure 1.1. It also describes the sequence of tests, and results that may allow additional tests in the sequence to not be conducted. **Related Public Inputs for This Document Related Input Relationship** Public Input No. 355-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.1.5.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 366-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.1.5.2.1] **Submitter Information Verification Submitter Full Name:** Howard Hopper **Organization:** UL Solutions **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Thu Jun 01 16:30:33 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA **Committee Statement Resolution:** FR-139-NFPA 855-2023 **Statement:** Since the code assumes compete failure of a unit or cabinets, this will require an ignition source to ignite those technologies that produce combustible gases during 9540A but do not catch fire. Currently an outdoor ESS unit can "pass" UL9540A if no visible flames are observed, however copious quantities of smoke/vent/off-gas may be emanating from the ESS. Based on cell and module level testing we know that this mixture is flammable and often may ignite in which case the fire may be sustained and propagate internally or to adjacent/target units. As these are one-off tests there is an aspect of uncertainty and thus ensuring that the gases released are ignited, if possible, will ensure that the fire propagation hazard is sufficiently evaluated.

# **Public Input No. 37-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. A.9.1.5.1 ]**

#### **A.9.1.5.1**

A UL 9540A test or equivalent test should evaluate the fire characteristics of the composition of both explosive gases generated and toxic and highly toxic emissions at cell level, module level, and unit and installation levels for an indoor installation of an ESS that undergoes thermal runaway, such as what might occur due to a fault, physical damage, or exposure hazard. The evaluation of the fire characteristics during fire vent testing at the unit level and indoor installation level testing should document whether the fire event propagates to the neighboring ESS units and include radiant heat flux measurements at enclosing wall surfaces and at various distances from the ESS being tested at the unit level. The data generated by the fire and explosion testing is intended to be used by manufacturers, system designers, and AHJs to determine the need for fire and explosion protection required for an ESS installation.

### **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

Clarification toxic and highly toxic emissions need to be collected during 9540A testing for evaluation of MAD and Plum studies as well as inclusion of the HMA.

Toxic emissions are not adequately addressed in the current addition of 855. A NFPA 855 Task Group was formed for the evaluation of current toxic code requirements and to provide recommendations for changes to the code. Information on the generation and emission of gases is still limited. The addition of a new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions. Information will be amended based on current research on toxics.

### **Related Public Inputs for This Document**



#### **Relationship**

group Public Input No. 43-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] 855 Toxics task

Public Input No. 44-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] 855 Toxics task

Public Input No. 45-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] 855 Toxics task

Public Input No. 46-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] 855 Toxics task

Public Input No. 47-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.2.3.3] 855 Toxics task

Public Input No. 48-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 15.10] 855 Toxics task

Public Input No. 49-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. C.4.2] 855 Toxics task

Public Input No. 50-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.7.3.7.2] 855 Toxics task

Public Input No. 51-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.11.5] 855 Toxics task

Public Input No. 52-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.11.8.5]

Public Input No. 53-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

Public Input No. 54-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.2 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

Public Input No. 55-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.3.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

Public Input No. 56-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

Public Input No. 36-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. A.4.6.11] 855 Toxics task

Public Input No. 31-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] Public Input No. 32-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] Public Input No. 33-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] Public Input No. 34-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] Public Input No. 35-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 4.6.11] Public Input No. 36-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. A.4.6.11] Public Input No. 38-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. A.9.6.5.1] Public Input No. 39-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.1.2] Public Input No. 40-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 41-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 42-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 43-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 44-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 45-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 46-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 47-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.2.3.3] Public Input No. 48-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 15.10] Public Input No. 49-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. C.4.2] Public Input No. 50-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.7.3.7.2]

group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group group

Public Input No. 51-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.11.5] Public Input No. 52-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.11.8.5] Public Input No. 53-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 54-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.2 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 55-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.3.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 56-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

# **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Paul Hayes **Organization:** The Hiller Companies/American **Affiliation:** none **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Sat Apr 22 12:14:10 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA

## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-139-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** Since the code assumes compete failure of a unit or cabinets, this will require an ignition source to ignite those technologies that produce combustible gases during 9540A but do not catch fire. Currently an outdoor ESS unit can "pass" UL9540A if no visible flames are observed, however copious quantities of smoke/vent/off-gas may be emanating from the ESS. Based on cell and module level testing we know that this mixture is flammable and often may ignite in which case the fire may be sustained and propagate internally or to adjacent/target units. As these are one-off tests there is an aspect of uncertainty and thus ensuring that the gases released are ignited, if possible, will ensure that the fire propagation hazard is sufficiently evaluated.



# **Public Input No. 38-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. A.9.6.5.1 ]**

#### **A.9.6.5.1**

This section addresses hazards associated with the release of flammable gases from ESS during normal charging, discharging, and use conditions. Similar requirements have been in fire codes for many years primarily to address off-gassing of hydrogen from stationary vented leadacid battery systems but not limited to that technology.

This section is not intended to provide protection against the release of flammable gases during abnormal charging or thermal runaway conditions. Those conditions are addressed in 9.6.5.6. In addition, this section does not regulate ventilation of toxic and highly toxic gases emissions , which are regulated by 4.6.11.

# **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

Toxic emissions are not adequately addressed in the current addition of 855. A NFPA 855 Task Group was formed for the evaluation of current toxic code requirements and to provide recommendations for changes to the code. Information on the generation and emission of gases is still limited. The addition of a new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions. Information will be amended based on current research on toxics.

# **Related Public Inputs for This Document**



#### **Relationship**

group group

group

group

group

group

group

group

group

group

group

group

group

group

group

855 Toxics task











#### **A.9.6.5.5**

A component of the thermal runaway protection might be integrated within the ESS battery management system or ESS management system that controls the charging and discharging to keep the ESS within its normal/safe operating limits when that device has been evaluated with the batteries or capacitors as part of the listing to UL 1973 or UL 9540, as applicable. The device might also initiate appropriate hazard mitigation as required elsewhere in this standard when the ESS is in an abnormal state such as overheating or off-gassing.

VRLA battery systems, if abused or neglected for long periods of time, may go into thermal walkaway. This condition is not to be confused with thermal runaway as seen in lithium-ion batteries. Much less heat and combustible gas is produced and is well known. Calculations for hydrgen gassing of lead-acid and nickel-cadmium batteries under thermal walk away conditions are found in IEEE 1635/ASHRAE 21. This is referenced in UL 1973. Thermal walkaway in VRLA batteries is typically prevented by use of temperature compensated charging. Even though a VRLA may occassionally go into thermal walkaway, no flame is produced. Melting of the jar container may occur, but no fire is instigated for VRLA batteries listed to UL 1973.

### **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

There is a need to clarify misconceptions regarding aqueous battery thermal "runaway" Thermal walkaway can occur in aqueous batteries, but happens in most cases because of abuse or neglect and takes months/years to develop. It is easily controlled with temperature compensation charging and/or recommended maintenance. In contrast, thermal runaway is usually a very fast occurring process with limited or no warning and cannot be prevented at least at the individual cell level. The quantities of heat and combustible gasses produced by a lithium-ion thermal runaway event are orders of magnitude greater than those produced by an aqueous battery thermal walkaway.

#### **Submitter Information Verification**



#### **Committee Statement**

#### **Resolution:** FR-79-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** There is a need to clarify misconceptions regarding aqueous battery thermal "runaway" Thermal walkaway can occur in aqueous batteries, but happens in most cases because of abuse or neglect and takes months/years to develop. It is easily controlled with temperature compensation charging and/or recommended maintenance. In contrast, thermal runaway is usually a very fast occurring process with limited or no warning and cannot be prevented at least at the individual cell level. The quantities of heat and

combustible gasses produced by a lithium-ion thermal runaway event are orders of magnitude greater than those produced by an aqueous battery thermal walkaway.



#### **A.9.6.5.6**

During failure conditions such as thermal runaway, fire, and abnormal faults, some ESS, in particular electrochemical batteries and capacitors, begin off-gassing flammable and toxic gases, which can include mixtures of CO, H2, ethylene, methane, benzene, HF, HCl, and HCN. Among other things, these gases present an explosion hazard that needs to be mitigated. Explosion control is provided to mitigate this hazard.

Both the exhaust ventilation requirements of 9.6.5.1 and the explosion control requirements of 9.6.5.6 are designed to mitigate hazards associated with the release of flammable gases in battery rooms, ESS cabinets, and ESS walk-in units. The difference is that exhaust ventilation is intended to provide protection for flammable gases released during normal charging and discharging of battery systems since some electrochemical ESS technologies such as vented lead-acid batteries release hydrogen when charging.

In comparison, the 9.6.5.6 provisions are designed to provide protection for electrochemical ESS during an abnormal condition, such as thermal runaway, which can be instigated by physical damage, overcharging, short circuiting, and overheating of technologies such as lithium-ion batteries, which do not release detectable amounts of flammable gas during normal charging and discharging but can release significant quantities of flammable gas during a thermal event.

VRLA battery systems, if abused or neglected for long periods of time, may go into thermal walkaway. This condition is not to be confused with thermal runaway as seen in lithium-ion batteries. Much less heat and gas is produced (see IEEE 1635/ASHRAE 21) so explosion control is not needed. Safety concerns are covered by ventilation requirements in 9.6.5.1. Thermal walkaway in VRLA batteries is typically prevented by use of temperature compensated charging.

### **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

Explosion control has never been an issue with lead-acid or nickel-cadmium batteries. If ventilation requirements as outlined in 9.6.1 are ignored, then a possible explosive situation could develop over time. However, requiring specific explosion control or deflagration equipment is not necessary.

#### **Submitter Information Verification**



#### **Committee Statement**



technologies change the requirements for no propagation between systems will apply to any BESS configuration.

# **Public Input No. 74-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. A.9.6.5.6.3 ]**

#### **A.9.6.5.6.3**

The requirement recognizes that with some cabinet designs that have low internal volume, the application of NFPA 68 or of NFPA 69 might not be practical. It is possible that a quantitative explosion analysis is necessary to show there is no threat to life and safety. For example, the cabinet design might be installed such that any overpressure due to ignition of gases and vapors released from cells in thermal runaway within the enclosure are released to the exterior of the enclosure. There should be no uncontrolled release of overpressure of the enclosure. All debris, shrapnel, or pieces of the enclosure ejected from the system should be controlled. The UL 9540A unit level and installation level test identified in 9.1.5 will provide the test data referenced in 9.6.5.6.3, which is necessary for verification of the adequacy of the engineered deflagration safety of the cabinet.

While NFPA 68 has been an approved method for explosion mitigation it is no longer a singular approved method, it may be provided as a supplement of NFPA 69 solutions in certain high-risk applications. If it is used as a supplementary explosion control option, then 9.6.5.6.4 would be required as a large-scale test. NFPA 68 applies to the design, location, installation, maintenance, and use of devices and systems that vent the combustion gases and pressures resulting from a deflagration within an enclosure so that structural and mechanical damage is minimized, and provides criteria for design, installation, and maintenance of deflagration vents and associated components. NFPA 68 does not apply to detonations. Hydrogen accumulation in a confined space can lead to a detonation. For that reason, the combustion gases generated during the cell, module, and installation level testing under UL 9540A must be used when applying a NFPA 68 solution. Where the likelihood for detonation exists, alternative solutions such as those in NFPA 69 automatic door opening systems should be considered.

NFPA 69 applies to the design, installation, operation, maintenance, and testing of systems for the prevention of explosions in enclosures that contain flammable concentrations of flammable gases, vapors, mists, dusts, or hybrid mixtures by means of the following methods:

- (1) Control of oxidant concentration
- (2) Control of combustible concentration
- (3) Pre-deflagration detection and control of ignition sources
- (4) Explosion suppression
- (5) Active isolation
- (6) Passive isolation
- (7) Deflagration pressure containment
- (8) Passive explosion suppression

Combustible gas concentration reduction can be a viable mitigation strategy for possible accumulation of flammable gases during abnormal conditions for lithium-ion batteries. Gas detection and appropriate interlocks can be used based on appropriate evaluation under an NFPA 69 deflagration hazard study. NFPA 69 allows concentration to exceed 25 percent LFL but not more than 60 percent with reliable gas detection and exhaust interlocks as demonstrated by a safety integrity level (SIL) 2 instrumented safety system rating.

Data on flammable gas composition and release rates, such as that included in UL 9540A fire and explosion testing, provide the information needed to design effective explosion control systems.

# **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

NFPA 855 Explosion Control Task group recommendations - Removal of NFPA 68 as in option in 9.6.5.6.3 requires additional clarification and modification in the annex. Information added that still allows NFPA 68 as an supplementary option to NFPA 69 solutions.

# **Related Public Inputs for This Document**

Public Input No. 64-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.8] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 65-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 66-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 67-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 4.2.1.3] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 70-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.1.5.1.2] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 71-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.1.1] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 72-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.1.2] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 73-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.3] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 75-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.4] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 76-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.5] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 77-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.6] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 78-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.9] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 79-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.7] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 80-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.8] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 81-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

Public Input No. 82-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.2 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

Public Input No. 83-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.3.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

Public Input No. 84-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.3.2.6 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

Public Input No. 85-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.5.6.7] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 64-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.8] Public Input No. 65-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] Public Input No. 66-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] Public Input No. 67-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 4.2.1.3] Public Input No. 70-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.1.5.1.2] Public Input No. 71-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.1.1]

**Related Input Relationship Group Group Group Group Group Group Group Group Group** Group **Group Group Group Group** 855 Explosion Task **Group** 855 Explosion Task **Group** 855 Explosion Task **Group** 

> 855 Explosion Task **Group**

> **Group**



## **Submitter Information Verification**



### **Committee Statement**

# **Resolution:** FR-109-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** The Technical Committee reaffirms the acceptance of TIA 20-2

This revision:

1) clarifies the exempt report requirements and adds standards as a condition of , and clarifies the application to ESS walk-in units and ESS cabinets It eliminates the reference to UL 1973 as a qualifier since it does not prevent the hazard.

2) For A9.6.5.6: Explosion control has never been an issue with lead-acid or nickelcadmium batteries. If ventilation requirements as outlined in 9.6.1 are ignored, then a possible explosive situation could develop over time. However, requiring specific explosion control or deflagration equipment is not necessary.

3) For 9.6.5.6.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

4) For 9.6.5.6.1.1: This is a clarification for abnormal conditions. The revision also removes deflagration venting as this is a subset of explosion control.

5) For 9.6.5.6.1.2: Uninterruptable was corrected as a typo. item 4 was deleted with better clarification of Item 5. This adds clarifying conditions that support the exclusion of selected technologies by identifying the standards of IEEE 1635 and ASHRAE 21. It makes the conditions of exception more stringent. Safe is removed as it is not defined.

6) For 9.6.5.6.13: The standard does not identify how the gas composition and volume of a thermal runaway event is to be determined for the purpose of use in and NFPA 68 or NFPA 69 solution.

7) For 9.6.5.6.3: This change removes multiple area designations as they just cause confusion especially as technologies change. The requirement is simplified to apply to all ESS. The option for NFPA 68 compliance is removed as for large scale gas deflagrations, they have not shown to be effective at mitigating the pressure release.

8) For A.9.6.5.6.3: Removal of NFPA 68 as in option in 9.6.5.6.3 requires additional clarification and modification in the annex. Information was added that still allows NFPA 68 as a supplementary option to NFPA 69 solutions.

9) For 9.6.5.6.4: The adds the new defined term of registered designed professional. NFPA 68 is not viable as a standalone option. These requirements are reversed so that the design and testing per 9.1.5 comes first, and based on that the AHJ could approve forgoing NFPA 69.

10) For 9.6.5.6.5: An explosion of a "box in a box" was edited to clarify and explain this concept.

11) For 9.6.5.6.6: This section is no longer needed with edits in prior sections. Explosion requirements for a box in a box have been updated.

12) For 9.6.5.6.7: Clarity has been added for standby power tied to the new Section 4.10. and for locations that a failed condition must be annunciated for first responder protection. Additional sections were added for the survivability evaluation of the NFPA 69 system; interaction requirements between suppression system; and NFPA 69 system and inspection requirements.

13) For 9.6.5.6.8: NFPA 68 and explosion panels are not a viable option for explosion mitigation in duct work and HVAC system internal to a BESS which creates a box in a box type deflagration.

14) For 9.6.5.8.9: This simplifies from BESS specific configurations to only BESS. As technologies change the requirements for no propagation between systems will apply to any BESS configuration.



vibration in the design of the flywheel mounting so that they do not create stress on the bearings.







**Public Input No. 212-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. A.13.2.12 ]**

#### **A.13.2.12**

Parts or other debris from catastrophic failure of a flywheel could damage adjacent flywheels or energy storage systems if the housing does not fully contain the failure*.* Annex note 13.2.8 references two containment measures, housing containment or stringent rotor screening in production. Containment of a rotor burst within the primary flywheel housing means that no primary or secondary particles leave the space defined by the housing if the rotor ruptures. The risk of rotor rupture can be greatly mitigated by ensuring that the rotor design and its materials prevent rapid propagation of any cracks that could result in a sudden rupture. Or, alternatively, the risk of rotor rupture can be greatly mitigated with controls, if the design and monitoring system make the cracked condition detectable before a rupture can occur. Risk mitigation can be realized with stringent production controls put in place to verify that each rotor and its material meet the requirements needed to prevent sudden rupture. The production controls generally include regular destructive sampling of actual production pieces and subjecting them to ASTM or other standard tests to verify actual physical properties, and 100% non-destructive testing (ultrasound and surface inspections) of production rotors.

# **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

Substantiation: The size and separation requirements of 9.4.2 are shown as N/A in table 13.2. Also, UL 9540 deals with design, securement, and containment of flywheels in the event of a fault. Such barriers should not be necessary with proper design, securement, and containment.

# **Related Public Inputs for This Document**



# **Submitter Information Verification**



# **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** The proposed wording does not provide sufficient clarity to the requirements and would

be difficult to enforce. The task group will continue to work on this section to improve the language including separation and quality control for inclusion in the Second Draft.



In the case of some batteries, electrolyte is managed at site and provisions for eye wash stations and safety showers should be considered in addition to protective clothing. Lead acid and flow batteries may have electrolyte added after installation.

This Public Input was submitted by the Flow Battery Task Group TG20.

## **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Steve Edley **Organization:** NFPA 855 Task Group 20 **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Mon May 08 19:28:21 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA

### **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-7-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** In the case of some batteries, electrolyte is managed at site and provisions for eye wash stations and safety showers should be considered in addition to protective clothing. Lead acid and flow batteries may have electrolyte added after installation.



# **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Michael O`Brian **Organization:** Code Savvy Consultants **Street Address:**



# **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-10-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** This revision provides the combination of annex text similar to other chemistries.

Г

٦













# **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-8-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** The last sentence has been deleted because it does not describe a hazard.


desire to be recognized multiple tables in the standard. These changes in appendix B is intended to add the technology to clarify and support these new technologies in the tables. The task group heard 7 presentations from various manufacturers and evaluated the submitted information through the open task group process. **Related Public Inputs for This Document Related Input Relationship** Public Input No. 181-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 1.3 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 181-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 1.3 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] **Submitter Information Verification Submitter Full Name:** Michael O`Brian **Organization:** Code Savvy Consultants **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Tue May 30 04:46:39 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA **Committee Statement Resolution:** FR-9-NFPA 855-2023 **Statement:** These changes address the changing use of lithium metal batteries in ESS systems as the technologies grow

Г









**Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-195-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** This revision provides the combination of annex text similar to other chemistries. The technical committee is looking for information through the code development process for the Second Draft to further clarify the new technologies.







# **Comparison of Fire Suppression Techniques on Lithium-Ion Battery Pack Fires**

Wei Tang<sup>1</sup> · Liming Yuan<sup>1</sup> · Richard Thomas<sup>1</sup> · John Soles<sup>1</sup>

Received: 5 December 2022 / Accepted: 25 April 2023

This is a U.S. Government work and not under copyright protection in the US; foreign copyright protection may apply 2023

#### **Abstract**

Lithium-ion battery pack fires pose great hazards to the safety and health of miners. A detailed experimental study has been conducted at the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) Pittsburgh Mining Research Division (PMRD) to investigate the effectiveness of different fire suppression systems on Li-ion battery pack fire extinguishment. Tests were conducted in a well-ventilated container. Two sizes of battery packs  $(12 \text{ V}, 24 \text{ V})$  were heated by heater strips to trigger thermal runaway and fire. Water mist with different flow rates, ABC powder, type D dry chemical, and water mist with F500 additives were used as the fire suppression agents. Multiple thermocouples were installed on the battery packs to measure the temperature evolution during the tests. The results indicated that the water mist with F500 additives is the most effective suppressant among the agents tested. Dry chemicals, however, do quench the fire for a moment, but cannot prevent re-ignition of the battery since they do not provide enough cooling. The findings of this paper can be used to develop safer battery fire suppression techniques in mining environments.

**Keywords** Lithium-ion battery  $\cdot$  Fire suppression  $\cdot$  Water mist  $\cdot$  Dry chemical

## 1 Introduction

As an important alternative to fossil fuels, lithium-ion (Liion) batteries have seen their applications growing from consumer electronic products to large electric vehicles. In the mining industry, Li-ion battery powered electric vehicles (BEVs) are believed to be a promising replacement for diesel-powered vehicles whose emission of diesel particulate matter (DPM) is a major concern to the safety and health of miners  $[1]$ . The introduction of BEVs into the mining industry has not been trouble-free as the potential use of Liion BEVs in gassy underground mines escalates the fire and explosion risks [1]. Methane-air mixtures are found in many types of mines, and the energy released by a Li-ion battery during thermal runaway or accidents resulting in fire can be an ignition source for such mixtures  $[2, 3]$ . A safer and more reliable design and application of Li-ion BEVs could help reduce and mitigate the risk of fire and explosion accidents underground. The size of a battery pack fire can be indicated by the heat release rate (HRR). Wang et al. [4] used cone calorimetry tests and found that the peak HRR and total heat release increase with state of charge of the battery. Most of the HRR measurement of battery fires used the oxygen consumption theory  $[5, 6]$ .

While preventing the fire and explosion of Li-ion batteries from occurring is necessary, suppression of such incidents when they occur is just as vital  $[7, 8]$ . In a mining environment where fire suppression resources are limited, an effective battery fire suppression technique is critical to the safety and health of miners. Numerous studies have been conducted to investigate the effectiveness of traditional fire suppression techniques on battery or battery pack fires. Unlike traditional fire suppression, battery fire suppression requires extensive cooling even after the fire is visually quenched  $[9-12]$ to reduce battery temperature and prevent re-ignition due to chemical reactions inside the batteries. Liu et al. [13] found that water mist can well control the thermal runaway of a battery by cooling the battery below a certain critical temperature. Larsson et al. [14] reported that the effectiveness of water mist on battery fire suppression is not obvious, and that hydrogen fluoride concentration increased after the application of water mist. Blum et al. [15] conducted large-scale

 $\boxtimes$  Wei Tang Ope0@cdc.gov

 $\mathbf{1}$ Pittsburgh Mining Research Division, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, 626 Cochrans Mill Road, Pittsburgh, PA 15236, USA



b. Top view of measurement on battery pack

Fig. 1 Battery fire suppression test setup

Table 1 Test conditions

Test number	Battery size	Agent
	12 V	Free burn
2	12V	Water mist, 3 GPM
3	12V	Dry chemical
4	24 V	Free burn
5	24 V	Water mist, 3 GPM
6	24 V	Dry chemical
	12 V	Water mist, 1 GPM
8	12 V	Water mist, 2 GPM
9	12 V	Water mist 3 GPM with F500 additive

battery fire suppression tests and noticed that a large amount of water is needed to extinguish BEV fires. Research on effective fire suppression technique for small and large battery pack fires in a mining environment is limited.

In this work, detailed experimental research was conducted to investigate the effectiveness of different fire suppression systems on Li-ion battery pack fires. Two sizes of Nickel/Manganese/Cobalt (NMC) Li-ion battery packs and five fire suppression systems were chosen. Results of the fire suppression tests will be discussed and compared.

#### 2 Experiments

Experiments were conducted within an open-ended shipping container (12.2-m length by 2.4-m width by 2.9-m height) located at the Pittsburgh Mining Research Division. Two types of Li-ion battery packs were used for the tests: a 12 V, 30Ah battery pack composed of 36 NMC cylindrical 18,650 batteries and a 24 V, 40Ah battery pack composed of 72 NMC cylindrical 18,650 batteries. Two 750-W electric-controlled metal heater strips with dimensions of  $45 \text{ cm} \times 3.8 \text{ cm} \times 0.8 \text{ cm}$  (length  $\times$  width  $\times$  thickness) were placed under the battery packs to induce thermal runaway. K-type thermocouples were attached on the battery pack to measure the battery temperature (as shown in Fig. 1). Several fire suppression systems were used for the tests. Each used a flow controller and suppression spray placed 0.5 m above the battery pack. Video cameras were used to record the fire and suppression behaviors.

The battery tests included free burn and the use of fire suppression agents: water mist  $(1, 2, 3)$  gallon per minute (GPM) and 3 GPM with F500 additive), ABC powder, and type D sodium chloride (NaCl) dry chemical. During the tests, the battery pack was placed on the two electric heater strips to induce a thermal runaway and trigger a fire. Timing information for the first visible release of smoke and fire was noted. Electrical heating was turned off after the first jet of fire was observed; suppression, if used, was initiated at the same time. Table 1 summarizes the test conditions. Fire and smoke behaviors were observed and noted throughout the tests. A low-speed ventilation  $({\sim}0.5 \text{ m/s})$  was applied to clear the smoke and gases.

#### **3 Results and Discussion**

With temperature measurements, comparisons were made between the free burn case and the suppression cases with distinctions drawn after suppression was applied to the battery pack fire.

#### 3.1 Free Burn versus Water Suppression

Test 1 is the free burn case where no suppression was applied. In this case, smoke was observed to release at about 3.5 min after heating started, and the flame started at about 10 min. The explosion and fire continued for about 8 min before the battery pack burnout. During the test, it was observed that some of the batteries exploded and ejected from the pack, which is a potential ignition source for other combustibles nearby. Figure 2 shows the four sequences



Fig. 2 Four sequences of free burn of a 12 V battery pack fire (a smoke starts, b flame starts, c explosion, d burnout)



Fig. 3 Three sequences of water mist suppression of a 12 V battery pack (a flame starts, b water suppression starts, c extinguishment)

of the free burn for the battery pack starting from smoke emission to battery burnout. As shown in the images, most of the batteries were completely burned out. However, it is worthwhile to note that some of the batteries were not burned even after the test was over due to the explosion and shootout behaviors. Some temperature measurements of the batteries were invalid due to the shootout behavior.

Test 2 is the water mist suppression with 3 GPM flow rate. In this case, smoke was observed to release at about 3 min after heating started, and the flame started at about 10 min. Heaters were unplugged at about 10.5 min. Water suppression started at about 13.5 min when the flame was fully established. Water suppression was turned off at about 16.5 min and the battery pack fire was completely extinguished. Re-examination of the battery pack after the test revealed that 8 batteries fully burned or exploded, but 28 of the batteries were partially burned or remained intact. There was no re-ignition after the battery fire was extinguished. Figure 3 shows the sequences of the water mist fire suppression

Temperatures were compared between the free burn of a 12V battery pack and a burn with water suppression. Figure 4 shows the temperature history of two temperature measurements. The two vertical dashed lines represent the water suppression period. It was observed from Figure 4 that battery temperatures of the free burn tests were much higher than the water mist suppression tests. In the free burn case, batteries went into thermal runaway and caught fire with sharp increases in battery temperatures. In the water suppression case, after water suppression was applied, the two thermocouple temperatures quickly dropped and remained below 200°C for the rest of the test. No re-ignition was observed. The cooling effect of water suppression was probably the key in containing the fire and preventing re-ignition.



Fig. 4 Temperature comparison of free burn and water mist suppression



Fig. 5 The sequences of NaCl dry chemical suppression (a flame starts, b suppression starts, c battery fire quenched, d re-ignition and explosion)

#### 3.2 Free Burn versus Dry Chemical Suppression

Test 3 is a fire suppression case with type D dry chemical. In this case, the battery fire started at about 10.5 min after heating. The suppressant was discharged at 12.5 min and lasted for about 45 s before the suppressant was depleted. The battery pack was buried under the dry chemical, and the fire visually disappeared as shown in Fig. 5 c. Shortly after the fire was quenched, re-ignition occurred, then the explosion followed. The battery fire continued until burnout. In this case, the dry chemical was able to quench the fire temporarily but failed to extinguish the fire completely.

The temperatures were compared between the free burn of a 12V battery pack and a burn with type D NaCl dry chemical suppression. Figure  $6$  shows the temperature history of two temperature measurements. The two vertical dashed lines represent the dry chemical suppression period. For the suppression case, it was observed that after suppression was

applied, battery temperatures had a noticeable drop before they went up again due to re-ignition. In this case, the lack of cooling effect afforded by the dry chemical application probably played a major role in the re-ignition as the chemical reactions inside the battery continued despite external flame quenching and air exclusion.

#### 3.3 Large Size Battery Pack

Test 4 is a free burn of a large battery pack (24V), test 5 is a water mist suppression case of the large battery pack (24V) fire with 3 GPM flow rate, and test 6 is the ABC dry chemical suppression case of the large battery pack  $(24V)$  fire. Figure 7 shows the comparison of free burn with water mist suppression and ABC dry chemical suppression regarding battery temperatures. The vertical dashed lines in both figures represent the suppression period. In the water mist suppression case (Fig.  $7a$ ), the application of water



Fig. 6 Temperature comparison of free burn and dry chemical suppression



Fig. 7 Comparison of free burn of large size battery pack with suppressions: a 3 GPM water mist suppression, b ABC powder suppression

slowed the heating, but fire and explosion occurred during the suppression period. The 3 GPM water mist failed to suppress the fire of large size battery pack. In the ABC dry chemical suppression case (Fig. 7b), the initial application put out the flame temporarily, but battery temperatures still climbed slowly and eventually fire and explosion followed. The dry chemical also failed to contain and suppress the large battery pack fire.

#### 3.4 The Effect of Water Mist Flow Rate

Different flow rates of water mist suppression were also used to study their impact on the small battery pack fire. Test 7 used water mist at 1 GPM, test 8 used water mist at 2 GPM, and test 9 used water mist at 3 GPM with F500 additive. In all three of these tests, water mist suppression started when the first explosion was observed. Four thermocouple data were plotted to demonstrate the battery temperature evolution against the time, shown in Figure 8. It was observed that



Fig. 8 The effect of water mist flow rate on suppression



water mist of all three flow rates can contain and suppress the small size battery fire without re-ignition. The 3 GPM flow rate with F500 additive might be the most effective since the drop in temperature was the quickest and most significant decrease.

## **4 Conclusions**

Battery pack fire suppression tests were conducted at the NIOSH Pittsburgh Mining Research Division as part of its continual effort to develop workplace solutions to reduce the risk of mine disasters and mine workers' risk of injuries and fatalities. Water mist with different flow rates and/or additives, type D NaCl, and dry chemical ABC powder were used to study their effectiveness in Li-ion battery pack fire suppression. The results indicated that water mist can suppress a small battery pack fire, and its cooling effect prevents re-ignition from occurring. Water mist suppression with F500 as an additive can better suppress the fire. Type D NaCl and dry chemical ABC powder fire suppressants could quench the battery pack fire temporarily but failed to cool the battery, and re-ignition occurred. The results from this study can be used to develop an improved Li-ion battery pack fire suppression system for a mining environment.

Acknowledgements Data from this manuscript have been presented at the 2023 SME Annual Conference & Expo, February  $26 - \text{March}$ 1, Denver, Colorado.

#### **Declarations**

Disclaimer The findings and conclusions in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Mention of any company or product does not constitute endorsement by NIOSH.

## **References**

1. Dubaniewicz TH, Zlochower I, Barone T, Thomas R, Yuan L (2021) Thermal runaway pressures of iron phosphate lithiumion cells as a function of free space. Metallurgy  $&$  Exploration 38:539-547. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42461-020-00349-9

- Dubaniewicz TH, DuCarme JP (2013) Are lithium-ion cells intrin-2. sically safe? IEEE Trans. Ind Appl 49:2451-2460
- 3. Dubaniewicz TH, DuCarme JP (2016) Internal short circuit and accelerated rate calorimetry tests of lithium-ion cells: Considerations for methane-air intrinsic safety and explosion proof/flameproof protection methods. J Loss Prev Process Ind 43:575-584
- $4.$ Wang Z, Ouyang D, Chen M, Wang X, Zhang Z, Wang J (2019) Fire behavior of lithium-ion battery with different states of charge induced by high incident heat fluxes, Journal of Thermal Analysis and Calorimetry 136 2239-2247
- 5. Chen M, Liu J, Dongxu O, Cao S, Wang Z, Wang J (2018) A simplified analysis to predict the fire hazard of primary lithium battery. Appl Sci 8:2329. https://doi.org/10.3390/app8112329
- 6 Fu Y, Lu S, Li K, Liu C, Cheng X, Zhang H (2015) An experimental study on burning behaviors of 18650 lithium ion batteries using a cone calorimeter. J Power Sources 273:216-222. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.jpowsour.2014.09.039
- 7. Wang Q, Li K, Wang Y, Chen H, Duan Q, Sun J (2018) The efficiency of dodecafluoro-2-methylpentan-3-one on suppressing the lithium ion battery fire. J Electrochem Energy Conversion Storage 15:041001
- Wang Q, Mao B, Stoliarov SI, Sun J (2019) A review of lithium 8. ion battery failure mechanisms and fire prevention strategies. Prog Energy Combust Sci 73:95-131
- $\mathbf{Q}$ Luo WT, Zhu SB, Gong JH, Zhou Z (2018) Research and development of fire extinguishing technology for power lithium batteries. Procedia Eng 211:531-537
- 10. Liu Y, Duan Q, Xu J, Chen H, Lu W, Wang Q (2018) Experimental study on the efficiency of dodecafluoro-2-methylpentan-3-one on suppressing lithium-ion battery fires. RSC Adv 8:42223-42232
- 11. Li Y, Yu D, Zhang S (2015) A typical lithium-ion battery fire extinguishing test. Journal of safety and environment 15(6):120-125
- 12. Cui Y, Liu J (2021) Research progress of water mist fire extinguishing technology and its application in battery fires. Process Saf Environ Prot 149:559-574
- $13.$ Liu T, Liu Y, Wang X, Kong X, Li G (2019) Cooling control of thermally-induced thermal runaway in 18,650 lithium ion battery with water mist. Energy Convers Manag 199:111969
- 14. Larsson F, Andersson P, Blomqvist P, Loren A, Mellander B-E (2014) Characteristics of lithium-ion batteries during fire tests. J Power Sources 271:414-420
- 15. Blum A, Long R (2015) Full-abs," SAE Int. J Passeng Cars Mech Syst 8(2):565-572. https://doi.org/10.4271/2015-01-1383

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



(4) Ventilation

## **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

Toxic emissions are not adequately addressed in the current addition of 855. A NFPA 855 Task Group was formed for the evaluation of current toxic code requirements and to provide recommendations for changes to the code. Information on the generation and emission of gases is still limited. The addition of a new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions. Information will be amended based on current research on toxics.

## **Related Public Inputs for This Document**



#### **Relationship**

group group group group group group group





## **Submitter Information Verification**



## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-55-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** This revision includes the danger of highly toxic emissions for which fire fighters and first responders need to be aware. These are industry accepted technical terms with definitions for both.

# **Public Input No. 331-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. C.5.1 ]**

#### **C.5.1** Lithium-Ion (Li-ion) Batteries.

Water or water with a water addtive, Ecnpasulating Agent (EA), is considered the preferred agent for suppressing lithium-ion battery fires. Water has superior cooling capacity, is plentiful (in many areas), and is easy to transport to the seat of the fire. While water or water with an Encapsulating Agent (EA) might be the agent agents of choice, the module/cabinet configuration could make penetration of water difficult for cooling the area of origin, but might still be effective for containment. Water spray has been deemed safe as an agent for use on high-voltage systems. The possibility of current leakage back to the nozzle, and ultimately the firefighter, is insignificant based on testing data published in the Fire Protection Research Foundation report *Best Practices for Emergency Response to Incidents Involving Electric Vehicles Battery Hazards: A Report on Full-Scale Testing Results*. Firefighting foams are not considered to be effective for these chemistries because they lack the ability to cool sufficiently and can conduct electricity. There is also some evidence that foams might actually encourage thermal runaway progression by insulating the burning materials and exacerbating heat rise.

Firefighting dry chemical powders can eliminate visible flame. However, they also lack the ability to cool burning battery components. Quite often, even if visible flame is removed, the thermal runaway inside the battery will continue resulting in reignition. Carbon dioxide and inert gas suppressing agents will also eliminate visible flame but will likely not provide sufficient cooling to interrupt the thermal runaway process. ESS with clean agent suppression systems installed have ventilation systems that are tied in with the fire detection and control panel so that the HVAC shuts down and dampers close to ensure the agents have sufficient hold times at the proper concentration levels to be effective suppressants. In some fire suppression systems, the HVAC recirculates and does not shut down and provides a means of dispersing the clean agents. Responders must ensure adequate hold time has occurred prior to accessing battery room/container. Manufacturer-recommended times should be made clear. These agents might also reduce flammability by suppressing oxygen levels, but data has identified that flammable gases will continue to be produced due to the continued heating and could create an environment ripe for flashover or backdraft when oxygen is reintroduced into the system.

## **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

While water is a good agent to fight Lithium-Ion battery fires, copious amounts of plain water are needed. Water with a water additive Encapsulating Agent (EA) has been shown to be more effective, with less water usage and run off than plain water, on controlling LIB fires.

## **Submitter Information Verification**



## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** This is presented as a technical fact and thus the proposed text reads more like a sales/marketing statement than a technical rationalization. Additional technical documentation, large scale fire testing, and proper testing results need to be presented. This should include testing in a loaded rack configuration with close module spacing.



#### **F.2.2** 2000 International Code Council Codes.

The targeted regulation of stationary lead-acid battery systems that began with the 1997 *Uniform Fire Code* was carried forward as the three legacy model code organizations merged as the International Code Council and completed work on the development of, among others, the 2000 *International Fire Code* and 2000 *International Building Code*. The topics covered were as follows:

- (1) Safety venting
- (2) Room design and construction
- (3) Spill control and neutralization
- (4) Ventilation
- (5) Signs
- (6) Seismic protection
- (7) Smoke detection

The threshold for application was reduced to 50 gal (190 L)and the 20 gal (75 L) per battery limitation was eliminated compared to the 1997 UFC. In addition, the *International Building Code* classified the battery storage as incidental use areas and added an exemption from the high-hazard use classification.

The purpose of the requirements was to provide for relief for certain battery system applications from being designated a high-hazard occupancy due to the amount of hazardous materials that were contained within the batteries. In practice, if a stationary lead-acid battery system satisfies these requirements then the facility containing those batteries is not regulated as a hazardous material occupancy and would not be designated a high-hazard use. That said, if the hazardous material maximum allowable quantities (MAQ) relative to the amount of electrolyte was exceeded then the battery system would result in a hazardous material classification.

The requirements for stationary lead-acid battery systems were brought into the 2000 *International Fire Code* as Section 608 with the topics listed in F.2.2 addressed. For room design and construction, the user was pointed to the 2000 *International Building Code* where the battery systems were identified as an incidental use area and required to be separated from the remainder of the occupancy by fire resistance rated assemblies.

As with the 1997 UFC, the topics addressed were based upon normal operation. Overcharging, thermal runaway, or other abnormal operating conditions were not considered or recognized at the time.

#### **F.2.3** 2003 International Code Council Codes and NFPA 1, *Fire Code*.

In Section 608 of the 2003 *International Fire Code*, the scope of lead-acid battery systems was changed to lead-acid battery systems using vented (flooded) lead-acid batteries. A new Section 609 was added to the IFC covering valve-regulated lead-acid battery systems and contained similar language. The requirements in the 2003 *International Building Code* remained the same applying to lead-acid batteries generally.

Section 608 vented (flooded) lead-acid batteries covered the following:

- (1) Safety venting
- (2) Room design and construction
- (3) Spill control and neutralization
- (4) Ventilation
- (5) Signs
- (6) Seismic protection
- (7) Smoke detection

Section 609 valve-regulated lead-acid battery systems covered the following:

- (1) Safety venting
- (2) Thermal runaway
- (3) Room design and construction
- (4) Spill control and neutralization
- (5) Ventilation
- (6) Cabinet ventilation
- (7) Signs
- (8) Seismic protection
- (9) Smoke detection

It should be noted that NFPA 1, *Fire Code*, did not have any requirements for stationary storage battery systems in the 2000 edition. The requirements were added to the 2003 edition of NFPA 1 from the same source used for the 2000 edition of the *International Fire Code*, the *Uniform Fire Code*, along with the added coverage of valve-regulated lead-acid batteries. The NFPA 1, *Fire Code*, battery storage provisions then remained unchanged until the 2009 edition.

**F.2.4** 2006 International Code Council Codes and NFPA 1, *Fire Code*.

In the 2006 edition of the *International Fire Code* (IFC), Section 608 was rewritten to cover the following:

- (1) Flooded lead-acid batteries
- (2) Flooded nickel-cadmium (Ni-Cad) batteries
- (3) Valve-regulated lead-acid (VRLA) batteries
- (4) Lithium-ion batteries

This edition of the IFC signaled a recognition for and the introduction of new chemistries such as nickel-cadmium and lithium-ion batteries.

The same general topics were covered in the revisions to the 2003 IFC that were implemented as the 2006 IFC, including the need for a separate room or space created in accordance with the building code. That said, beyond the separate room, only the IFC signage, seismic protection, and smoke detection requirements applied to the lithium-ion batteries. Figure F.2.4 provides the overview of the 2006 IFC provisions.

#### **Figure F.2.4 2006 International Fire Code Battery Requirements.** *(Source: 2006 International Fire Code.)*



There were no changes made between the 2003 and the 2006 edition of NFPA 1, *Fire Code*. As such, it continued to apply only to the flooded lead-acid and valve-regulated lead-acid batteries.

#### **F.2.5** 2009 International Code Council Codes and NFPA 1, *Fire Code*.

The 2009 edition of NFPA 1, *Fire Code*, contained new provisions that added lithium-ion and nickel-cadmium technologies, and both NFPA 1 *(see Table F.2.5)* and the IFC *(see Figure F.2.5)* contained new provisions that added lithium metal polymer batteries to the list of regulated battery technologies. The key difference in treatment between lithium-ion batteries and lithium metal polymer batteries was the requirement for thermal runaway protection for lithium metal polymer batteries. It should be noted that although Table 52.1 of the 2009 edition of NFPA 1 indicates no thermal runaway requirement for lithium-ion batteries, the technical language in 52.3.2 indicates thermal runaway was required for lithium-ion as well.

**Thermal Runaway**. VRLA and lithium-ion and lithium metal polymer battery systems shall be provided with a listed device or other approved method to preclude, detect, and control thermal runaway. [**1:**52.3.2, 2009]

A change to the *International Building Code* (IBC) unrelated to battery storage systems limited all incidental uses, the classification the IBC applies to battery systems, to no more than 10 percent of the area of the floor of the building they are located on.



Table F.2.5 Battery Requirements

#### [**1:**Table 52.1, 2009]

#### **Figure F.2.5 2009 International Fire Code Battery Requirements.** *(Source: 2009 International Fire Code.)*



#### **F.2.6** 2012 and 2015 International Code Council Codes and NFPA 1, *Fire Code.*

Between the 2009 and 2012 editions of the fire codes, there were insignificant changes made to the requirements associated with battery systems. Between the 2012 and 2015 editions no changes were made. Essentially the 2009 and 2015 editions were the same with respect to battery systems.

**F.2.7** 2018 International Code Council Codes and NFPA 1, *Fire Code*.

Recognizing the development of new battery technologies and the evolution of battery storage into a more robust and wider energy storage industry in relation to the requirements in the various fire and building codes, the International Code Council's Fire Code Action Committee created an Energy Storage Systems Work Group (ESS WG). The work of the ESS WG resulted in a new chapter being approved for inclusion in the 2018 *International Fire Code* — Chapter 12, Energy Systems — into which all the key energy-storage-related requirements (including batteries) were moved including the following:

- (1) Emergency and stand-by power systems
- (2) Solar photovoltaic power systems
- (3) Stationary fuel cell power systems
- (4) Electrical energy storage systems

As part of this work the requirements of the former stationary storage battery systems chapter took on the broader application of electrical energy storage systems and addressed the following topics:

- (1) Battery storage system threshold quantities
- (2) Construction documents
- (3) Hazard mitigation analysis
- (4) Fault condition
- (5) Thermal runaway
- (6) Seismic and structural design
- (7) Vehicle impact protection
- (8) Combustible storage
- (9) Testing, maintenance, and repair
- (10) Location and construction
- (11) Stationary battery arrays
- (12) Outdoor installations
- (13) Maximum allowable quantities
- (14) Storage batteries and equipment
- (15) Fire-extinguishing and detection systems
- (16) Specific battery-type requirements
- (17) Capacitor energy storage systems

A major change within this work of the IFC was the introduction of array (unit) spacing as follows:

**1206.2.8.3 Stationary battery arrays**. Storage batteries, prepackaged stationary storage battery systems and preengineered stationary storage battery systems shall be segregated into stationary battery arrays not exceeding 50 kWh (180 megajoules) each. Each stationary battery array shall be spaced not less than 3 feet (914 mm) from other stationary battery arrays and from walls in the storage room or area. The storage arrangements shall comply with Chapter 10. [**IFC,** 2018]

This is intended to restrict the amount of energy in arrays (units) and requires a larger footprint for an energy storage system installation due to the 3 ft separation requirement. Exceptions were provided that eliminate lead-acid and nickel-cadmium storage batteries from this limitation, allow listed prepackaged units to have a 250 kWh threshold for separation, and elimination of the limits based upon fire and explosion testing as follows:

#### *Exceptions:*

(1) *Lead acid and nickel cadmium storage battery arrays.*

- (2) *Listed preengineered stationary storage battery systems and prepackaged stationary storage battery systems shall not exceed 250 kWh (900 megajoules) each.*
- (3) *The fire code official is authorized to approve listed, preengineered and prepackaged battery arrays with larger capacities or smaller battery array spacing if large-scale fire and fault condition testing conducted or witnessed and reported by an approved testing laboratory is provided showing that a fire involving one array will not propagate to an adjacent array, and be contained within the room for a duration equal to the fire-resistance rating of the room separation specified in Table 509 of the International Building Code.*

#### [**IFC,** 2018]

The IFC relies upon 1- or 2-hour fire-resistant construction to separate systems from the remainder of the building and an assessment that that level of protection can contain the fire impacts within the room or space where a system is installed. A fire and explosion test is needed to document such containment.

The other significant change between the 2015 and 2018 IFC editions was the specification of a maximum allowable battery quantity *(see Figure F.2.7)*.

#### **Figure F.2.7 2018 International Fire Code Maximum Allowable Battery Quantities.** *(Source: 2018 International Fire Code.)*



This was the first time there was an upper limit applied to the amount of energy allowed to be stored in an energy storage system located in a room or space. As with the spacing limitations, there was an exception that could be applied based upon fire and explosion testing as follows:

*Exception: Where approved by the fire code official, areas containing stationary storage batteries that exceed the amounts in Table 1206.2.9 shall be treated as incidental use areas and not Group H occupancies based on a hazardous mitigation analysis in accordance with Section 1206.2.3 and large-scale fire and fault condition testing conducted or witnessed and reported by an approved testing laboratory.* [**IFC,** 2018]

Along with the provisions in the 2018 IFC, energy storage language was added to the 2018 *International Residential Code* for the first time. In summary, the new language in the *International Residential Code* required energy storage systems to be listed and precluded them from being installed within the habitable space of a dwelling unit.

The 2018 NFPA 1, *Fire Code*, Chapter 52 contained modifications to the 2015 edition that were very similar to all of the new requirements introduced to the 2018 IFC.

**F.2.8** 2021 International Code Council Code Development and 2019 NFPA 855, *Standard for the Installation of Stationary Energy Storage Systems*.

While the code revision process was being completed for the 2018 editions of the IFC and NFPA 1, NFPA developed the new standard NFPA 855, *Standard for the Installation of Stationary Energy Storage Systems*. The work of the NFPA 855 technical committee closely tracked and utilized the 2018 language added to the fire codes along with the language from NFPA 853, *Standard for the Installation of Stationary Fuel Cell Power Systems*, for the initial NFPA 855 draft document.

With the adoption and availability of the 2018 editions of the codes, a broader audience was reached that generated additional input to the NFPA 855 committee on the impact of the requirements and questions on how to apply them in differing circumstances such as follows:

- (1) Roof installs
- (2) Open parking garage installs
- (3) Remote installations
- (4) Dedicated ESS buildings
- (5) Array (unit) spacing threshold
- (6) Maximum allowable quantity impact
- (7) Incidental use 10 percent of floor area limitation
- (8) Appropriate requirements based upon technology
- (9) Deflagration prevention/venting
- (10) Suppression system selection
- (11) Fire detection method and where required

Going into the NFPA 855 First Draft process, language improvements were coordinated with work in progress on the proposals for the 2021 editions of the *International Fire Code*, *International Building Code*, and the *International Residential Code*.

Key areas addressed by the current proposals approved by the ICC Fire Code Action Committee and the Fire Code Committee at the proposal hearings for the 2021 edition code change process were as follows:

- (1) Permits, operational as well as installation
- (2) Fire and explosion test reliance on new UL 9540A
- (3) Fire remediation actions and personnel
- (4) Commissioning
- (5) Decommissioning
- (6) Operation and maintenance
- (7) Repairs, retrofits, and replacements
- (8) Reused and repurposed equipment
- (9) Toxic and highly toxic gases
- (10) Security of installations
- (11) Occupied work centers
- (12) Walk-in units
- (13) Size and separation threshold reduction
- (14) Maximum allowable quantities as simply a testing trigger
- (15) Remote installations
- (16) ESS dedicated-use buildings designated as an F-1 Group use
- (17) Non-dedicated-use buildings

(18) Elimination of incidental use 10 percent of floor area restriction and H Group designation

(19) Explosion control

(20) Outdoor installations

(21) Rooftop installations

(22) Open parking garage installations

(23) Mobile ESS equipment and operations

Though some of the new language is more conservative, such as the threshold before fire and explosion testing and the requirement for explosion protection for lithium-ion energy storage systems, other proposed changes provide relief from some requirements such as ESS dedicated-use buildings, remote locations, and rooftop and open parking garage installations.

The most restrictive requirements were maintained to address when an energy storage system is installed within a mixed-use occupancy building and it is important to contain an event for life safety and property protection.

The changes proposed for the 2021 I-Codes, and coordinated with the 2019 NFPA 855 development process, are significantly different from the 2018 provisions because of industry participation. The initial language of the 2018 editions of the fire codes and the draft of NFPA 855 are intended to obtain an acceptable level of safety recognizing how challenging and dynamic events from batteries and energy storage systems can be, whether the system instigates an issue or is a casualty of outside events. Those who verify code compliance and others working on the code language have maintained an open view, and where industry has provided data on different technologies and/or on documented safety practices, or a reduction in exposure hazards, there has been a willingness to modify the requirements in recognition of the new information and data.

F2.9 NFPA 18A 2022 Edition includes an Encapsulator- Spherical Micelle Stability Test (Liquid phase fuels). This test allow water additives to be tested to a standard, making the use of NFPA 18A agents more readily accepted.

F2.10 NIOSH conducted a Comparison of Fire Suppression Techniques on Lithium-Ion Battery Pack Fires that concluded that a water mist system with F-500 (an Encapsultor Agent (EA)) can better suppress a Litium-ion nbattery fire.

## **Additional Proposed Changes**

**File Name Description Approved** NIOSH\_report.pdf NIOSH report

## **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

While NFPA will not accept the NIOSH report submitted here, it was previously submitted for technical review in the comments to NFPA 10.

## **Submitter Information Verification**



## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** This is presented as a technical fact and thus the proposed text reads more like a sales/marketing statement than a technical rationalization. Additional technical documentation, large scale fire testing, and proper testing results need to be presented. This should include testing in a loaded rack configuration with close module spacing.



# **Comparison of Fire Suppression Techniques on Lithium-Ion Battery Pack Fires**

Wei Tang<sup>1</sup> · Liming Yuan<sup>1</sup> · Richard Thomas<sup>1</sup> · John Soles<sup>1</sup>

Received: 5 December 2022 / Accepted: 25 April 2023

This is a U.S. Government work and not under copyright protection in the US; foreign copyright protection may apply 2023

#### **Abstract**

Lithium-ion battery pack fires pose great hazards to the safety and health of miners. A detailed experimental study has been conducted at the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) Pittsburgh Mining Research Division (PMRD) to investigate the effectiveness of different fire suppression systems on Li-ion battery pack fire extinguishment. Tests were conducted in a well-ventilated container. Two sizes of battery packs  $(12 \text{ V}, 24 \text{ V})$  were heated by heater strips to trigger thermal runaway and fire. Water mist with different flow rates, ABC powder, type D dry chemical, and water mist with F500 additives were used as the fire suppression agents. Multiple thermocouples were installed on the battery packs to measure the temperature evolution during the tests. The results indicated that the water mist with F500 additives is the most effective suppressant among the agents tested. Dry chemicals, however, do quench the fire for a moment, but cannot prevent re-ignition of the battery since they do not provide enough cooling. The findings of this paper can be used to develop safer battery fire suppression techniques in mining environments.

**Keywords** Lithium-ion battery  $\cdot$  Fire suppression  $\cdot$  Water mist  $\cdot$  Dry chemical

## 1 Introduction

As an important alternative to fossil fuels, lithium-ion (Liion) batteries have seen their applications growing from consumer electronic products to large electric vehicles. In the mining industry, Li-ion battery powered electric vehicles (BEVs) are believed to be a promising replacement for diesel-powered vehicles whose emission of diesel particulate matter (DPM) is a major concern to the safety and health of miners  $[1]$ . The introduction of BEVs into the mining industry has not been trouble-free as the potential use of Liion BEVs in gassy underground mines escalates the fire and explosion risks [1]. Methane-air mixtures are found in many types of mines, and the energy released by a Li-ion battery during thermal runaway or accidents resulting in fire can be an ignition source for such mixtures  $[2, 3]$ . A safer and more reliable design and application of Li-ion BEVs could help reduce and mitigate the risk of fire and explosion accidents underground. The size of a battery pack fire can be indicated by the heat release rate (HRR). Wang et al. [4] used cone calorimetry tests and found that the peak HRR and total heat release increase with state of charge of the battery. Most of the HRR measurement of battery fires used the oxygen consumption theory  $[5, 6]$ .

While preventing the fire and explosion of Li-ion batteries from occurring is necessary, suppression of such incidents when they occur is just as vital  $[7, 8]$ . In a mining environment where fire suppression resources are limited, an effective battery fire suppression technique is critical to the safety and health of miners. Numerous studies have been conducted to investigate the effectiveness of traditional fire suppression techniques on battery or battery pack fires. Unlike traditional fire suppression, battery fire suppression requires extensive cooling even after the fire is visually quenched  $[9-12]$ to reduce battery temperature and prevent re-ignition due to chemical reactions inside the batteries. Liu et al. [13] found that water mist can well control the thermal runaway of a battery by cooling the battery below a certain critical temperature. Larsson et al. [14] reported that the effectiveness of water mist on battery fire suppression is not obvious, and that hydrogen fluoride concentration increased after the application of water mist. Blum et al. [15] conducted large-scale

 $\boxtimes$  Wei Tang Ope0@cdc.gov

 $\mathbf{1}$ Pittsburgh Mining Research Division, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, 626 Cochrans Mill Road, Pittsburgh, PA 15236, USA



b. Top view of measurement on battery pack

Fig. 1 Battery fire suppression test setup

Table 1 Test conditions

Test number	Battery size	Agent
	12 V	Free burn
2	12V	Water mist, 3 GPM
3	12V	Dry chemical
4	24 V	Free burn
5	24 V	Water mist, 3 GPM
6	24 V	Dry chemical
	12 V	Water mist, 1 GPM
8	12 V	Water mist, 2 GPM
9	12 V	Water mist 3 GPM with F500 additive

battery fire suppression tests and noticed that a large amount of water is needed to extinguish BEV fires. Research on effective fire suppression technique for small and large battery pack fires in a mining environment is limited.

In this work, detailed experimental research was conducted to investigate the effectiveness of different fire suppression systems on Li-ion battery pack fires. Two sizes of Nickel/Manganese/Cobalt (NMC) Li-ion battery packs and five fire suppression systems were chosen. Results of the fire suppression tests will be discussed and compared.

#### 2 Experiments

Experiments were conducted within an open-ended shipping container (12.2-m length by 2.4-m width by 2.9-m height) located at the Pittsburgh Mining Research Division. Two types of Li-ion battery packs were used for the tests: a 12 V, 30Ah battery pack composed of 36 NMC cylindrical 18,650 batteries and a 24 V, 40Ah battery pack composed of 72 NMC cylindrical 18,650 batteries. Two 750-W electric-controlled metal heater strips with dimensions of  $45 \text{ cm} \times 3.8 \text{ cm} \times 0.8 \text{ cm}$  (length  $\times$  width  $\times$  thickness) were placed under the battery packs to induce thermal runaway. K-type thermocouples were attached on the battery pack to measure the battery temperature (as shown in Fig. 1). Several fire suppression systems were used for the tests. Each used a flow controller and suppression spray placed 0.5 m above the battery pack. Video cameras were used to record the fire and suppression behaviors.

The battery tests included free burn and the use of fire suppression agents: water mist  $(1, 2, 3)$  gallon per minute (GPM) and 3 GPM with F500 additive), ABC powder, and type D sodium chloride (NaCl) dry chemical. During the tests, the battery pack was placed on the two electric heater strips to induce a thermal runaway and trigger a fire. Timing information for the first visible release of smoke and fire was noted. Electrical heating was turned off after the first jet of fire was observed; suppression, if used, was initiated at the same time. Table 1 summarizes the test conditions. Fire and smoke behaviors were observed and noted throughout the tests. A low-speed ventilation  $({\sim}0.5 \text{ m/s})$  was applied to clear the smoke and gases.

#### **3 Results and Discussion**

With temperature measurements, comparisons were made between the free burn case and the suppression cases with distinctions drawn after suppression was applied to the battery pack fire.

#### 3.1 Free Burn versus Water Suppression

Test 1 is the free burn case where no suppression was applied. In this case, smoke was observed to release at about 3.5 min after heating started, and the flame started at about 10 min. The explosion and fire continued for about 8 min before the battery pack burnout. During the test, it was observed that some of the batteries exploded and ejected from the pack, which is a potential ignition source for other combustibles nearby. Figure 2 shows the four sequences



Fig. 2 Four sequences of free burn of a 12 V battery pack fire (a smoke starts, b flame starts, c explosion, d burnout)


Fig. 3 Three sequences of water mist suppression of a 12 V battery pack (a flame starts, b water suppression starts, c extinguishment)

of the free burn for the battery pack starting from smoke emission to battery burnout. As shown in the images, most of the batteries were completely burned out. However, it is worthwhile to note that some of the batteries were not burned even after the test was over due to the explosion and shootout behaviors. Some temperature measurements of the batteries were invalid due to the shootout behavior.

Test 2 is the water mist suppression with 3 GPM flow rate. In this case, smoke was observed to release at about 3 min after heating started, and the flame started at about 10 min. Heaters were unplugged at about 10.5 min. Water suppression started at about 13.5 min when the flame was fully established. Water suppression was turned off at about 16.5 min and the battery pack fire was completely extinguished. Re-examination of the battery pack after the test revealed that 8 batteries fully burned or exploded, but 28 of the batteries were partially burned or remained intact. There was no re-ignition after the battery fire was extinguished. Figure 3 shows the sequences of the water mist fire suppression

Temperatures were compared between the free burn of a 12V battery pack and a burn with water suppression. Figure 4 shows the temperature history of two temperature measurements. The two vertical dashed lines represent the water suppression period. It was observed from Figure 4 that battery temperatures of the free burn tests were much higher than the water mist suppression tests. In the free burn case, batteries went into thermal runaway and caught fire with sharp increases in battery temperatures. In the water suppression case, after water suppression was applied, the two thermocouple temperatures quickly dropped and remained below 200°C for the rest of the test. No re-ignition was observed. The cooling effect of water suppression was probably the key in containing the fire and preventing re-ignition.



Fig. 4 Temperature comparison of free burn and water mist suppression



Fig. 5 The sequences of NaCl dry chemical suppression (a flame starts, b suppression starts, c battery fire quenched, d re-ignition and explosion)

#### 3.2 Free Burn versus Dry Chemical Suppression

Test 3 is a fire suppression case with type D dry chemical. In this case, the battery fire started at about 10.5 min after heating. The suppressant was discharged at 12.5 min and lasted for about 45 s before the suppressant was depleted. The battery pack was buried under the dry chemical, and the fire visually disappeared as shown in Fig. 5 c. Shortly after the fire was quenched, re-ignition occurred, then the explosion followed. The battery fire continued until burnout. In this case, the dry chemical was able to quench the fire temporarily but failed to extinguish the fire completely.

The temperatures were compared between the free burn of a 12V battery pack and a burn with type D NaCl dry chemical suppression. Figure  $6$  shows the temperature history of two temperature measurements. The two vertical dashed lines represent the dry chemical suppression period. For the suppression case, it was observed that after suppression was

applied, battery temperatures had a noticeable drop before they went up again due to re-ignition. In this case, the lack of cooling effect afforded by the dry chemical application probably played a major role in the re-ignition as the chemical reactions inside the battery continued despite external flame quenching and air exclusion.

### 3.3 Large Size Battery Pack

Test 4 is a free burn of a large battery pack (24V), test 5 is a water mist suppression case of the large battery pack (24V) fire with 3 GPM flow rate, and test 6 is the ABC dry chemical suppression case of the large battery pack  $(24V)$  fire. Figure 7 shows the comparison of free burn with water mist suppression and ABC dry chemical suppression regarding battery temperatures. The vertical dashed lines in both figures represent the suppression period. In the water mist suppression case (Fig.  $7a$ ), the application of water



Fig. 6 Temperature comparison of free burn and dry chemical suppression



Fig. 7 Comparison of free burn of large size battery pack with suppressions: a 3 GPM water mist suppression, b ABC powder suppression

slowed the heating, but fire and explosion occurred during the suppression period. The 3 GPM water mist failed to suppress the fire of large size battery pack. In the ABC dry chemical suppression case (Fig. 7b), the initial application put out the flame temporarily, but battery temperatures still climbed slowly and eventually fire and explosion followed. The dry chemical also failed to contain and suppress the large battery pack fire.

### 3.4 The Effect of Water Mist Flow Rate

Different flow rates of water mist suppression were also used to study their impact on the small battery pack fire. Test 7 used water mist at 1 GPM, test 8 used water mist at 2 GPM, and test 9 used water mist at 3 GPM with F500 additive. In all three of these tests, water mist suppression started when the first explosion was observed. Four thermocouple data were plotted to demonstrate the battery temperature evolution against the time, shown in Figure 8. It was observed that



Fig. 8 The effect of water mist flow rate on suppression



water mist of all three flow rates can contain and suppress the small size battery fire without re-ignition. The 3 GPM flow rate with F500 additive might be the most effective since the drop in temperature was the quickest and most significant decrease.

# **4 Conclusions**

Battery pack fire suppression tests were conducted at the NIOSH Pittsburgh Mining Research Division as part of its continual effort to develop workplace solutions to reduce the risk of mine disasters and mine workers' risk of injuries and fatalities. Water mist with different flow rates and/or additives, type D NaCl, and dry chemical ABC powder were used to study their effectiveness in Li-ion battery pack fire suppression. The results indicated that water mist can suppress a small battery pack fire, and its cooling effect prevents re-ignition from occurring. Water mist suppression with F500 as an additive can better suppress the fire. Type D NaCl and dry chemical ABC powder fire suppressants could quench the battery pack fire temporarily but failed to cool the battery, and re-ignition occurred. The results from this study can be used to develop an improved Li-ion battery pack fire suppression system for a mining environment.

Acknowledgements Data from this manuscript have been presented at the 2023 SME Annual Conference & Expo, February  $26 - \text{March}$ 1, Denver, Colorado.

### **Declarations**

Disclaimer The findings and conclusions in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Mention of any company or product does not constitute endorsement by NIOSH.

## **References**

1. Dubaniewicz TH, Zlochower I, Barone T, Thomas R, Yuan L (2021) Thermal runaway pressures of iron phosphate lithiumion cells as a function of free space. Metallurgy  $&$  Exploration 38:539-547. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42461-020-00349-9

- Dubaniewicz TH, DuCarme JP (2013) Are lithium-ion cells intrin-2. sically safe? IEEE Trans. Ind Appl 49:2451-2460
- 3. Dubaniewicz TH, DuCarme JP (2016) Internal short circuit and accelerated rate calorimetry tests of lithium-ion cells: Considerations for methane-air intrinsic safety and explosion proof/flameproof protection methods. J Loss Prev Process Ind 43:575-584
- $4.$ Wang Z, Ouyang D, Chen M, Wang X, Zhang Z, Wang J (2019) Fire behavior of lithium-ion battery with different states of charge induced by high incident heat fluxes, Journal of Thermal Analysis and Calorimetry 136 2239-2247
- 5. Chen M, Liu J, Dongxu O, Cao S, Wang Z, Wang J (2018) A simplified analysis to predict the fire hazard of primary lithium battery. Appl Sci 8:2329. https://doi.org/10.3390/app8112329
- 6 Fu Y, Lu S, Li K, Liu C, Cheng X, Zhang H (2015) An experimental study on burning behaviors of 18650 lithium ion batteries using a cone calorimeter. J Power Sources 273:216-222. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.jpowsour.2014.09.039
- 7. Wang Q, Li K, Wang Y, Chen H, Duan Q, Sun J (2018) The efficiency of dodecafluoro-2-methylpentan-3-one on suppressing the lithium ion battery fire. J Electrochem Energy Conversion Storage 15:041001
- Wang Q, Mao B, Stoliarov SI, Sun J (2019) A review of lithium 8. ion battery failure mechanisms and fire prevention strategies. Prog Energy Combust Sci 73:95-131
- 9 Luo WT, Zhu SB, Gong JH, Zhou Z (2018) Research and development of fire extinguishing technology for power lithium batteries. Procedia Eng 211:531-537
- 10. Liu Y, Duan Q, Xu J, Chen H, Lu W, Wang Q (2018) Experimental study on the efficiency of dodecafluoro-2-methylpentan-3-one on suppressing lithium-ion battery fires. RSC Adv 8:42223-42232
- 11. Li Y, Yu D, Zhang S (2015) A typical lithium-ion battery fire extinguishing test. Journal of safety and environment 15(6):120-125
- 12. Cui Y, Liu J (2021) Research progress of water mist fire extinguishing technology and its application in battery fires. Process Saf Environ Prot 149:559-574
- $13.$ Liu T, Liu Y, Wang X, Kong X, Li G (2019) Cooling control of thermally-induced thermal runaway in 18,650 lithium ion battery with water mist. Energy Convers Manag 199:111969
- 14. Larsson F, Andersson P, Blomqvist P, Loren A, Mellander B-E (2014) Characteristics of lithium-ion batteries during fire tests. J Power Sources 271:414-420
- 15. Blum A, Long R (2015) Full-abs," SAE Int. J Passeng Cars Mech Syst 8(2):565-572. https://doi.org/10.4271/2015-01-1383

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.





group group group group group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group group group group group group group group 855 Toxics task group group group group

Public Input No. 41-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 42-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 43-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 44-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 45-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 46-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5] Public Input No. 48-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 15.10] Public Input No. 49-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. C.4.2] Public Input No. 50-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.7.3.7.2] Public Input No. 51-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.11.5] Public Input No. 52-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.11.8.5] Public Input No. 53-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 54-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.2 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 55-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.3.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]] Public Input No. 56-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

# **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Paul Hayes



## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-110-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** Information on the generation and emission of toxic gases is still limited. The addition of a new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions.

# **Public Input No. 59-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. G.3.1.1 ] G.3.1.1** The risk assessment design process should be directed by parties a registered design professional experienced in fire protection engineering and in energy storage risk assessment and plant operation of the type of, or similar to the, plant under consideration. **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input** The term "Registered design professional" is used and required for evaluation of multiple required reports in the standard including an HMA. This guidance section needs to confirm RDP instead of qualified person. **Related Public Inputs for This Document Related Input Relationship** Public Input No. 57-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 3.3.20] Qualified Persons Public Input No. 58-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] Qualified Persons Public Input No. 60-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 4.3.2.1.4] Qualified Persons Public Input No. 61-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.11.3] Qualified Persons Public Input No. 62-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.11.4] Qualified Persons Public Input No. 63-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.11.7.3] Qualified Persons Public Input No. 57-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 3.3.20] Public Input No. 58-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] Public Input No. 60-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 4.3.2.1.4] Public Input No. 61-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.11.3] Public Input No. 62-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.11.4] Public Input No. 63-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. G.11.7.3] **Submitter Information Verification Submitter Full Name:** Paul Hayes **Organization:** The Hiller Companies/American **Affiliation:** None **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Sun Apr 23 11:59:03 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA **Committee Statement Resolution:** FR-111-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** The term "registered design professional" is used and required for evaluation of multiple required reports in the standard including an HMA. This guidance section needs to confirm RDP instead of qualified person.





**Submittal Date:** Thu Jun 01 18:55:34 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA

**Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-112-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** Documentation has not been provided on these "two known publicly available fire and explosion tests" to demonstrate they are equivalent to UL 9540A. That reference should be deleted, which doesn't impact the overall points made in this section









comment stage.

Г

I



ı





ı

I









**G.7.3.6.1** Cell-Level Event.

Carbon monoxide (CO) is one of the main components present for the longest period of time and is considered especially important for early stage detection.

Off-gas in the early stages of thermal runaway events will be colder than off-gas in the later stages. The early off-gas can therefore become heavier than the air, collecting at floor level. It should therefore be considered if gas detection related to room explosion risks should be applied at both levels, close to the floor and close to the ceiling. Both sensor and ASD detection technologies can provide off-gas detection in the early stages of lithium-ion battery thermal runaway events. In addition to off-gas detection, ASD detection can provide very early smoke detection.

Tests conducted in this project indicate that solely relying on lower explosion limit (LEL) sensors and cell voltage levels to detect early stages of a thermal runway event is insufficient.

Cell-level detection, close to or inside the affected module, has proven the most reliable means of pre-thermal-runaway warning. The early detection of thermal runaway has also proven that a cell can be disconnected, effectively stopping the overheating process.

One important aspect of the protection of LIB systems in ESS is the prevention of thermal runaway and propagation of cell failures. While there are many ways to detect and prevent thermal runaway, off-gas monitoring or off-gas particle detection is, perhaps, the most effective because it provides the most amount of time to react to the condition. Off-gas monitors or detectors are installed at the battery rack level and capable of sensing the off-gas byproducts from a single cell. In this way, they can provide up to 30 minutes of time for investigation and intervention by automatic deactivation of charging before thermal runaway.

Off-gas sensors or detectors must be designed to detect the variety of different gases from the many types of LIB chemistries. The gases emitted during the early stages of battery failure are a precursor to the much larger and more dangerous issue of thermal runaway and potential propagation of fire from cell to cell and module to module. This is why, for thermal runaway prevention, LEL gas detectors are not adequate because the concentrations of flammable gases are not high enough. Flammable gas detection has a role to play in other aspects of the protection of the ESS *(see 9.6.5.6 )* .

Battery cells will release flammable gases throughout the cell venting and thermal runaway stages of failure, however the species composition, release rate, and temperature will vary based on the phase. Ideally during cell venting, the battery's safety features are activated, leading to the release of gas and other reactive materials in a controlled manner to prevent an uncontrolled explosion. In this scenario, the gas species primarily consists of carbon dioxide (CO2), carbon monoxide (CO), hydrogen (H2) and VOCs. The gas temperature during cell venting is generally around 100-150°C.

During cell thermal runaway, the battery undergoes a rapid, self-sustaining increase in temperature. In this situation, additional flammable and toxic gas species may be produced including hydrogen fluoride (HF), hydrogen cyanide (HCN), various hydrocarbon gases (CH4, C2H4, C2H6, etc.), in addition to those gases produced during cell venting. The gas temperature during thermal runaway can reach much higher levels, often exceeding 500°C, resulting in the rapid release of large volumes of flammable and/or toxic gases, posing a significant hazard to human health and the environment.

Off-gas detection in the early stages may target different gas species than that during cell thermal runaway. In all cases the detection method should be tied to the cell chemistry, sensor location relative to the cell(s), volume of the enclosure (ie a cabinet or a large room), and objective of detection in order to ensure that the sensor is aligned with the safety objectives. Technologies are advancing rapidly however early and rapid detection must also be paired with response, thus costly systems that may provide some level of advanced notice may not provide a significant increase in actions or improved safety outcomes. In contrast to smoke detectors in occupied structures, knowledge of a cell failure several minutes earlier, may not result in any difference in outcome unless the detection system is also tied into a viable thermal runaway protection system which stops the event.

Off-gas detection systems of various types have been shown to be effective at detecting cell failure prior to thermal runaway, in some cases as much as 30 minutes prior, however this advanced knowledge must be tied into other mitigation systems in order to prevent thermal runaway from occurring or propagating.

Off-gas sensors or detectors are typically mounted in each battery rack or module, with the exact location of the sensors or detectors being dictated by the actual rack design. But, in general, the sensors must be mounted in the path of airflow. This could mean that, depending upon rack design, the sensor or detector could be either at the top or bottom of the rack. For specific detection design requirements, refer to the manufacturer's published installation and operation manuals and any relevant regulatory approvals/listings for the intended purpose of "off-gas detection" from the incipient stages of a lithium-ion battery thermal runaway.

To Presently, to be most effective, the network of sensors or detectors throughout the many battery racks in the ESS must be connected with a central controller that allows for the supervision for failures of the individual sensors and a coordinated response when one or more sensors or detectors detect an off-gas event. The responses can be either automated or human generated.

# **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

Provides additional details on cell level gas detection and the methods that may be best suited

### **Submitter Information Verification**



### **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-172-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** This provides additional details on cell level gas detection and the methods that may be best suited.





group

855 Toxics task



Public Input No. 42-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.6.2.5]



# **Submitter Information Verification**



# **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-174-NFPA 855-2023 **Statement:** The addition of a new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions.



**G.8** Flammable Gas, Deflagration Hazard Studies, and Use of NFPA 68 and NFPA 69 for Lithium-Ion Batteries.- (Reserved) -

#### $(1)$  - INTRODUCTION

The increase in the number of failures of lithium ion battery stationary energy storage systems within the international market sector has demonstrated the importance of understanding inherent risks associated with the design, development and deployment of innovative battery systems. As an emerging industry with many unknown variables, equipping First Responders and Authority Having Jurisdiction (AHJ) with information of the inherent hazards is essential to minimize the risks of equipment loss and injury to personnel.

While the failure mechanisms of lithium ion battery chemistries is highly researched, the body of knowledge does not contain research of the consequences of containerized explosions.

This work is intended to assist AHJs, stakeholders, and practitioners with engineering design and risk mitigation considerations to minimize the likelihood and consequences of an explosion event. This effort is not intended to prescribe how hazard and risks analysis are performed, rather presents principles and methodologies to assist the energy storage practitioner in the qualitative and quantitative analysis process to properly characterize the risk and hazards associated with the deployment of lithium ion battery energy storage systems.

The following information is the integration of numerous international consensus standards, applicable publications, peer-reviewed research and journal articles, and state and local municipal codes and standards applicable to the energy storage market sector.

This guidance document is divided into two sections: Part (1) presents a summary to assist AHJs by outlining key elements to consider when evaluating proposed stationary energy storage systems, and Part (2) presents a detailed discussion intended to assist stakeholders and practitioners in navigating the numerous international consensus standards and highlighting recognized and generally accepted good engineering practices leading to well-designed engineering and administrative controls to mitigate the identified hazards.

(1) - PART I: LITHIUM ION BATTERY MITIGATION CONSIDERATIONS

(2) *Lithium-ion Battery Explosion Basics*

Lithium-ion batteries offer high energy and power densities but have a narrower stability operating range when compared to other battery types and contain reactive and flammable materials that when electrically and thermally abused, may result in high energy fires.

Lithium ion cell failures can result from a variety of sources including manufacturing defects, physical abuse, thermal abuse, electrical abuse and mechanical damage [1-7]. In some instances, these failures can lead to cell internal degradation resulting in exothermic reactions, causing the cell to undergo thermal runaway. In a thermal runaway event, the exothermic reactions increases the cell temperature, resulting in internal generation of gases. These gases build within the cell and can ultimately lead to rupture of the cell and release of the gases. The released flammable gas mixture consists of various mixtures of hydrogen, carbon-monoxide, carbon-dioxide and various hydrocarbons including methane and propane. As the cells enter thermal runaway the expelled electrolyte material can ignite flammable gases can resulting in fire, deflagration, or explosion scenarios that pose a significant risk to surrounding life and property [8]. Since January 2019, the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) has recorded 27 Stationary Energy Storage Failure Events [9].

From a firefighting and explosion mitigation perspective, the source of the flammable gas generation is typically not accessible within the battery module and is extremely difficult to mitigate. These complex thermal runaway events have elements of multiple types of ignition sources (metallic, chemical, etc.) as well as being exothermic and potentially producing its own oxygen [10]. Lithium-ion battery cell failure can lead to failure propagation of the adjacent cells resulting in the exponential generation of flammable gases and increasing generated heat fluxes eventually propagating throughout the energy storage unit and having involved the entire battery system.

(1)

#### (a) *Essential Hazard Mitigation Analysis Elements*

Typically, explosion risk is quantified by assessing probability of occurrence, consequences of the event, and detectability of the generation flammable gases of an event. Although the probability of an explosion is low in listed and labeled BESS, the effects and consequences can be extremely high. Some explosion risk mitigation strategies include flammable gas exhaust, deflagration venting, inerting, suppression, hardening and increased standoff distance to personnel and assets [11]. When evaluating an explosion analysis it is recommended AHJs understand the characterization of three key gas properties as these values determine the strength of the explosion:

- lower flammability limit of the gases,
- <del>flame speed, and</del>
- the maximum adiabatic overpressure

Additional important analyses to be included in the hazard mitigation analysis includes the conclusions and outputs associated with the identification and quantification of the explosive risks associated with the BESS design.

Lithium-ion batteries present unique explosive risks due to the complex nature of their failure mechanisms: they produce large volumes of flammable gases and produce sufficient oxygen to sustain exothermic reactions can emit particles hot enough to ignite gases.

As discussed in the BESS fire risks Chapter  $X$ .?, the cell vented off gas constitutes both an explosive and a toxic hazard are to be evaluated. The core element behind explosion prevention is the avoidance of the collection of highly flammable gas concentrations within a well-designed ventilation system. Design trends within the energy storage market sector include the different philosophies used to dilute and flammable gas concentrations. The main design considerations include containing the battery modules and off-gas in gas tight enclosures leading directly to a safe area, without passing the battery room [10]. The other options may include opening battery rack sures to the external environment where off-gas released into the battery compartment before being diffused by a forced exhaust system of sufficient air changes per hours (ACH). Exposing the battery compartment to external environment is a means for the NFPA 855 explosion prevention and deflagration venting requirements [12].

Each BESS equipment provider should conduct an explosion hazard analysis in accordance with NFPA 68 or NFPA 69 to quantify the risks and hazards [13, 14]. Elements to be evaluated as part of the explosion hazard analysis should include:

- lower flammability limit (LFL),
- laminar flame speed, and
- maximum overpressure are key metrics used to evaluate the overall hazard.

When reviewing the computational fluid dynamics or other analyses performed, the AHJ should consider other important elements are presented in the explosion hazard analysis for both the NFPA 68 and NFPA 69 should consider:

- Enclosure reaction force
- Enclosure geometry
- Enclosure internal surface area including partial volumes
- Surface area of internal structures
- Flammable gas properties
- Best and worst case scenario one cell failure (may be the same as UL 9540A if the cells do not show propagation)
- UL9540A failure level, one or more cells, module, or unit based on the test results.
- Limited propagation failure. This adds a safety margin to the UL9540A. Example if one

cell failed with no propagation, then evaluate a 3-cell failure, one on either side. module failed but did not propagate, then evaluate 3 module failure the one above and below

- 25% LFL failure determine how may cells does it take to reach 25% LFL in the enclosure.
- Partial volume deflagration how many cells can fail with a resulting deflagration that does not produce a pressure value that will cause the enclosure to fail.
- Worst total failure assumes all cell in the ESS fail. No evaluation required
- (1) <del>- Part II: Lithum-ion Battery Fire and Explosion Hazard Identification and</del> **MITIGATION**

Lithium ion battery use within the residential, commercial, industrial and transportation markets is rapidly changing, and each unique design presents challenges to the fire and explosion risks to engineers and practitioners who are responsible for developing engineering and administrative controls for safe operation.

In the design of these systems, engineers must balance criteria for performance, safety concerns. Achieving a high level of safety is especially important in applications in densely populated environments, such as indoor installations, where a thermal-runaway event is more likely to lead to high losses of the structure and property. While performance measures are generally well characterized for battery designers (UL1642, UL1973, UL9540), safety analysis techniques that can impact design decisions are not as well-defined. The engineering and safety guidelines and requirements for lithium ion battery technologies required for applications such as energy storage are slowly emerging in current and proposed codes and standards.

Part 2 is intended to answer the question of "what to consider" when designing safe energy storage systems rather than "how to do it". References are provided to assist in the computational and numerical analysis that could be used in the quantification of fire and explosive hazard risk assessments and subsequent mitigation measures.

(1)

### (a) *Explosion Risks*

The governing national consensus standards available to the stakeholder and practitioner are NFPA 68, Standard on Explosion Protection by Deflagration Venting, and NPFA 69, Standard on Explosion Prevention Systems [13, 15]. These standards should be used in conjunction with this Guide when analyzing explosion prevention systems. The information presented in this section is intended to assist with the compliance verification of the Section 1207 of the International Fire Code (ICC-IFC) [16].

Energy storage system enclosures can be a room, a building, externally design container, within spaces specifically designed process equipment. In the unlikely event a lithium-ion cell degrades to the point where exothermic reactions and thermal runaway events occur, the cells will vent a highly flammable combination of hydrocarbons and without mitigation measures may reach flammability limits of the enclosure.

In explosion hazard analysis, lower flammability limit (LFL), laminar flame speed, and maximum overpressure are key metrics used to evaluate the overall hazard. The impetus for analyzing the explosion hazard is to establish the technical basis mitigation measures including detection and ventilation or explosion venting.

(1)

#### (a) *Explosion Mitigation: Deflagration Venting*

Explosion venting is the discharge of combustion gases during a deflagration to maintain pressures below the enclosure damage threshold [15].

The discharge vent opening is usually covered initially by one or more transient pressure relieving panels, rupture discs, or other engineered vent devices. Since explosion vents usually

after the explosion is initiated to limit the pressure rise, they cannot be used for detonations because the maximum pressure occurs instantaneously when the shock front reaches a given location. The most effective explosion venting systems are those that deploy early in the deflagration, have as large a vent area as possible, and allow unrestricted venting of combustion gases. Early vent deployment requires that the vent release at the lowest possible pressure without interfering with al operations and pressure fluctuations in the enclosure. In the case of vents on exterior walls and roofs of buildings, the minimum feasible vent release pressure is usually slightly larger than the highest expected differential pressure associated with wind loads (typically 0.14 to 0.21 psig; i.e., 0.96 to 1.44 kPa).

Crucial aspects of both vented-gas-explosion data correlations are:

- (1) mixture reactivity,
- (2) turbulence sources (both initial turbulence and obstacle-flame interaction turbulence),
- (3) vessel volume (scale) effects, and
- (4) vessel geometry (primarily length/diameter ratio), as well as the vent parameters: vent area, vent release pressure, and vent panel inertia.

Vented-gas-explosion testing has the additional complication of various flame instabilities, some of which are dependent on ignition location, enclosure wall lining, and the presence of equipment within the enclosure

The amount of vent area needed for effective explosion venting depends on the size of the enclosure and the rate of pressure rise within it. According to Equation  $X$  -of NFPA 68, the rate of pressure rise in an unvented enclosure is proportional to the product of the mixture effective burning velocity and flame surface area and varies inversely with the enclosure volume. The rate of pressure reduction due to venting is proportional to the product of vent area and gas velocity through the vent. The vent velocity is dependent on the instantaneous pressure in the enclosure and the composition of the vented gas (i.e., the relative proportions of burned and unburned gas). These considerations have been implemented in the formulation of theoretical models, scaling correlations for test data, and guidelines for determining the required vent area.

One of the most catastrophic failures of a lithium-ion battery system is a cascading thermal way event where multiple cells in a battery module fail due to a failure starting at one individual cell. Thermal runaway can occur due to exposure to excessive thermal abuse and repetitive exposure to elevated temperatures, electrical abuse and external shorts due to faulty wiring, or internal shorts cell defects. Thermal runaway events result in the venting of toxic and highly flammable gases and the release of significant energy in the form of heat. If ignited, these gases can cause enclosed areas to over pressurize, and if unmitigated, this overpressure can result in an explosion and severe damage to the battery and surrounding equipment or people.

Li-ion cells are sealed units, and thus under normal usage conditions, venting of electrolyte should not occur. In normal usage, cell electrolyte should not be encountered by anyone handling a Li-ion battery, making the risk of a spill of electrolyte from any commercial Li-ion battery pack remote. If subjected to abnormal heating or other thermal abuse conditions, electrolyte and electrolyte decomposition products can vaporize and be vented from cells.

Vented electrolyte is flammable, and may ignite on contact with a competent ignition source, such as an open flame, spark, or a sufficiently heated surface. Vented electrolyte may also ignite on contact with cells undergoing a thermal runaway reaction. Cell vent gas composition will depend upon a number of factors, including cell composition, cell state of charge, and the cause of cell venting. Vent gases may include volatile organic compounds (VOCs, such as alkyl-carbonates, methane, ethylene, and ethane), hydrogen gas, carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide, soot, and particulates containing oxides of nickel, aluminum, lithium, copper, and cobalt. Additionally, phosphorus pentafluoride (PF5), phosphoryl fluoride (POF3), and hydrogen fluoride (HF) vapors may form. Vented gases may irritate the eyes, skin, and throat. Cell vent gases are typically hot and upon exit from a cell, can exceed 1500 °C (1773 °F)

More than one scenario should be evaluated during the deflagration hazard study. It should include the 9540A cell and module test as a realistic option for failure. However, this only provides one data point and this does not provide any margin of safety for potential other failure modes such an arc flash on a module. Conservatism should always be applied to ensure a safety margin.
Recommended evaluation modes

- (1) Best *-case scenario* : One cell failure (may be the same as UL 9540A if the cells do not show propagation)
- (2) *UL 9540A* failure level One or more cells, module, or unit based on the test results.
- (3) Limited propagation *failure* : This adds a safety margin to the UL 9540A. Example if one cell failed with no propagation, then evaluate a 3 cell failure, one on either side. If a module failed but did not propagate, then evaluate 3 module failure the one above and below
- $(4)$  25% LFL failure Determine how may cells does it take to reach 25% LFL in the enclosure.
- (5) Partial volume *deflagration* : how many cells can fail with a resulting deflagration that does not produce a pressure value that will cause the enclosure to fail.
- (6) Worst *total failure* :– Assumes all cell in the ESS fail. No evaluation required

Based on these levels of evaluation it can then be incorporated in the Hazard Mitigation Analysis (HMA) with a determination of acceptable risk.

These factors that determine the release rate and initial geometry of a hydrocarbon gas release. The most significant is whether the gas is under pressure or released at atmospheric conditions. Depending on the release source the escaping gas can last from several minutes, hours, or days, until the supply is isolated, depleted, or fully depressurized, and routed for safe disposal [2]. These factors are:

- (1) The size, type, configuration (pressurized), and location of the ignition source
- (2) The type, amount, position, spacing, orientation, and surface area of the fuel packages
- (3) The geometry of the enclosure
- (4) The size and location of the compartment openings
- (5) The material properties of the enclosure boundaries [83].

Th e f o l l o w i ng s i m p l i fied gene ri c e v ent t r ee c an be de v e l o p ed for an explosion of flammable gases that accumulate inside the e o n t a i ner, cabinet or enclosure up on the rm al r un away of the L i - I on  $b a t t e r i e s.$ 

If released under atmospheric conditions, the gas will either rise or fall depending on its vapor density and will be carried into the path of forced air of the design of the Heating ventilation and air ditioning (HVAC) system of the energy storage enclosure.

Numerous UL 9540A unit tests indicate that in the absence of forced air movement, and in the presence of an ignition source, the flammable gas will burn relatively close to the source point, normally in a vertical position with flames of short length. For the lighter gases, the height of a gas plume will mostly be limited by enclosure environmental conditions. If gases are ignited, the height of the plume will rise due to the increased buoyancy of the high temperature gases from the combustion process [17].

If the lithium battery releases gas releases under pressure, there are a number of determining factors that influence the release rates and initial geometry of the escaping gases. The pressurized gas is released as a gas jet and depending on the nature of the failure, may be directed in the direction of the module colling systems exhaust pathway [17]. Escaping gases are normally very turbulent and air will immediately be drawn into the mixture. The mixing of air will also reduce the velocity of the escaping gas jet. Obstacles such as the module racking system, cable trays, conduit, HVAC ducting, buswork, structures, etc., will disrupt momentum forces of any pressurized release. These releases if not detected and/or ignited will then generally form a vapor cloud that would naturally disperse in the atmosphere or if later then ignited, cause an explosive blast if the cloud is in a relatively confined area. Where turbulent dispersion processes are prevalent (e.g., high pressure flow, winds, congestion, etc.) the gas will spread in both horizontal and vertical dimensions while continually mixing with available oxygen in the air. Initially, escaping gases are above the UEL, but with dispersion and turbulence effects, they will rapidly pass into the flammable limits. If not ignited

and given an adequate distance for dilution by the environment, they will eventually disperse below the LEL. Various computer software programs are currently available that can calculate the turbulent jet dispersion, downwind explosive atmospheric locations, and volumes for any given flammable commodity, release rates, and atmospheric date input (i.e., wind direction and speed) [17].

For ESS enclosures that are typically vented at only one end, the maximum effective vent area to use to determine the expected *P* <sub>red</sub> -shall be the enclosure cross section. For enclosures that can be vented at more than one point along the major axis, the vents shall be permitted to be distributed along the major axis and sized based on the length to diameter ( *L/D* ) between vents. The maximum effective vent area at any point along the major axis shall be the enclosure cross section [18].

The *L/D* -of an elongated enclosure shall be determined based upon the general shape of the enclosure, the location of the vent, the shape of any hopper extensions, and the farthest distance from the vent at which the deflagration could be initiated. The maximum flame length along which the flame can travel, *H* , should be determined based on the maximum distance, taken along the central axis, from the farthest end of the enclosure to the opposite end of the vent.

Where multiple vents are provided, a single value of H , and L/D, shall be permitted to be determined for the enclosure based on the farthest vent. Where multiple vents are located along the central axis, the value of *H* , and *L/D* , shall be permitted to be determined for each section using the maximum distance from the closest end of one vent to the opposite end of the next vent. The effective volume of the enclosure, *V eff* , should be determined based on the volume of that part of the enclosure through which the flame can pass as it travels along the maximum flame length,

Partial volume shall not be considered in the determination of effective volume for the safe release of the deflagration pressure transient. Where multiple vents are provided, a single value of  $V_{eff}$  shall be permitted to be determined for the enclosure based upon the farthest vent. Where multiple vents are located along the central axis, *V* eff shall be permitted to be determined for each section using the maximum distance from the closest end of one vent to the opposite end of the next vent. When *V eff* is less than the total volume of the enclosure, only those vents located within the effective volume shall be considered as providing venting for the event [18].

(1)

## (a) *Explosion Risk Assessment Considerations and Analysis Techniques*

Ignition of a gas-air mixture generated by lithium-ion batteries in thermal runaway in an unvented compact enclosure will usually result in a deflagration that produces a pressure increase because of hot gas and unburned gas confinement. Determining the amount of flammable gases that can be contained within the lower and upper flammability limits is a function of the total free-air volume of an enclosure as well as the forces exerted on the enclosure during a pressure transient due to the rapid expansion of air due to deflagration or detonation. The process for calculating the surface area for deflagration venting is presented in NFPA 68 and the parameters to accomplish this analysis include:

- (1) Determining the volume of the area to be protected
- (2) Enclosure strength
- (3) Enclosure reaction force(s)
- (4) Enclosure geometry
- (5) Enclosure internal surface area
- (6) Surface area of internal structures
- (7) Gas vapor fuel properties
- (8) Gas properties used in vent area calculation
- (9) Turbulent flame enhancement factor
- (10) Partial volume corrections

## (11) Panel inertia corrections

The following information is intended to assist the stakeholder and practitioner the parameters required to be identified and included in the analysis of the enclosure and is intended to be accompanied by the information within NFPA 68:2018. NFPA 68 provides the recognized guidance for the design, location, installation, maintenance, and use of devices and systems that vent tion gases and pressures resulting from a deflagration within an enclosure. However, it is noted NFPA 68 does not apply to emergency vents for pressure generated during runaway exothermic reactions, self-decomposition reactions, internal vapor generation resulting from electrical faults, or pressure generation mechanisms other than deflagration.

(1)

- (a)
- i. *Determine the Volume of Area to be Protected.*

The pressure developed in the enclosure is dependent on the extent of flame propagation and the temperature and composition of the burned gas. If the flame has propagated throughout the enclosure, the ratio of the deflagration pressure to the initial pressure in the enclosure can be obtained from the ideal gas equation as it applies to the post-deflagration and pre-deflagration gas-air mixtures, both of which occupy the same enclosure volume. Therefore, understanding the volume of the enclosure or volume to be protected has to be clearly understood and documented. Specifically, information that delineates the following is required:

(1)

- (a) Include any additional features that add to the volume of the area.
- (b) Subtract any stationary features that can subtract from the volume to be protected.
	- (2) *Enclosure Strength*

The purpose for understanding the strength of an enclosure is directly related to the safety integrity of the operating envelope. The essential safety element behind understanding the enclosure strength is to confidently quantitatively characterize the theoretical performance of the enclosure under transient conditions to limit the damage to property and minimizing the likelihood projectiles resulting in injury to the general public.

(1)

(a)

#### i. *Enclosure Reaction Force*

Knowing the duration of the reaction force can aid in the design of certain support structures for enclosures with deflagration vents.

The supporting structure for the enclosure shall be strong enough to withstand any forces that develop as a result of operation of the vent, including the dynamic effect of the rate of force application, as expressed by a *DLF* .

The following equation shall be used to determine the reaction force applicable to enclosures without vent ducts:

 $F_F = a^* D L F^* A \neq P F H$ 

#### **Where**

Fr is maximum reaction force resulting from combustion venting [kN (lbf)]

 $a'' =$  units conversion

 $DLF=1.2$ 

 $A \neq 0$  = vent area [m<sup>2</sup> (in.<sup>2</sup>)]

 $P_{\text{red}} = \text{maximum pressure developed during venting [bar-g (psig)]}$ 

Modification of the value of *DLF* based on a documented analysis of the vented explosion pressure profile and the supporting structure's response shall be permitted. The total reaction force shall be applied at the geometric center of the vent. The calculation of reaction forces on the enclosure shall be permitted to be eliminated when all of the following conditions are satisfied:

(1)

- (a) Vent panels are of the rupture diaphragm type.
- (b) Vent panels are located at opposing positions on the enclosure.
- (c) The  $P_{\text{start}}$  of each vent panel is equal and less than or equal to 0.1 bar  $g$ .
- (d) Vent panels are of equal area.

The duration of the reaction force shall be calculated according to the equation below, which is shown to represent the available duration data within a minus 37 percent and a plus 118 percent:

t f ൌb P max P red 0.5 V A <sup>v</sup>

$$
t_f = b \left(\frac{p_{max}}{p_{real}}\right)^{0.5} \left(\frac{V}{A_n}\right) \tag{2}
$$

Where,

 $t f =$  duration of pressure pulse after vent opening (s)

$$
b = 4.3 * 10 \stackrel{?}{\rightarrow} (1.3 * 10 \stackrel{?}{\rightarrow})
$$

 $P_{\text{max}} = \text{maximum pressure developed in an unvented explosion [bar g (psig)]}$ 

 $P_{\text{red}} = \text{maximum pressure developed during venting [bar-g (psig)]}$ 

 $V =$ enclosure volume

 $A_{\pi}$  = area of vent (without vent duct)  $\{m^2 \text{ (ft }^2\}$ 

$$
(1)
$$

(a)

## i. *Enclosure Geometry*

The factors that influence the development of a fire in an enclosure can be divided into two main categories: those that have to do with the enclosure itself, and those that have to do with the fuel [19]. The geometry and operating conditions of the combustion chamber in many practical devices (e.g., spark ignition engines and furnaces) are important because of their effects on the flame speed and heat release distribution - [20] .

It shall be permitted to conservatively determine both *H* and *Veff*, or *H* alone, but not *Veff* alone, based on the total enclosure, irrespective of vent location. The effective area, *Aeff* , shall be determined by dividing *Veff* by *H* . The effective hydraulic diameter, *Dhe* , for the enclosure shall be determined based on the general shape of the enclosure taken normal to the central axis:



 $A<sub>eff</sub>$  = effective area

#### = permitter of general shape

Where the enclosure and rectangular extension having an aspect ratio, *R*, of the largest cross section is greater than or equal to 1.2, the perimeter shall be permitted to be determined based on the aspect ratio of the largest cross section, given the following:

 $D$  he  $=4$  A eff R  $p=2^*$  R+1  $*$  D 1

$$
D_{h\epsilon} = 4 \left(\frac{A_{eff}}{R}\right)_{p=2*(R+1)*D,}
$$
 (4)

Where,

 $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{He}} = \mathbf{hydraulie diameter}$ 

 $A_{eff}$  = effective area

 $R =$  Aspect ratio

 $D_{\pm}$  = Largest cross section

p = permitter of general shape

*L/D* for use in this standard shall be set equal to *H/Dhe* . The vent areas shall be permitted to be reduced from those specified in within NFPA 68, Chapters 7 and 8 if large scale tests show that the resulting damage is acceptable to the user and the authority having jurisdiction [18].

The vent flow discharge coefficient  $(C_d)$  -shall be 0.70 unless the vent occupies an entire wall of the enclosure, in which case a value of 0.80 shall be permitted to be used. The value of P0 shall be greater than or equal to the normal operating pressure and chosen to represent the likely maximum pressure at which a flammable gas mixture can exist at the time of ignition [18].

(1)

(a)

i. *Enclosure Internal Surface Area*

The internal surface area, A s , shall include the total area that constitutes the perimeter surfaces of the enclosure that is being protected. Nonstructural internal partitions that cannot with– stand the expected pressure shall not be considered to be part of the enclosure surface area The enclosure internal surface area,  $A S$ , includes the roof, ceiling, walls floors and vent area and shall be based on shall be based on simple geometric figures. Surface corrugations and minor deviations from the simplest shapes shall not be considered [18].

Regular geometric deviations, such as saw-toothed roofs, shall be permitted to be "averaged" by adding the contributed volume to that of the major structure and calculating *AS* - for the basic geometry of the major structure. The internal surface of any adjoining rooms shall be included. The surface area of equipment and contained structures shall be neglected when calculating the enclosure internal surface area [18].

(1)

(a)

i. *Surface Area of Internal Structures*

The total external surface area,  $A_{\text{obs}}$  -of the following equipment and internal structures that can be in the enclosure shall be estimated:

(1)

(a) Piping, tubing, and conduit with diameters greater than  $\frac{1}{2}$  in.

- (b) Structural columns, beams, and joists
- (c) Stairways and railings
- (d) Equipment with a characteristic dimension in the range of 2 in. to 20 in.  $(5.1 \text{ cm to } 51)$  $em) - [18]$ 
	- (2) *Gas/Fuel Properties.*

Any material capable of reacting rapidly and exothermically with an oxidizing medium can be classified as a fuel. The concentration of a gaseous fuel in air is usually expressed as a volume percentage (vol %) or mole percentage (mol %).

Flammable gases are present in air in concentrations below and above which they cannot burn. Such concentrations represent the flammable limits, which consist of the lower flammable limit, *LFL* , and the upper flammable limit, *UFL* . It is possible for ignition and flame propagation to occur between the concentration limits. Ignition of mixtures outside these concentration limits fails because insufficient energy is given off to heat the adjacent unburned gases to their ignition temperatures. Lower and upper flammable limits are determined by test and are test-method dependent. Published flammable limits for numerous fuels are available. For further information, see NFPA 325. (Note: Although NFPA 325 has been officially withdrawn from the *National Fire Codes* , the information is still available in NFPA's *Fire Protection Guide to Hazardous Materials* .)

The mixture compositions that are observed to support the maximum pressure, *P max* , and the maximum rate of pressure rise, *(dP/dt)max* , for a deflagration are commonly on the fuel-rich side of the stoichiometric mixture. It should be noted that the concentration for the maximum rate pressure rise and the concentration for *Pmax* can differ.

(1)

(a)

- i.
- अआ *Flammable gas properties identified in UL 9540A testing*

अआ *Composition*

The ability to estimate the toxic hazards of combustion gases in a fire compartment is of great importance to the fire protection engineer. The species of interest to the fire engineer would most often be CO, CO, and  $\Theta_2$ , but concentrations of other combustion products may also be of interest; for example, soot concentration can be directly linked to visibility through a gas mass. To allow an estimation of the hazard, the amount of each toxic product produced per unit fuel burned must be assessed, i.e., the species yield must be estimated. Once the production term is known (the yield), the concentration in the fire gases must be calculated. The products of combustion may be diluted by air entering the hot gas layer through the plume and gases may escape out through an opening, thus influencing the species concentrations in the hot gas layer. The concentration of species must therefore be calculated by considering a mass balance of the region of interest. For example, this region may be the hot gas layer in a room or a fire plume. The generation of combustion products is a very complex issue, and the engineer must rely on measurement and approximate methods for estimating the yield of a product [19].

Understanding the generation of combustion products involves a detailed knowledge of their chemistry. But this is very complex, and the fire protection engineer must rely on measurements, not fundamental theory, to make predictions. For a given product, the nature of the combustion products will depend on the following:

- (1) The model of combustion (flaming, smoldering, or thermal degradation, i.e., pyrolysis
- (2) or evaporation);



When chemical reactions occur, they are normally accompanied by the release or absorption of heat. Thermochemistry deals with the quantification of the associated energy changes. This requires a definition of the initial and final states, normally expressed in terms of an appropriate chemical equation, for example,

-*€ 3 H 8 + 50 2*  $C_3H_8 + 5O_2 \rightarrow 3CO_2 + 4H_2O$  (5)

in which the reactants (propane and oxygen) and products (carbon dioxide and water) are specified. This balanced chemical equation defines the *stoichiometry* of the reaction, that is, the exact proportions of the two reactants (propane and oxygen) and products (carbon dioxide and water) are specified. This balanced chemical equation defines the *stoichiometry* -of the reaction, that is, the exact proportions of the two reactants (propane and oxygen) for complete conversion to products (no reactants remaining) ([21]. Note that the physical states of the reactants and products should also be specified. In most cases, the initial conditions correspond to ambient (i.e., 25°C and atmospheric pressure) so that there should be no doubt about the state of the reactants. In this case both are gaseous, but it is more common in fires for the "fuel" to be in a condensed state, either liquid or solid.

Given the scenario where it is required to calculate the mass of oxygen or air required for the complete oxidation of a given the NFPA 68 required flammable gas equivalent to mass of propane. It is required to understand that a single mole of propane (44 g) reacts completely with five moles of  $oxygen (5x32 = 160 g).$ 

Where is it understood that 1 g propane requires 3.64 g oxygen for complete stoichiometry. Given a burning propane air mixture, the presence of nitrogen needs to be considered although it does not participate to any significant extent in the chemical change. It is known that the oxygen to nitrogen ratio in air is approximately 21:79 (or 1:3.76). Therefore, the reaction in this scenario is rewritten as

 $-C$  3 H 8  $+$  50 2  $+18.8$  N 2  $\rightarrow$  3CO 2  $+4$  H 2 0+18.8 N 2

$$
C_3H_8 + 5O_2 + 18.8N_2 \rightarrow 3CO_2 + 4H_2O + 18.8N_2 \quad \underline{\qquad} (5)
$$

which shows that 44 g propane requires 686.4 g of "air" for complete combustion, that is, 15.6 g air/g propane[[19].

Calculations of this nature are essential to determining the magnitude of the deflagration  $s$ ure transient. In order to calculate yields we must know the exact chemical formula for the reaction. The above equations can then be used to calculate the equivalence ratio, the fuel mixture fraction, and the yield of species *i* . However, the exact chemical formula for the reaction is hardly ever known in practical applications. It is only in cases where the products composition is directly measured in experiments that we can use the data and the above equations for calculations as typically recorded in the UL 9540A testing [19].

(1)

(a)

i.

## अआ *Fundamental Burning Velocity.*

Ignition of a gas air mixture in an unvented enclosure will usually result in a deflagration (i.e., flame propagation at subsonic speed away from the ignition site). The pressure developed in the ure is dependent on the extent of flame propagation, and the temperature and composition of the burned gas. If the flame has propagated throughout the enclosure, the ratio of the deflagration pressure to the initial pressure in the enclosure can be obtained from the ideal gas equation as it applies to the post deflagration and pre deflagration gas-air mixtures, both of which occupy the same enclosure volume [21].

The rate of pressure rise during a deflagration is primarily dependent on the rate of flame propagation and the vessel size, as well as the flame temperature. Theoretical calculations usually based on the following assumptions. First, it is assumed that the flame speed is small in comparison to sound speed so that the pressures in the enclosure are spatially uniform at any given time during the deflagration. The rate of flame propagation relative to the unburned gas ahead of the flame front is called the burning velocity,  $S_{\mu}$  [21].

Flame propagation into a near-stoichiometric gas-air mixture will occur as an expanding spherical flame until the flame approaches the walls of the enclosure. Laminar burning velocities have been measured for worst-case concentrations of many gases and vapors. Representative values for the alkanes and many other hydrocarbons are 40 to 47 cm/s. Expansion of the burned gas, and the corresponding motion of the unburned gas away from the ignition site as the flame propagates, the actual flame velocity relative to a fixed observer  $(i.e., the flame speed)$  to be significantly larger than the burning velocity. Before any compression occurs, the flame speed is ( *Tb* / *T* 0) *Su* , which is equal to 350 to 440 cm/s for many hydrocarbons at near stoichiometric concentrations. Turbulent motion of the unburned gas can further increase the burning velocity and flame speed, as represented either by the augmentation factor *χ* , or by generating wrinkled or distorted flames with corresponding larger flame surface areas [21].

Where the hazard within an ESS consists of a flammable gas mixture, the vent size shall be based on the fundamental burning velocity of the mixture. Where the gas mixture composition is not certain, NFPA 68 requires the vent size shall be based on the component having the highest fundamental burning velocity.

A list of fundamental burning velocities of select gases is presented in NFPA 68:2018, Table  $D.1(a)$ .

(1)

(a)

i.

## Maximum Pressure Developed in a Contained Deflagr

By definition, the *maximum pressure*  $-(Pmax)$  is the maximum pressure developed in a contained deflagration of an optimum mixture as determined by ISO 6184-2:1985 [22]. A list of select flammable gas maximum pressures is provided in NFPA 68, Table D.2.

(1)

(a)

i. *Gas Properties Used in Vent Area Calculation*

The following variables are required to calculate the minimum vent area:

 $(1)$   $P_A$  Enclosure pressure (gauge) prior to ignition.

(2) *P max* Maximum pressure developed in a contained deflagration.

(3)  $S_{\pi}$  Fundamental burning velocity.

- $(4)$  rho u Unburned gas/air mixture density.
- (5) *Gu* Unburned gas/air mixture sonic flow mass flux.
- (6) gamma\_b Burned gas/air mixture specific heat ratio.
- (7) mu\_u Unburned gas/air mixture dynamic viscosity
- (8) *au* Unburned gas/air mixture sound speed.
	- (9)
- i. *Turbulent Flame Enhancement Factor*

NFPA 68:2018 provides instructions for calculating the baseline value,  $\lambda \rho$ , of  $\lambda$  shall be calculated where

$$
\rightarrow
$$
  $\phi$  4 = 4, if  $\rightarrow$  Re f  $\leq 4000$  Re f  $4000$ , if  $\rightarrow$  Re f  $\geq 400$ 

 $\phi$  2 = max 1,  $\phi$  1 R e v 10 6 β 2 S u 0.5 -

$$
Re f = \rho u S u D he 2 \mu u
$$
\n
$$
\varphi_1 = \left\{ \frac{1.if Re_f \le 4000}{\frac{Re_f}{\Delta_{000}}}, if Re_f \ge 400 \right\} Re_f = \frac{\rho_u s_u(\frac{D_{h\alpha}}{2})}{\mu_u}
$$
\n(6)

Where,

 $\rho$  u  $\rho_u$  = mass density of unburned gas air mixture (kg/m  $\frac{3}{2}$ )  $S_{\text{H}}$  = fundamental burning velocity of gas-air mixture (m/s)

 $\mu$  u  $\mu$ <sub>u</sub> = the unburned gas-air mixture dynamic velocity (kg/m-s)

 $D_{\text{He}}$  = the enclosure hydraulic equivalent diameter as determined in NFPA 68:2018, Chapter 6 (m)

 $\varphi_2 = max \left\{ 1, \beta_1 \left( \frac{Re_v}{10^6} \right)^{\left( \frac{\beta_2}{S_u} \right)^{0.5}} \right\} \qquad \qquad \overbrace{\qquad \qquad }^{(7)}$ 

Where,

 $β$  4  $β$ <sub>1</sub> = 1.23

 $β$  2  $β$ <sub>2</sub> = fundamental burning velocity of gas air mixture (m/s)

 $S_{\text{H}}$  = fundamental burning velocity of gas-air mixture (m/s)

Re <sup>v</sup> ൌ ρ <sup>u</sup> <sup>u</sup> <sup>v</sup> D <sup>v</sup> 2 μ <sup>u</sup> Where,

 $\rho$  u  $\rho_u$  = mass density of unburned gas-air mixture (kg/m  $\frac{3}{2}$ )

 $u_{\overline{x}}$  = maximum velocity through vent (m/s)

 $D<sub>x</sub>$  = the vent diameter as determined through iterative calculation (m)

 $\mu_{\rm H}$  - = the unburned gas-air mixture dynamic velocity (kg/m-s)



M T ൌ P red 0.2 <sup>n</sup> 0.8 V S <sup>u</sup> λ 0.5 1.67

$$
M_T = \left[\frac{P_{red}^{0.2}n^{0.8}V}{(S_{\rm H}\lambda)^{0.5}}\right]^{1.67}
$$
 (12)

Where,

 $M \, T \, M_T =$ threshold mass (kg/m  $\geq$ )

 $P_{\text{red}} = \text{maximum pressure developed during venting [bar-g (psig)]}$ 

## $=$  number for panels

## V = Enclosure volume

The determined vent area shall be adjusted for vent mass when the vent mass exceeds  $M \neq -as$ calculated in above.

For instances when ESS panel mass  $M \rightarrow MT$ , the required vent area,  $Av$  2, shall be calculated as follows:

$$
A \quad \psi_2 = A \quad \psi_1 + B \quad \text{SH} \quad 1 + B
$$
\n
$$
A \quad \psi_2 = A \quad \psi_1 + B \quad \text{SH} \quad 1 + B
$$
\n
$$
A_{v2} = A_{v1} F_{SH} \left[ 1 + \frac{0.05 \left( M \right)^{0.6} \left( S_{u2} \right)^{0.5}}{n^{0.8} V P_{v2}^{0.2}} \right] \quad \text{(13)}
$$

Where,

 $A \nleftrightarrow Z \nvert A_{v2}$  = vent area for panel inertia (m<sup>2</sup>)

 $_{\rm mass\, of\, vent\, panel\, (kg/m}$   $^{2}$  )

A  $v1$   $A_{v1}$  = vent area determined in equation 11

 $F S H = 1$  for translating panels or 1.1 for hinged panels

In ESS installations where  $M \leq MT$ ,  $Av$  2 shall be set equal to  $Av$  1.

Ignition of a gas air mixture in an unvented enclosure will usually result in a deflagration (i.e., flame propagation at subsonic speed away from the ignition site). The pressure developed in the enclosure is dependent on the extent of flame propagation, and the temperature and composition of the burned gas. If the flame has propagated throughout the enclosure, the ratio of the deflagration pressure to the initial pressure in the enclosure can be obtained from the ideal gas equation as it applies to the post deflagration and pre deflagration gas air mixtures, both of which occupy the same enclosure volume.

The maximum pressures for each flammable gas occur at fuel equivalence ratios in the range 1.1 to 1.2 (i.e., at slightly richer than stoichiometric concentrations). These worst-case deflagration pressures are in the range 8 to 9.6 atm abs. Theoretical values of *Pm* at an equivalence ratio of 0.5, which corresponds to the lower flammable limit for methane and propane, are in the range 6 to 6.5 atm abs. Experimental measurements of closed vessel deflagration pressures agree well with the theoretical values of *Pm* at near-stoichiometric concentrations, but are significantly less than the theoretical values at concentrations near the lower and upper flammable limits. The reasons for the deviation at near-limit concentrations are 1) incomplete combustion due to flame propagation through only a portion of the enclosure and 2) slow flame propagation allowing time for heat losses from the burned gas mixture to the enclosure walls. As an example of the incomplete combustion, extensive deflagration testing of lean hydrogen– air mixtures has shown that the fraction of hydrogen burned ranges from zero to one as the hydrogen concentration increases from its lower limit of 4 volume percent to 8 volume percent, and remains equal to approximately one (complete combustion) as the hydrogen concentration ranges from 8 volume percent to about 40 volume percent (equivalence ratio of 1.6).

(1)

## (a) *Blast Pressure wave Determination*

Blast wave pressures from the door-vented BESS enclosure gas deflagration have been culated using three different literature correlations for blast pressure versus distance from the enclosure vent. These are the Palmer and Tonkin correlation, the Hattwig correlation, and the Li and Hao correlation [23-25].

Figure 8 shows the calculated blast wave pressures as a function of distance from a blownoff/open door, using an upper bound 6-psig estimate of the enclosure deflagration pressure explained above. According to the preliminary site plan drawing you provided, the distance from the BESS enclosure to the fence line is 25 feet. The range of calculated pressures from the three correlations at that distance is 1.5 to 3.5 psig. A pressure of 1.5 psig would break glass windows such as a vehicle window. A pressure of 3.5 psig can damage industrial buildings and storage tanks.

Figure 9 shows the calculated blast wave pressures as a function of distance from a blownoff/open door, using a BESS enclosure P red value of 4 psig. As shown in the figure, the calculated pressure at the 25-ft distant fence line is in the range 0.9 to 2.2 psig. This range of pressures has a slightly reduced damage potential compared to the damage described above. In both cases, there is also a threat of projectiles from objects such as a blown-off door or fastener.

(1)

#### (a) *Fireball Size Determination*

The requirements for the establishment of an area in the proximity of rated deflagration vents presented in the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Standard 68, *Standard for Explosion Protection by Deflagration Venting* [26]. The specific requirements for the establishment of an area where the intentional exclusion of persons is recommended is presented in Section 7.6, Fireball Dimensions which states "[the] hazard zone from a vented gas deflagration shall be calculated by the following equation:

$$
D = 3.1 \begin{pmatrix} V \\ n \end{pmatrix}^{0.402} \qquad (14)
$$

where:

 $D =$ axial distance (front-centerline) from vent (m)

 $V =$  volume of vented enclosure (m3)

 $n =$  number of evenly distributed vents

The hazard zone measured radially (to the sides, measured from the centerline of the vent) shall be calculated as 0.5 *D* " [26].

The equation governing the calculation of the dimensions of an exclusion zone is based on the work of Bartknecht [27, 28] and Siwek [29] and is bounded by enabling assumptions. Siwek infers the estimation of the maximum flame range *(LF) "* can be made only for nonturbulent gas-air mixtures ignited in a cubic vessel" and is directly proportional to size of the cubic vented vessel [29]. However, Siwek's work does not address the impact of evenly distributed vents. It is inferred the fireball hazard zone can be linearly divided by the number of deflagration vents. Additionally, Siwek's work is based on dated research (1989)[29]. Therefore, it is recommended the engineer analyzing the hazards consider the additional research identified numerous fireball calculations methodologies as a function of fuel [30, 31].

The modelling of fireballs covers the following aspects:

- $(1)$  Fireball regime,
- (2) Mass of fuel in the fireball,
- (3) Fireball development and timescales,
- (4) Fireball diameter and duration,

## $(5)$  Heat radiated and  $(6)$  the view factor.

The calculation of the heat radiated from a fireball emphasizes the necessity of understanding the different approaches which may be taken to the modelling of fires in process plants. Specifically, there are three different ways of determining the heat radiated. One is to assume that it is a given fraction of the heat released. Another is to assume a given value for the heat radiated from the flame surface, or surface emissive power  $-$  [31] . The third is to calculate the heat radiated from the flame properties, such as flame temperature and emissivity. Numerical modeling of fireballs can be accomplished through correlations of diameter and duration time, and fundamental models.

Various engineers have correlated fireball diameter using a relation of the form

$$
D = K + M + H + 1 = K_1 M^{n_1} \qquad (15)
$$

where D is the diameter of the fireball  $(m), K \pm i s$  a constant and n  $\pm i s$  an index  $-[31]$ .

Based upon the updated information, the application of the work of A.F. Roberts which is one of the most widely recognized correlation for hydrocarbons and should be considered as part of the analysis and methodologies used to arrive at a conservative hazard zone [30]:

$$
D = 5.8 \text{ m} \quad f \quad 4 \quad 3 \quad D = 5.8 m_f^{1/3} \quad (16)
$$

where:

 $D =$ axial distance (front-centerline) from vent (m)

 $m =$  mass of propellant (kg)

Following the principles outlined in NFPA 68, the diameter of the fireball is a function of evenly spaced vents. Therefore, the application of A.F. Roberts and NFPA 68, the equation used for analysis becomes:

$$
D=5.8 \quad m \quad f \quad n \quad 4 \quad 3 \quad D = 5.8 \left(\frac{m_f}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \quad (16)
$$

**Where** 

- $D =$ axial distance (front-centerline) from vent (m)
- $m =$  mass of propellant (kg)
- $n =$  number of evenly distributed vents

(1)

(a)

## i. *Explosion Mitigation: Flammable Gas Detection and Ventilation*

The recognized national consensus standard to be used for the design and construction of explosion prevention systems is NFPA 69:2019 and should be used in conjunction with this Chapter [13].

For effective and efficient mitigation of explosions within energy storage systems, the intentional use of the container ventilation system as a safety barrier to limit or control flammability limits, the following measures can be considered:

External ventilation at nominal rate in case of absence of carbon monoxide (to be measured by local CO detector).

- Increase of external ventilation rate to 400 Nm3/h (or more) in case of H2 and/ or CO detection in the container. The high CO content of the flammable gases generated during thermal runaway of batteries allows a rapid detection based on CO concentration.
- Independent power supply to the external ventilation system (to avoid common mode failures in case of fire in the container).

degraded cells.  $-$  In the event of  $-$ s u c h a f i r e, t he intentional operation of the ESS v en ti l a t i on sy s t em m ay i n c r e a se t he c ombu s t i on of the flammable gases by the int ro due t i on of fresh air int o the c ont a iner. Conversely, the introduction of fresh air may assist in diluting the flammable gases from reaching the lower flammability limit  $(LFL)$ .  $-$  T here f o r e, as part of the engineering controls for mitigating an explosive environment, stakeholders and practitioners should consider adopting a well evaluated risk-reduction and hazard mitigation strategy. This risk-reduction and hazard mitigation strategy -should consider the appropriate variables and controls necessary to establish fire scenario metrics, energy storage management system performance permissives, and other administrative controls to determine the appropriate measures of when to  $s \mathfrak{t}$  o p/de-energize  $\mathfrak{t}$  he v e n til a t i on i n c ase of a c o n f i rm ed container compartment fire. However, it is understood the ESS thermal management system for internal container environmental control does not directly control or impact cell thermal runaway of one or more

can be performed to assist in the engineering risk reduction decision process. - S u c h an ana l y s i s was p e r fo r m ed i n an o n g o i ng J o i n t D e v e l o p m e nt P r o j e c t for battery safety led by DNV GL  $[10, 32]$ . The influence of external v en ti l a t i on on t he fla mm a b l e cl o u d v o l ume i n a ba tt e r y c o nt a i ner up o n t her m al r un away of Li -I o n b a tt e ri es wa s i n v e s ti g a t ed i n t h i s p r o j e c t . P r e li m i n a r y r esul t s f r om CFD s im ul a t i o n s de m  $\theta$  n s t r a t e - t he eff e c t t h a t i n c r e ased  $\theta$  ent i l a t i  $\theta$ n - r a t es - c a n have on the flamm able  $e$  loudsize. Figure 10 shows how increasing the  $\frac{1}{2}$  en t i l a t i o n r a t e fr om 5 to 10 a i r ch a n g es per ho u r  $($  A C H  $)$  r ed uc es t he m aximum  $f$  l am m a b l  $e$  c l  $\theta$  u d s i z  $e$  by m ore t han 2  $0\%$  i n c a se of t her m al  $r$  un away of a s ing l ebatter  $y$  mo dule. Depending on the complexity of the ESS it is recommended a three-dimensional (3D) computational fluid dynamics (CFD) analysis be performed whereby multivariable attribute analysis

CFD dispersion simulations show that in a typical battery container (without external ventilation), failure of a single battery rack (consisting of about 15 to 20 battery modules) may result in a 50% volume filling of an equivalent stoichiometric gas cloud. This gas cloud contains gradients of gas concentrations and air. If the gas discharge rate is high enough (relative to external ventilation), the atmosphere inside the container will become saturated, reducing the size of the flammable cloud. If ventilation is increased, then the flammable cloud size increases with increasing ventilation rates. This is why ventilation is mainly useful when the thermal runaway can be limited to one of just a few battery modules.

A study was performed by Warner et al. (2018) on explosion and fire risk in ventilated battery rooms. They used experimentally-backed computational fluid dynamics (CFD) simulations of offgassing and explosion events. In the simulations, the composition of the gases discharged during thermal runaway of Li-ion batteries were obtained experimentally. Based on these experiments, they conclude that the primary gases of interest, in order of descending approximate quantitye2, CH4, ethylene, HCl, ethane, methanol, ethanol, benzene, toluene, HF, HCN. Many of the gases end up in small enough quantities to be discarded, with CO, H2, CH4 and ethylene presenting the bulk of the explosion risk.

The blast panel weight and size are varied to find the combination of parameters that yield sufficient reduction in explosion pressure. The dimensioning event is assumed to be an entire battery rack malfunction (thermal runaway) producing a 50% volume fill of a stoichiometric equivalent mixture. No external air ventilation is present.

CFD simulations indicate that the explosion overpressure in the container exceeds 3 barg if it is a fully enclosed strong room. This pressure is too high to be contained and requires the use of sure relief panels to lower the internal pressure acceptable levels. Assuming a design load of 1 barg overpressure on the container walls, one can determine the relief panel area and weight required to reduce the overpressure below the design threshold of the container. The explosion pressures are found by modeling the same explosion event several times with varying panel weight and size.

In all modeling and analysis methodologies used, it is recommended that NFPA 69:2019 be relied upon for verification and validation of conclusions and results. The m ost c o mmon u s e o f N FPA 6 9: 2 019 f or ESS facilities is presented in C h a p t e r 8, *Deflagration Prevention by Combustible Concentration Reduction* [13]. Chapter 8 outlines the requirements and techniques for maintaining the flammable gas  $\epsilon$  o n ce n trat i on be l ow t h  $\epsilon$  L o w e r Fl a m ma b le Limit (LFL).

The LFL for ESS applications is usually determined by flammability testing on a gas sample obtained during UL 9540A thermal runaway tests.  $-$  T h e gas  $m$  ix t u r e p ro d u e ed d u ring ther m al r un awa y s as noted above, of t en co n tai n s c ar b o n m o n o x i d e, c arb on dio xid e, h y drogen, and v ari ous h y dro carb on s (in c ludin g ele et  $r \theta$  l  $\gamma$  te  $v \theta$  a p  $\theta$  rs),  $w$  ith  $w$  th e relative  $v \theta$  p r  $\theta$  p ort i  $\theta$  n s of the see c o m p one n ts va r y i ng wi d e l y w i th t h e cell state-of-charge at runaway, and the cathode and electrolyte materials [11]. The UL 9540A cell level report includes the gas mixture composition and the measured LFL value for the particular ESS cell application.

NFPA 69:2019 paragraph 8.2.3.2 requires ESS facility owner or operator to provide complete documentation and a detailed description of the protection system to be used for monitoring and controlling flammable gas concentrat i ons. This system usually includes the following components:

- B a tt e r y management system ( B MS) p r o v i sions f or d e t ecti n g an d con tr ollin g in e ip ien t cell an o mal i es tha t cou ld lead t o a the  $r$  mal ru n aw a  $v$  .
- **Gas d et ee ti on pre v isi en s d esign ed t e s en s e con e en tra ti e n s** of v a ri o u s the r m al r u n away f lammable ga s es p r od u c ed in the e ar l y s ta g e s o farun away an d send a n alar m to the BM S an d e x tern al  $s$   $+$   $s$  te  $m$   $m$   $+$   $n$   $+$   $t$   $+$   $r$  $+$
- $\bullet$  N  $\bullet$  r  $m$  al -a n d emerge n  $c$ y  $\bullet$  e n tilation a n d ESS e n  $c$  l  $\bullet$  s u re e x h a u s t p r e v isions design e d to dil u t e a n d e x p el fl a mma b le  $v$  ap  $e$  rs  $\cdot$   $\overline{131}$  .

NFPA 69 paragraph 8.2.3.4 requires the protection system design be reviewed by a qualified person acceptable to the facility's authority having jurisdiction.  $\Theta$  th er paragra ph  $s - r$  eq u ire the ESS owner o r operat or to p r o v id e m ain t e n a n e e o f the sy st e m aft er installation and acceptane e, and to arrange for periodicinspection by p e r so nn e l t r a i n ed by t he p r ot e e t i o n - s y st e m - m a nu fae tu rer(s). The r e i s o n e impo r tant n e w provision in NFPA 69-2019 applicable to an instrumented explosion prevention control system, also known as a safety instrumented system (SIS). ) [13]. In order to achieve a minimum documented level of system reliability, section 15.5.5 requires an SIS installed after November 5, 2021 to be either listed for explosion prevention service or evaluated to demonstrate a safety integrity level 2 rating in accordance with ANSI/ISA 84.000.01. Therefore, the review of all ESS instrumented explosion prevention systems should include a careful assessment of component and system reliability.

NFPA 69 paragraph 8.3.1 requires the flammable gas concentration to be maintained at or below 25 percent of the LFL. There is an exception for installations that have continuous monitoring of combustible gas concentration and associated safety interlocks to control flammable gas concentrations. Such explosion prevention systems are allowed to maintain flammable gas concentrations at or below 60 percent of the LFL. This is an important provision for BESS explosion prevention systems that can be shown to have reliable continuous monitoring of incipient thermal runaway flammable gases, and the combination of ventilation provisions to cope with UL 9540A data on gas generation rates and quantities, so as to limit gas concentrations to 60% of the LFL.

N FPA  $69-2$  019 se e ti on  $8.3:3$  con tain s so me straigh tf or ward re qu ire m en t s f o r v e n t ilation and air in ta k es an d e x h a u s t s . Th e s e requir ements include locating air in take sand exhausts such that f l a mm a b l e gas d is e h arged fr o m o n e en e l o s u re w i l l n ot enter the air i n take

## o fana d ja e en tene l o s u re.

NFPA 69 Annex D describes ventilation calc u lat i on me th o d  $s-t$  o est i mate the c on c e ntration of a f lammable gas released into a ventilated enclosure such as a BESS container. Equations are given for simple applications including calculating the number of enclosure air changes per minute required to limit the average gas concentration to some fraction of the LFL. These equations are special case solutions to the following equation for gas concentration, C, as a function of time, t.

$$
\mathcal{V} \quad \text{d}\mathcal{C} \quad \text{d}t \quad +Q\mathcal{C}=G \qquad V\frac{\mathcal{d}\mathcal{C}}{\mathcal{d}t} + Q\mathcal{C} = G \qquad (17)
$$

where:  $V$  is t h e en e l o s u re vol u me,  $O$  is the en e l o s u re ve n tilation rate, and

 G is the gas vol u metric rel e a s e rate. In order to account for ventilation mixing issues, i.e. uniform concentrations, the value of  $Q$  in Equation 1 is replaced by KQ, where K is an empirically determined mixing efficiency factor for the specific ventilation arrangement. The solution of Eqn 1 for the case of constant gas release rate starting at  $t=0$ , is

$$
C = G \quad Q \quad 4 = e \quad KN \quad C = \frac{G}{o}(1 - e^{-KN}) \quad (18)
$$

Where the required number of air changes for dilution, N, resulting in a given concentration. introduced implicitly as being equal to *N* = QtV. Figure 11 is a graph showing C calculated from and Figure 12 shows the solution for dilution after the release rate is terminated

#### **REFERENCES**

- [1] Y. Liu, Q. Duan, J. Xu, H. Li, J. Sun, and Q. Wang, "Experimental study on a novel safety strategy of lithium-ion battery integrating fire suppression and rapid cooling," *Journal of Energy Storage,* vol. 28, p. 101185, 2020.
- [2] M. Ghiji *et al.* , "A Review of Lithium-Ion Battery Fire Suppression," *Energies,* vol. 13, no. 19, p. 5117, 2020.
- [3] A. W. Golubkov *et al.* , "Thermal-runaway experiments on consumer Li-ion batteries with metal-oxide and olivin-type cathodes," *Rsc Advances,* vol. 4, no. 7, pp. 3633-3642, 2014.
- [4] P. J. Bugryniec, J. N. Davidson, D. J. Cumming, and S. F. Brown, "Pursuing safer batteries: thermal abuse of LiFePO4 cells," *Journal of Power Sources,* vol. 414, pp. 557-568, 21 January 2019 2019.
- [5] A. Barré, B. Deguilhem, S. Grolleau, M. Gérard, F. Suard, and D. Riu, "A review on lithium-ion battery ageing mechanisms and estimations for automotive applications," *Journal of Power Sources,* vol. 241, pp. 680-689, 2013.
- [6] X. Meng *et al.* , "Internal failure of anode materials for lithium batteries—A critical review," *Green Energy & Environment,* vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 22-36, 2020.
- [7] F. Larsson and B. E. Mellander, "Abuse by external heating, overcharge and short circuiting of commercial lithium-ion battery cells," *Journal of The Electrochemical Society,* vol. 161, no. 10, p. A1611, 2014.
- [8] Davion Hill, "McMicken Battery Energy Storage System Event Technical Analysis and Recommendations," DNV GL Energy Insights USA, Inc, Chalfont, PA, 18 July 2020.
- [9] EPRI. "BESS Failure Event Database." Electric Power Research Institute. https://storagewiki.epri.com/index.php/BESS\_Failure\_Event\_Database (accessed 14 May, 2022).
- [10] B. Gully, H. Helgesen, J. Skogtvedt, and D. Kostopoulos, "Technical Reference for Li-ion Battery Explosion Risk and Fire Suppression," in "Maritime Battery Safety Joint Development Project," DNV-GL, Høvik, Norway, 1 November 2019.
- [11] A. R. Baird, E. J. Archibald, K. C. Marr, and O. A. Ezekoye, "Explosion hazards from lithium ion battery vent gas," *Journal of Power Sources*, vol. 446, no. Volume 446, pp.



Annex G chapter 6 guidance LIB gas production for was a reserve chapter last cycle due to limited information available at the time of committee review. The data provides the necessary information to the industry for guidance on how to evaluate the explosion control as required under section 9.6.5.6

# **Related Public Inputs for This Document**

## **Related Input Relationship**

Public Input No. 65-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 66-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 67-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 4.2.1.3] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 70-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.1.5.1.2] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 71-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.1.1] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 72-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.1.2] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 73-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.3] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 74-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. A.9.6.5.6.3] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 75-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.4] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 76-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.5] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 77-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.6] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 78-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.9] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 79-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.7] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 80-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.8] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 81-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

Public Input No. 82-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.2 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

Public Input No. 83-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.3.1 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

Public Input No. 84-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.5.3.2.6 [Excluding any Sub-Sections]]

Public Input No. 85-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.6.5.6.7] 855 Explosion Task

Public Input No. 65-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] Public Input No. 66-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 3.3.27] Public Input No. 67-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 4.2.1.3] Public Input No. 70-NFPA 855-2023 [New Section after 9.1.5.1.2] Public Input No. 71-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.1.1] Public Input No. 72-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.1.2] Public Input No. 73-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.3] Public Input No. 74-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. A.9.6.5.6.3] Public Input No. 75-NFPA 855-2023 [Section No. 9.6.5.6.4]

**Group Group Group** 855 Explosion Task **Group** 855 Explosion Task **Group** 855 Explosion Task **Group** 855 Explosion Task **Group Group** 



# **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Paul Hayes



# **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-196-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** This addition provides necessary information to the industry for guidance on how to evaluate the explosion control as required under Section 9.6.5.6.

# **Public Input No. 61-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. G.11.3 ]**

## **G.11.3** Guidelines.

Battery ESS based on electrochemical technologies represent the majority of ESS being designed and installed. The safe operation of electrochemical ESS is critical—especially when installed inside occupied structures. The primary concerns of the fire service with this type of installation would include the implications of overheating via internal or external heat source, thermal runaway, potential deflagration event in enclosed spaces, and the effective operation of fire detection, suppression, and smoke exhaust systems. There are additional concerns to be considered where assessing firefighter responses to electrochemical ESS.

Handover procedures for potentially damaged systems should be developed for fire departments to ensure the timely response of a qualified person as a technical representatives to manage safety issues. These procedures would also cover issues such as the removal or recycling of damaged equipment. Another procedural component is the realization that damaged ESS system components could include significant stored or stranded energy with no known method for safe dissipation. Stored or stranded energy could be defined as energy that remains in a battery after the system has been shut down.

# **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

"Qualified" is used in different configurations thru out the standard. Updating the definition to align with the use in the standard. Additional updating the usage to be consistently applied.

# **Related Public Inputs for This Document**



# **Submitter Information Verification**

**Submitter Full Name:** Paul Hayes **Organization:** The Hiller Companies/American **Affiliation:** none **Street Address: City:**

## **Relationship**

**Qualified Persons Qualified Persons Qualified Persons Qualified Persons Qualified Persons Qualified Persons** 



**Statement:** "Qualified" is used in different configurations thru out the standard. This updates the usage to be consistently applied throughout the standard.

# **Public Input No. 62-NFPA 855-2023 [ Section No. G.11.4 ]**

## **G.11.4** Suppression Systems.

Some ESS design validations have included pre-engineered inert or clean-agent fire suppression systems for fire protection. These system installations were often approved without validation based on fire and explosion testing in accordance with 9.1.5 by nationally recognized testing laboratories. Evidence-based data is needed to ensure ESS designers specify appropriate fire protection systems based on the material involved and physical design characteristics. Several early research papers from multiple organizations, including NFPA's Fire Protection Research Foundation, and third-party engineering groups have shown that fires involving lithium-ion cells must be cooled to terminate the thermal runaway process. Water is the agent of choice, yet system cabinet design could pose a significant barrier to the efficient application of water while simultaneously allowing the free movement of fire and combustion gases.

One of the more challenging types of incidents will be one where no signs of overheating are visible, and no information is available via integral displays. This places the responding firefighter in the challenging position of determining what is safe or not with very little information. Integrated energy management systems (EMS) are designed to monitor and manage critical safety parameters of the battery such as cell temperature, voltage, and available current. While this data might prove valuable to responders to best understand the current state of the battery, there is no standard for manufacturers to provide a user interface to access the state of these parameters or a method to interface with to monitored alarm systems within the building. Responders should attempt to gather any visible information prior to shutting down the system unless there is clear evidence of imminent danger. Additionally, the response of a qualified and trained individual in person in ESS should be made available to assist the firefighters in the event of damage to an installed system.

# **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

"Qualified" is used in different configurations thru out the standard. Updating the definition to align with the use in the standard. Additional updating the usage to be consistently applied.

# **Related Public Inputs for This Document**



## **Relationship**

**Qualified Persons Qualified Persons Qualified Persons Qualified Persons Qualified Persons Qualified Persons** 

# **Submitter Information Verification**



Г









## **Submitter Information Verification**



# **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-178-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** The addition of a new section addresses a path to evaluate toxic and highly toxic gas and requirements to mitigate potential emission of gases during failure conditions. The annex is updated to reflect these requirements.



## **G.11.7.3** Suppression Tactics.

As previously mentioned, battery components are often housed in cabinets or other configurations that can serve to protect the components and thus limit the ability of fire stream penetration. Firefighters should never use piercing nozzles and long penetrating irons. It is recommended that firefighters use the reach of the water stream instead but should never be up close to these installations. Mechanically damaged cells or puncturing unburned or undamaged cells can result in the immediate ignition of those cells. In addition, internal shorting within the cabinets could create an electrocution risk. The use of salt water on a damaged system will cause more electrical leakage back to the water appliance. Only unadulterated fresh water should be used on ECE hazardous materials.

Movement of damaged cells might result in arcing or reignition if active material or cells remain in the modules. Modules should not be moved without consultation from a qualified personnel person . Firefighter should never attempt to "overhaul" a damaged ECE hazardous material.

Ventilation during suppression is critical. Research has shown that Li-ion batteries might continue to generate flammable gases during and after extinguishing. In addition, testing has shown that during sprinkler suppression, removal of combustion and flammable gases emitted from the battery significantly improves the effectiveness of the suppression. Ventilation of an enclosure does not remove the potential of explosion. Ventilation manual activation devices that can be used in enclosure to exhaust flammable and toxic gases from within the enclosure must be remote from the installation and marked for fire department use. This option of ventilation of an enclosure should be in consultation with the system SME. No ventilation should be attempted by the fire service until more information is gathered and the area around the installation is secured.

Testing has shown that electrical current leakage back through hose streams using unadulterated fresh water will not be a shock hazard when appropriate streams are used and distances maintained. Firefighters that use tower ladders (i.e., buckets) should be aware of explosion hazards and should not be in the explosion area when operating a water source from these types of apparatus. In cases where systems are destroyed and electric potential is shown to be minimal, close-range engagement with hoses for drowning modules can be performed to provide more direct cooling. During postfire operations, SCBA should continue to be worn by all persons near the damaged ESS, especially where systems are in confined or poorly ventilated spaces or have not been sufficiently cooled yet. There is a concern that the buildup of these gases can cause an explosion even after the fire has been put under control. Gases, and CO in particular, should be monitored during this period, as dangerous buildups have been observed during postfire testing. If possible, batteries should be monitored for residual heat and temperature, as reignition is a possibility in cells that are not sufficiently cooled.

Care should be taken to secure the area where the batteries are located and ensure that the heat has been removed and that the batteries are not at risk of being electrically shorted or mechanically damaged. This should be done at the guidance of a qualified technician person . At this point, the fire scene should be handed over to the owner, operator, or responsible party appointed by the site owner. Though trace amounts of heavy metals such as nickel and cobalt can be deposited from combustion of the batteries, these elements are not expected to be present in large quantities or in quantities larger than any other similar fire. In most instances, water exposed to the batteries shows very mild acidity, with an approximate pH of 6. Runoffwater pH can be monitored during firefighting operations but should not pose a greater risk than normal firefighting runoff. In unique cases where a system on fire poses little or no risk to the surrounding uninvolved equipment or the environment, it is reasonable to assume a defensive posture and allow the system to burn itself out. Some typical steps for this approach include local municipal firefighters responding to the scene to make sure that the flames do not spread beyond the property perimeter, having ESS operations personnel arriving at the scene to review the situation and conditions, and then allowing the fire to burn out. This option should only be considered when no risks are posed to the environment and the risk to firefighting operations is great or unknown. It is up to the site owner/operator to communicate with fire services in the event of an emergency to relay vital system information to fire services.

# **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input**

**Relationship Qualified Persons Qualified Persons Qualified Persons Qualified Persons Qualified Persons Qualified Persons** 

"Qualified" is used in different configurations thru out the standard. Updating the definition to align with the use in the standard. Additional updating the usage to be consistently applied.

# **Related Public Inputs for This Document**



# **Submitter Information Verification**



# **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-179-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** "Qualified" is used in different configurations thru out the standard. This updates the usage to be consistently applied throughout the standard.





group group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group 855 Toxics task group





**H.1.1** NFPA Publications.

National Fire Protection Association, 1 Batterymarch Park, Quincy, MA 02169-7471. NFPA 1, *Fire Code*, 2021 edition. NFPA 10, *Standard for Portable Fire Extinguishers*, 2022 edition. NFPA 12, *Standard on Carbon Dioxide Extinguishing Systems*, 2022 edition. NFPA 12A, *Standard on Halon 1301 Fire Extinguishing Systems*, 2022 edition. NFPA 13, *Standard for the Installation of Sprinkler Systems*, 2022 edition. NFPA 14, *Standard for the Installation of Standpipe and Hose Systems*, 2019 edition. NFPA 15, *Standard for Water Spray Fixed Systems for Fire Protection*, 2022 edition. NFPA 17, *Standard for Dry Chemical Extinguishing Systems*, 2021 edition. NFPA 22, *Standard for Water Tanks for Private Fire Protection*, 2018 edition. NFPA 24, *Standard for the Installation of Private Fire Service Mains and Their Appurtenances*, 2022 edition. NFPA 25, *Standard for the Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance of Water-Based Fire Protection Systems*, 2023 edition. NFPA 68, *Standard on Explosion Protection by Deflagration Venting*, 2018 edition. NFPA 69, *Standard on Explosion Prevention Systems*, 2019 edition. *NFPA 70®, National Electrical Code®*, 2023 edition. NFPA 70B, *Recommended Practice for Electrical Equipment Maintenance*, 2022 edition. NFPA *70E®, Standard for Electrical Safety in the Workplace®*, 2021 edition. *NFPA 72*®, *National Fire Alarm and Signaling Code®*, 2022 edition. NFPA 76, *Standard for the Fire Protection of Telecommunications Facilities*, 2020 edition. NFPA 80, *Standard for Fire Doors and Other Opening Protectives*, 2022 edition. NFPA 90A, *Standard for the Installation of Air-Conditioning and Ventilating Systems*, 2021 edition. NFPA *101®, Life Safety Code®*, 2021 edition. NFPA 110, *Standard for Emergency and Standby Power Systems*, 2022 edition. NFPA 111, *Standard on Stored Electrical Energy Emergency and Standby Power Systems*, 2022 edition. NFPA 204, *Standard for Smoke and Heat Venting,* 2021 edition. NFPA 400, *Hazardous Materials Code*, 2022 edition. NFPA 497, *Recommended Practice for the Classification of Flammable Liquids, Gases, or Vapors and of Hazardous (Classified) Locations for Electrical Installations in Chemical Process Areas*, 2021 edition. NFPA 499, *Recommended Practice for the Classification of Combustible Dusts and of Hazardous (Classified) Locations for Electrical Installations in Chemical Process Areas*, 2021 edition. NFPA 550, *Guide to the Fire Safety Concepts Tree,* 2022 edition. NFPA 551, *Guide for the Evaluation of Fire Risk Assessments*, 2022 edition. NFPA 652, *Standard on the Fundamentals of Combustible Dust*, 2019 edition. NFPA 704, *Standard System for the Identification of the Hazards of Materials for Emergency Response*, 2022 edition. NFPA 750, *Standard on Water Mist Fire Protection Systems*, 2023 edition.

NFPA 805, *Performance-Based Standard for Fire Protection for Light Water Reactor Electric Generating Plants,* 2020 edition. NFPA 850, *Recommended Practice for Fire Protection for Electric Generating Plants and High Voltage Direct Current Converter Stations*, 2020 edition. NFPA 921, *Guide for Fire and Explosion Investigations*, 2021 edition. NFPA 1221, *Standard for the Installation, Maintenance, and Use of Emergency Services Communications Systems*, 2019 edition. NFPA 1620, *Standard for Pre-Incident Planning*, 2020 edition. NFPA 1962, *Standard for the Care, Use, Inspection, Service Testing, and Replacement of Fire Hose, Couplings, Nozzles, and Fire Hose Appliances*, 2018 edition. NFPA 2001, *Standard on Clean Agent Fire Extinguishing Systems*, 2022 edition. NFPA 2010, *Standard for Fixed Aerosol Fire-Extinguishing Systems*, 2020 edition. *Fire Protection Handbook*, 20th 21st edition, 2008 2023 . **H.1.2** Other Publications. **H.1.2.1** CENELEC Publications. CENELEC, European Committee for Electrotechnical Standardization, CEN-CENELEC Management Centre, Rue de la Science 23, B - 1040 Brussels, Belgium. EN 15276-1, *Fixed firefighting systems — Condensed aerosol extinguishing systems — Part 1: Requirements and test methods for components*, 2019. EN 15276-2, *Fixed firefighting systems — Condensed aerosol extinguishing systems — Part 2: Design, installation and maintenance*, 2019. **H.1.2.2** CSA Group Publications. CSA Group, 178 Rexdale Blvd., Toronto, ON M9W 1R3, Canada. CAN/CSA C22.2 No. 107.1, Power conversion equipment, 2016, reaffirmed 2021. CAN/CSA C22.2 No. 62109-1, *Safety of power converters for use in photovoltaic power systems — Part 1: General requirements*, 2016, reaffirmed 2021. **H.1.2.3** FPRF Publications. Fire Protection Research Foundation, 1 Batterymarch Park, Quincy, MA 02169-7471. *Best Practices for Emergency Response to Incidents Involving Electric Vehicles Battery Hazards: A Report on Full-Scale Testing Results*, July 2013. **H.1.2.4** ICC Publications. International Code Council, 500 New Jersey Avenue, NW, 6th Floor, Washington, DC 20001. *Uniform Fire Code*, 1997. **H.1.2.5** IEC Publications. International Electrotechnical Commission, 3, rue de Varembé, P.O. Box 131, CH-1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland. IEC 60812, *Analysis techniques for system reliability — Procedure for failure mode and effects analysis (FMEA*), 2006. IEC 61025, *Fault tree analysis (FTA)*, 2006.
**H.1.2.6** IEEE Publications.

IEEE, 3 Park Avenue, 17th Floor, New York, NY 10016-5997.

IEEE 450, *Recommended Practice for Maintenance, Testing, and Replacement of Vented Lead-Acid Batteries for Stationary Applications*, 2010.

IEEE 484, *IEEE Recommended Practice for Installation Design and Installation of Vented Lead-Acid Batteries for Stationary Applications*, 2019.

IEEE 1187, *Recommended Practice for Installation Design and Installation of Valve-Regulated Lead-Acid Batteries for Stationary Applications*, 2013.

IEEE 1188, *IEEE Recommended Practice for Maintenance, Testing, and Replacement of Valve-Regulated Lead-Acid (VRLA) Batteries for Stationary Applications*, 2005.

IEEE 1547, *Standard for Interconnection and Interoperability of Distributed Energy Resources with Associated Electric Power Systems Interfaces*, 2018.

IEEE 1635/ASHRAE 21, *Guide for the Ventilation and Thermal Management of Batteries for Stationary Applications,* 2018.

IEEE 3007.1, *Recommended Practice for the Operation and Management of Industrial and Commercial Power Systems*, 2010.

IEEE C2, *National Electrical Safety Code*, 2017.

**H.1.2.7** ISO Publications.

International Organization for Standardization, ISO Central Secretariat, BIBC II, Chemin de Blandonnet 8, CP 401 - 1214 Vernier, Geneva, Switzerland.

ISO 9001, *Quality management systems — Requirements*, 2015.

**H.1.2.8** Military Specifications.

Department of Defense Single Stock Point, Document Automation and Production Service, Building 4/D, 700 Robbins Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19111-5094.

MIL-STD-1629A, *Procedures for Performing a Failure Mode, Effects and Criticality Analysis,* 1980.

**H.1.2.9** NECA Publications.

National Electrical Contractors Association, 3 Bethesda Metro Center, Suite 1100, Bethesda, MD 20814.

NECA 416, *Recommended Practice for Installing Energy Storage Systems (ESS)*, 2017.

**H.1.2.10** SFPE Publications.

Society of Fire Protection Engineers, 9711 Washingtonian Blvd., Suite 380, Gaithersburg, MD 20878.

*SFPE Engineering Guide to Fire Risk Assessment*, 2006.

*SFPE Handbook of Fire Protection Engineering*, 2016.

**H.1.2.11** UL Publications.

Underwriters Laboratories Inc., 333 Pfingsten Road, Northbrook, IL 60062-2096.

UL 1012, *Power Units Other Than Class 2*, 2021.

UL 1642, *Lithium Batteries*, 2020.

UL 1741, *Inverters, Converters, Controllers and Interconnection System Equipment for Use With Distributed Energy Resources*, 2018.

UL 1778, *Uninterruptible Power Systems*, 2017.

UL 1973, *Batteries for Use in Stationary, Vehicle Auxiliary Power and Light Electric Rail (LER) Applications,* 2018.

UL 1974, *Evaluation for Repurposing Batteries,* 2018.

UL 2436, *Outline of Investigation for Spill Containment for Stationary Acid and Alkaline Electrolyte Battery Systems,* 2020.

ANSI/UL 2775, *Standard for Fixed Condensed Aerosol Extinguishing System Units,* 2019.

UL 62109-1, *Safety of Power Converters for Use in Photovoltaic Power Systems — Part 1: General Requirements*, 2019.

UL 9540, *Energy Storage Systems and Equipment*, 2020.

UL 9540A, *Test Method for Evaluating Thermal Runaway Fire Propagation in Battery Energy Storage Systems*, 2019.

**H.1.2.12** UN Publications.

United Nations Headquarters, 760 United Nations Plaza, New York, NY 10017.

UN 38.3, *Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods: Lithium Metal and Lithium Ion Batteries*, 2015.

UN 2800, *Batteries, wet, non-spillable, electric storage*, 2017.

**H.1.2.13** US Government Publications.

US Government Publishing Office, 732 North Capitol Street, NW, Washington, DC 20401-0001.

Title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 1910.38, "Emergency Action Plans."

Title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 1910.39 "Fire Prevention Plans."

Title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 1910.120(q)(6), "Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response—Emergency Response to Hazardous Substance Releases—Training."

Title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 1910.147, "The Control of Hazardous Energy (Lockout/Tagout)."

Title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 1910.269(d), "Electric Power Generation, Transmission, and Distribution — Hazardous Energy Control (Lockout/Tagout) Procedures."

**H.1.2.14** Other Publications.

#### **H.1.2.14.1** References for Annex D.

1. International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC), "Electrical Energy Storage," White Paper, Geneva/Switzerland, pp. 17–34, December 2011.

2. Rastler, D., "Electricity Energy Storage Technology Option," Electric Power Research Institute, December 2010.

3. Doetsch, C., "Electrical energy storage from 100 kW—State of the art technologies, fields of use," 2nd International Renewable Energy Storage Conference, Bonn, Germany, November 2007.

4. Xie, S., and L. S. Wang, "Industry Trends — Issue 9," China Energy Storage Alliance, January 2012.

5. The ADELE project in Germany uses adiabatic compression, while the SustainX, General Compression, and LightSail projects in the US use isothermal compression. See "ADELE — Adiabatic Compressed-Air Energy Storage (CAES) for Electricity Supply," RWE; "SustainX's ICAES," SustainX; and "General Compression, Who We Are," General Compression.

6. Nakhamkin, M., "Novel Compressed Air Energy Storage Concepts," developed by Energy Storage and Power Consultants (ESPC) and presented to EESAT, May 2007.

7. Inage, Shin-ichi, "Prospects for Large-Scale Energy Storage in Decarbonised Grids," International Energy Agency, Report, 2009.

8. Schossig, P., "Thermal Energy Storage," 3rd International Renewable Energy Storage Conference, Berlin, Germany, November 2012.

9. Fairley, P., http://spectrum.ieee.org/energy/environment/largest-solar-thermal-storage-plantto-start-up, Article 2008, Accessed July 2011.

10. Jahnig D. et al., "Thermo-chemical storage for solar space heating in a single-family house," 10th International Conference on Thermal Energy Storage, Ecostock 2006, New Jersey, May/June 2006.

11. Tamme, R., "Development of Storage Systems for SP Plants," DG TREN—DG RTD Consultative Seminar on Concentrating Solar Power, Brussels, Belgium, June 2006.

12. Bullough, C., "Advanced Adiabatic Compressed Air Energy Storage for the Integration of Wind Energy," European Wind Energy Conference and Exhibition, London, GB, November 2004.

**H.1.2.14.2** References for Annex F.



### **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** Public inputs referencing encapsulating agents were rejected. See Public Inputs 269, 330,331 and 349 for technical substantiation for rejecting inclusion of encapsulating agents. Therefore, this document should not reference NFPA 18A.



**H.1.1** NFPA Publications.

National Fire Protection Association, 1 Batterymarch Park, Quincy, MA 02169-7471. NFPA 1, *Fire Code*, 2021 edition. NFPA 10, *Standard for Portable Fire Extinguishers*, 2022 edition. NFPA 12, *Standard on Carbon Dioxide Extinguishing Systems*, 2022 edition. NFPA 12A, *Standard on Halon 1301 Fire Extinguishing Systems*, 2022 edition. NFPA 13, *Standard for the Installation of Sprinkler Systems*, 2022 edition. NFPA 14, *Standard for the Installation of Standpipe and Hose Systems*, 2019 edition. NFPA 15, *Standard for Water Spray Fixed Systems for Fire Protection*, 2022 edition. NFPA 17, *Standard for Dry Chemical Extinguishing Systems*, 2021 edition. NFPA 18A, Standard on Water Additives for Fire Control and Vapor Mitigation, 2022 Edition NFPA 22, *Standard for Water Tanks for Private Fire Protection*, 2018 edition. NFPA 24, *Standard for the Installation of Private Fire Service Mains and Their Appurtenances*, 2022 edition. NFPA 25, *Standard for the Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance of Water-Based Fire Protection Systems*, 2023 edition. NFPA 68, *Standard on Explosion Protection by Deflagration Venting*, 2018 edition. NFPA 69, *Standard on Explosion Prevention Systems*, 2019 edition. *NFPA 70®, National Electrical Code®*, 2023 edition. NFPA 70B, *Recommended Practice for Electrical Equipment Maintenance*, 2022 edition. NFPA *70E®, Standard for Electrical Safety in the Workplace®*, 2021 edition. *NFPA 72*®, *National Fire Alarm and Signaling Code®*, 2022 edition. NFPA 76, *Standard for the Fire Protection of Telecommunications Facilities*, 2020 edition. NFPA 80, *Standard for Fire Doors and Other Opening Protectives*, 2022 edition. NFPA 90A, *Standard for the Installation of Air-Conditioning and Ventilating Systems*, 2021 edition. NFPA *101®, Life Safety Code®*, 2021 edition. NFPA 110, *Standard for Emergency and Standby Power Systems*, 2022 edition. NFPA 111, *Standard on Stored Electrical Energy Emergency and Standby Power Systems*, 2022 edition. NFPA 204, *Standard for Smoke and Heat Venting,* 2021 edition. NFPA 400, *Hazardous Materials Code*, 2022 edition. NFPA 497, *Recommended Practice for the Classification of Flammable Liquids, Gases, or Vapors and of Hazardous (Classified) Locations for Electrical Installations in Chemical Process Areas*, 2021 edition. NFPA 499, *Recommended Practice for the Classification of Combustible Dusts and of Hazardous (Classified) Locations for Electrical Installations in Chemical Process Areas*, 2021 edition. NFPA 550, *Guide to the Fire Safety Concepts Tree,* 2022 edition. NFPA 551, *Guide for the Evaluation of Fire Risk Assessments*, 2022 edition. NFPA 652, *Standard on the Fundamentals of Combustible Dust*, 2019 edition. NFPA 704, *Standard System for the Identification of the Hazards of Materials for Emergency Response*, 2022 edition.

NFPA 750, *Standard on Water Mist Fire Protection Systems*, 2023 edition. NFPA 805, *Performance-Based Standard for Fire Protection for Light Water Reactor Electric Generating Plants,* 2020 edition. NFPA 850, *Recommended Practice for Fire Protection for Electric Generating Plants and High Voltage Direct Current Converter Stations*, 2020 edition. NFPA 921, *Guide for Fire and Explosion Investigations*, 2021 edition. NFPA 1221, *Standard for the Installation, Maintenance, and Use of Emergency Services Communications Systems*, 2019 edition. NFPA 1620, *Standard for Pre-Incident Planning*, 2020 edition. NFPA 1962, *Standard for the Care, Use, Inspection, Service Testing, and Replacement of Fire Hose, Couplings, Nozzles, and Fire Hose Appliances*, 2018 edition. NFPA 2001, *Standard on Clean Agent Fire Extinguishing Systems*, 2022 edition. NFPA 2010, *Standard for Fixed Aerosol Fire-Extinguishing Systems*, 2020 edition. *Fire Protection Handbook*, 20th edition, 2008. **Statement of Problem and Substantiation for Public Input** Added NFPA 18A as a needed NFPA reference. **Submitter Information Verification Submitter Full Name:** Craig Leadbetter **Organization:** Hazard Control Technologies **Street Address: City: State: Zip: Submittal Date:** Thu Jun 01 17:42:43 EDT 2023 **Committee:** ESS-AAA **Committee Statement Resolution:** FR-56-NFPA 855-2023 **Statement:** This updates the publications to the current revision date of publication. Standards newly referenced in NFPA 855 are added.



**H.1.2.6** IEEE Publications.

IEEE, 3 Park Avenue, 17th Floor, New York, NY 10016-5997.

IEEE 450, *Recommended Practice for Maintenance, Testing, and Replacement of Vented Lead-Acid Batteries for Stationary Applications*, 2010.

IEEE 484, *IEEE Recommended Practice for Installation Design and Installation of Vented Lead-Acid Batteries for Stationary Applications*, 2019.

IEEE 1187, *Recommended Practice for Installation Design and Installation of Valve-Regulated Lead-Acid Batteries for Stationary Applications*, 2013.

IEEE 1188, *IEEE Recommended Practice for Maintenance, Testing, and Replacement of Valve-Regulated Lead-Acid (VRLA) Batteries for Stationary Applications*, 2005.

IEEE 1547, *Standard for Interconnection and Interoperability of Distributed Energy Resources with Associated Electric Power Systems Interfaces*, 2018.

IEEE 1635/ASHRAE 21, *Guide for the Ventilation and Thermal Management of Batteries for Stationary Applications,* 2018.

IEEE 3007.1, *Recommended Practice for the Operation and Management of Industrial and Commercial Power Systems*, 2010.

IEEE C2, *National Electrical Safety Code*, 2017.

**H.1.2.7** ISO Publications.

International Organization for Standardization, ISO Central Secretariat, BIBC II, Chemin de Blandonnet 8, CP 401 - 1214 Vernier, Geneva, Switzerland.

ISO 9001, *Quality management systems — Requirements*, 2015.

**H.1.2.8** Military Specifications.

Department of Defense Single Stock Point, Document Automation and Production Service, Building 4/D, 700 Robbins Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19111-5094.

MIL-STD-1629A, *Procedures for Performing a Failure Mode, Effects and Criticality Analysis,* 1980.

**H.1.2.9** NECA Publications.

National Electrical Contractors Association, 3 Bethesda Metro Center, Suite 1100, Bethesda, MD 20814.

NECA 416, *Recommended Practice for Installing Energy Storage Systems (ESS)*, 2017.

**H.1.2.10** SFPE Publications.

Society of Fire Protection Engineers, 9711 Washingtonian Blvd., Suite 380, Gaithersburg, MD 20878.

*SFPE Engineering Guide to Fire Risk Assessment*, 2006.

*SFPE Handbook of Fire Protection Engineering*, 2016.

**H.1.2.11** UL Publications.

Underwriters Laboratories Inc., 333 Pfingsten Road, Northbrook, IL 60062-2096.

UL 1012, *Power Units Other Than Class 2*, 2021.

UL 1642, *Lithium Batteries*, 2020.

UL 1741, *Inverters, Converters, Controllers and Interconnection System Equipment for Use With Distributed Energy Resources*, 2018.

UL 1778, *Uninterruptible Power Systems*, 2017.

UL 1973, *Batteries for Use in Stationary, Vehicle Auxiliary Power and Light Electric Rail (LER) Applications,* 2018.

UL 1974, *Evaluation for Repurposing Batteries,* 2018.

UL 2436, *Outline of Investigation for Spill Containment for Stationary Acid and Alkaline Electrolyte Battery Systems,* 2020.

ANSI/UL 2775, *Standard for Fixed Condensed Aerosol Extinguishing System Units,* 2019.

UL 62109-1, *Safety of Power Converters for Use in Photovoltaic Power Systems — Part 1: General Requirements*, 2019.

UL 9540, *Energy Storage Systems and Equipment*, 2020.

UL 9540A, *Test Method for Evaluating Thermal Runaway Fire Propagation in Battery Energy Storage Systems*, 2019.

**H.1.2.12** UN Publications.

United Nations Headquarters, 760 United Nations Plaza, New York, NY 10017.

UN 38.3, *Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods: Lithium Metal and Lithium Ion Batteries*, 2015.

UN 2800, *Batteries, wet, non-spillable, electric storage*, 2017.

**H.1.2.13** US Government Publications.

US Government Publishing Office, 732 North Capitol Street, NW, Washington, DC 20401-0001.

Title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 1910.38, "Emergency Action Plans."

Title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 1910.39 "Fire Prevention Plans."

Title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 1910.120(q)(6), "Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response—Emergency Response to Hazardous Substance Releases—Training."

Title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 1910.147, "The Control of Hazardous Energy (Lockout/Tagout)."

Title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 1910.269(d), "Electric Power Generation, Transmission, and Distribution — Hazardous Energy Control (Lockout/Tagout) Procedures."

**H.1.2.14** Other Publications.

#### **H.1.2.14.1** References for Annex D.

1. International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC), "Electrical Energy Storage," White Paper, Geneva/Switzerland, pp. 17–34, December 2011.

2. Rastler, D., "Electricity Energy Storage Technology Option," Electric Power Research Institute, December 2010.

3. Doetsch, C., "Electrical energy storage from 100 kW—State of the art technologies, fields of use," 2nd International Renewable Energy Storage Conference, Bonn, Germany, November 2007.

4. Xie, S., and L. S. Wang, "Industry Trends — Issue 9," China Energy Storage Alliance, January 2012.

5. The ADELE project in Germany uses adiabatic compression, while the SustainX, General Compression, and LightSail projects in the US use isothermal compression. See "ADELE — Adiabatic Compressed-Air Energy Storage (CAES) for Electricity Supply," RWE; "SustainX's ICAES," SustainX; and "General Compression, Who We Are," General Compression.

6. Nakhamkin, M., "Novel Compressed Air Energy Storage Concepts," developed by Energy Storage and Power Consultants (ESPC) and presented to EESAT, May 2007.

7. Inage, Shin-ichi, "Prospects for Large-Scale Energy Storage in Decarbonised Grids," International Energy Agency, Report, 2009.

8. Schossig, P., "Thermal Energy Storage," 3rd International Renewable Energy Storage Conference, Berlin, Germany, November 2012.

9. Fairley, P., http://spectrum.ieee.org/energy/environment/largest-solar-thermal-storage-plantto-start-up, Article 2008, Accessed July 2011.

10. Jahnig D. et al., "Thermo-chemical storage for solar space heating in a single-family house," 10th International Conference on Thermal Energy Storage, Ecostock 2006, New Jersey, May/June 2006.

11. Tamme, R., "Development of Storage Systems for SP Plants," DG TREN—DG RTD Consultative Seminar on Concentrating Solar Power, Brussels, Belgium, June 2006.

12. Bullough, C., "Advanced Adiabatic Compressed Air Energy Storage for the Integration of Wind Energy," European Wind Energy Conference and Exhibition, London, GB, November 2004.

**H.1.2.14.2** References for Annex F.



# **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** The NIOSH report is not referenced within the standard.



**Resolution:** FR-57-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** This updates the publications to the current revision date of publication. Standards newly referenced in NFPA 855 have been added.

Г





## **Committee Statement**

**Resolution:** FR-58-NFPA 855-2023

**Statement:** It is not customary or necessary to show that the paper was accessed on any given date (H.1.2.14.1.9) and corrects H.1.2.14.1.5 to be consistent with all the other references.



