

U.S. Department of Commerce Technology Administration National Institute of Standards and Technology Office of Applied Economics Building and Fire Research Laboratory Gaithersburg, MD 20899

ALARM 2.0 User Manual Minimizing Compliance Costs of the Life Safety Code for Prisons

Stephen F. Weber and Laura I. Schultz





U.S. Department of Commerce Technology Administration National Institute of Standards and Technology Office of Applied Economics Building and Fire Research Laboratory Gaithersburg, MD 20899

ALARM 2.0 User Manual Minimizing Compliance Costs of the Life Safety Code for Prisons

Stephen F. Weber and Laura I. Schultz

Funded by:

The U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Justice

Through the NIST Office of Law Enforcement Standards

November 2001





U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Donald L. Evans, Secretary

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY Karen H. Brown, Acting Director

Abstract

ALARM, Alternative Life Safety Analysis for Retrofit Cost Minimization, is a software tool that helps prison facility managers and fire safety engineers achieve cost-effective compliance with the widely-used *Life Safety Code*[®] of the National Fire Protection Association. The latest version of the software (2.0) supports analysis of Detention and Correctional Occupancies. Through a special provision of the code, *ALARM* implements a goal-oriented, or performance-based approach to code compliance. The user specifies the current safety level of the facility for each of 13 life safety parameters and then enters quantity and size data on each of the safety improvements to be explored. The software indicates whether the current safety level is in compliance with the code and, if not, quickly finds the least-cost compliance strategy and its estimated construction cost. The software takes into account the special conditions in the code that preclude finding solutions by hand. A practice file with data from a sample facility, extensive help with a step-by-step tutorial, a report utility for viewing and printing results, and a comprehensive file manager are included. The optimization method used in ALARM has been field tested in 89 hospitals (17,898 beds). For this sample the least-cost solution identified by the software was on average 41 % less expensive than the prescriptive solution. This represents a potential cost savings of \$2,116 per bed or over \$37 million in total.

Keywords: building codes; building economics; correctional facilities; cost minimization, fire safety; life safety code; linear programming; mathematical programming; optimization, prisons.

Acknowledgments

The authors express special thanks and acknowledgment to the National Institute of Justice and the NIST Office of Law Enforcement Standards for their generous support of the technical research and software development effort that made this publication possible.

The authors greatly appreciate the permission granted by Dennis Berry, Associate General Counsel for the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA), to reprint material from the *Life Safety Code*[®] in the User Manual and software help system. Users should note that the reprinted material found in this publication is not the complete and official position of NFPA on the referenced subject, which is represented only by the standard in its entirety.

Special thanks are owed to Walter J. Jones of NIST for developing the comprehensive help system; designing the graphics for the welcome screen and the software icon, and conducting extensive tests on early versions of the software. Thanks is also extended to Robert Chapman of NIST, who developed the original linear programming model and software application on which the cost minimization method is based. Credit is also due to Michel Berkelaar of Eindhoven University of Technology (Netherlands) for putting into the public domain his efficient software code, *lp_solve*, which includes the module for solving zero-one integer programming problems that we adapted for *ALARM 2.0*.

We are indebted to Harold Nelson, Edward Budnick, and Shivani Mehta of Hughes Associates, Inc. of Columbia MD for supplying detailed construction specifications as well as cost estimation algorithms and data for the improvements in fire safety levels. Harold Nelson is the major force behind development of the Fire Safety Evaluation Systems for various building occupancies found in NFPA 101A. He also provided many useful comments on early versions of the software and developed the case study for the sample file used in the tutorial.

The authors thank Robert J. Verdeyen, Director of Standards and Accreditation at the American Correctional Association (ACA), for help in finding beta testers. Beta testers from correctional facilities in Maryland, Virginia, and Ohio provided many helpful comments and suggestions. The authors also appreciate the help of Nancy Schwartz of NFPA's One-Stop Data Shop and of Gabriella Daley, Director of Communications at the ACA, in distributing the software. The authors wish to thank Hayden Brown and Daniel Madrzykowski of NIST for their thorough review of and constructive comments on the User Manual, software, and text of the help file. Special thanks are owed to J'aime Maynard for preparing the final version of the manuscript for publication.

Disclaimer on the use of non-metric units:

The policy of the National Institute of Standards and Technology is to use metric units of measurement in all its publications. This publication, however, is intended for the fire safety engineering and construction industries in the United States, where certain non-metric units are so widely used instead of metric units that it is more practical and less confusing to present construction dimensions, costs, and safety level definitions in customary units.

Disclaimer on trade names:

Trade names are mentioned in this publication to specify products used in the software. Such identification does not imply recommendation or endorsement by the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

Notice of permission to reprint copyrighted material from NFPA 101A-2001:

Material in the help file and the Project Window of the software, appearing also as screen shots in this User Manual, is reprinted with permission from NFPA 101A-2001, *Guide on Alternative Approaches to Life Safety*, Copyright[©], National Fire Protection Association. This reprinted material is not the complete and official position of NFPA on the referenced subject, which is represented only by the standard in its entirety.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
1.0 Introduction 1.1 Purpose 1.2 History 1.3 New Features 1.4 Overview	1 1 1 1 2
 2.0 Getting Started 2.1 Installing <i>ALARM 2.0</i> 2.2 Starting <i>ALARM 2.0</i> 2.3 Help System 	3 3 3 4
 3.0 Starting a Project	7 7 7 9
4.0 Understanding the Project Window	. 11 . 11 . 12
 5.0 Data Entry 5.1 Selecting an Initial Level 5.2 Data Entry 	. 15 . 15 . 16
6.0 Finding the Least-Cost Improvement Plan6.1 Optimizing6.2 The Report	. 19 . 19 . 20
 7.0 Technical Background: How <i>ALARM</i> Finds the Least Cost Plan 7.1 Linear Programming	. 23 . 23 . 24 . 24
 8.0 Safety Improvements and Cost Data. 8.1 Safety Improvements 8.2 Cost Data. 8.3 Cost Algorithms 	. 27 . 27 . 27 . 27 . 28
References	. 29 . 31

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

The Fire Safety Evaluation System (FSES) for Detention and Correctional Facilities, specified in Chapter 5 of the *Guide on Alternative Approaches to Life Safety* (NFPA 101A), provides the managers and fire safety engineers of these facilities with many alternative compliance solutions that are equivalent in safety to the prescriptive version of the *Life Safety Code*[®] found in NFPA 101[®], *Code for Safety to Life in Buildings and Structures*. The flexibility provided by the FSES allows for major cost savings in achieving compliance with the *Life Safety Code*. The wide range of acceptable compliance solutions and the many exceptions and interdependencies introduced by the footnotes combine to make it virtually impossible to find the least-cost solution using trial and error methods.

ALARM 2.0, Alternative Life Safety Analysis for Retrofit Cost Minimization, is a software tool that helps prison facility managers, fire safety engineers, and architects quickly find the most cost-effective plan to achieve compliance with the *Life Safety Code*. ALARM 2.0 is a user-friendly, 32-bit Windows software program designed to help users take full advantage of the flexibility offered by NFPA 101A. The ALARM tool allows users to enter data about the physical dimensions of their facilities through an interface that mirrors the main worksheet of NFPA 101A. The program then applies its cost algorithms and unit cost data to estimate the cost of each safety improvement to be considered. The cost estimates automatically vary by facility location using the built-in geographic area cost factors of the nearest major city. Finally, the software quickly finds the most cost-effective construction plan for achieving compliance with the *Life Safety Code*.

1.2 History

The first version of *ALARM* was developed in the Building and Fire Research Laboratory at the National Institute of Standards and Technology. The software generated a set of alternative compliance strategies and their estimated construction costs for the NFPA 101A for health care occupancies. The software used an optimization method that has since been tested in 89 hospitals and compared to the cost of strict compliance with the prescriptive code of the NFPA. Research done after the development of the first version of *ALARM* showed a potential cost savings of \$2,116 per bed for almost 18,000 beds, resulting in a total savings of over \$37 million.

1.3 New Features

This latest version of ALARM (2.0) has integrated many improvements in modeling techniques, interface design, and usability. Version 1.0 was a DOS program limited by its

text only, 16-bit platform. *ALARM 2.0* takes full advantage of the 32 bit, graphical Windows platform. This has allowed for speedier optimization and improvements in user-friendliness. The main Project screen is directly based on the design and layout of the key worksheet of the *Life Safety Code*. The more powerful platform has also facilitated the use of the new optimization algorithm included in this version.

Another significant feature of *ALARM 2.0* is that almost all of the descriptive text, safety parameter definitions, code and point requirements, and cost data are contained in data files that are independent of the executable program. As a result, a new set of data files is all that is needed to efficiently incorporate changes in code requirements and cost data. In addition, this software design will enable rapid development of new releases of *ALARM* that cover occupancies other than Correctional Facilities, such as Business, Health Care, and Board and Care occupancies.

1.4 Overview

This manual provides instructions on getting started with *ALARM 2.0* and setting up new projects for analysis. To show the many features of *ALARM*, a demonstration case is included with the software as a sample project file. To learn to use the software, practice each instruction in Chapters 2 through 6 of this manual using the sample project file, State Penn.fse. Chapter 7 provides information on the economic and mathematical methods the software uses to determine the least-cost safety improvement plan. Chapter 8 discusses the fire safety improvements and cost data and cost estimating algorithms used in the software.

2.0 Getting Started

2.1 Installing ALARM 2.0

To install *ALARM 2.0*, insert the CD-ROM into your drive and close the CD drawer. Wait a few seconds for the AutoRun feature to execute the Setup.exe installation program. You will be asked to confirm the drive and installation folder for *ALARM*. Click on the OK button to begin the process of copying all the files to the installation folder on your hard drive. Once the files are copied you are ready to start the *ALARM* software. If the AutoRun feature is disabled on your computer, simply click on the Start button and select Run. Then type the command "d:\setup.exe," substituting for "d" the letter assigned to your CD-ROM drive, to execute the Setup.exe installation program directly from the CD-ROM drive.

2.2 Starting ALARM 2.0

To start *ALARM 2.0*, use the My Computer icon to open the *ALARM* folder and double click on the file labeled Alarm.exe. In a few seconds, the *ALARM* welcome window will appear.



ALARM Welcome Window

The welcome screen presents the user with four options: New Project, Existing Project, Help and Exit. New Project and Existing Project are discussed in the following section. Help will open the Help Window to *ALARM*'s Online Tutorial. The help system also provides users with information on the *Life Safety Code* and instructions on using the software. Complete documentation of the Help system can be found below. The final button, **Exit**, shuts down *ALARM*.

Note on Screen Resolution: Due to the large amount of information displayed on the main screen, *ALARM*, runs best at a screen resolution of 800x600 or higher. If the program does not fully display on your desktop, the resolution is probably set too low. To increase the resolution, press the **Start** button and select **Settings** and **Control Panel**. Select the **Display** icon in the control panel. The Settings tab will allow you to reset the resolution. In the box titled **Desktop Area** move the pointer to the right until it reads 800 by 600 resolution. To accept the new resolution, press the **OK** button. You may need to reboot for the settings to take effect.

2.3 Help System

The help system was designed to provide the user with a reference on running *ALARM* and a resource for looking up the definitions of safety parameters and safety levels taken from the NFPA documentation on the *Life Safety Code*. Help can be accessed from several places in *ALARM*, starting with the Welcome Screen, where the user can press the Help button.

ALAF	RM 2.0
New Project	Existing Project
Help	Exit

The Help Button

Help may also be found in the Menu Bar by selecting Help and then Contents, or by pressing the F1 key.



Help Menu

The above methods open the main help page which describes the *ALARM* software and accesses the tutorial.

The other method of accessing the help system is to use the context sensitive feature by selecting **Help** from the drop down menu of a safety level.

Sprinklers		\$ 84636			\$ 86491	Ŭ	Ŭ	Ŭ	Ŭ
6.Interior Finish (Corrs <u>E</u> gress)	Class C	Class B			Class A	0	0	0	0
7.Interior Finish (Other Areas)	Class C	<u>S</u> et Initial UnSet Initial			Class A \$ 15256	-1	0	0	-2
8.Cell/Sleeping Room Enclosure	Cells face on Corridor	Enter Data. Disqualify Safety Level	n Space in Re Resistant <1	esid. Housin . hour	g Area Fire Resistant ≥1 hour	0	0	0	0
9.Separation of Residential	Incomplete				>1 Hour Fire Resistance \$ 16645	2	1	2	2

Safety Level Specific Help

When help is accessed with this method, the help system takes you directly to the documentation on the specific safety parameter that was clicked. From there, documentation on choosing the correct safety level can be viewed.



The Help System

The Help system includes a tutorial that is designed to help a new user learn how to operate *ALARM*. The documentation for the tutorial is based on this manual. The Project Information section of the help system provides documentation about the data needed to start a new project, such as use condition and number of stories. The parameters section is based on NFPA documentation regarding the 13 safety parameters. This section should be used to help select the Initial Safety level and the safety levels to be considered for analysis for each safety parameter.

The help system can be navigated by browsing through the outline in the contents panel on the left side of the help window. The help documentation itself also contains links to information relevant to the displayed topic.

The help system may also be searched for a specific keyword or term. To search, select the Search Tab on the left side of the window, and enter the term. All references to the key term will be listed. Double clicking on a reference displays that topic.

3.0 Starting a Project

3.1 Creating a New Project

A new project can be created by either pressing the New Project button on the Welcome Window or by selecting File menu on the menu bar and then New on the drop-down menu. To create a new project you need to answer several questions about the facility to be analyzed using the two Project Information Windows:

Project Information	🛿 Project Information- Page 2
Project Title State City Number of Stories Help	Check all that Apply ☐ Building is Existing ☐ Building is a High Rise(>=75 ft high)
Use Condition C Use Condition II: Zoned Egress C Use Condition III: Zoned Impeded Egress C Use Condition IV: Impeded Egress C Use Condition V: Contained Help Cancel Continue	 Building was renovated or modernized. Cells face on corridor. Intervening space greater than 50 feet. There is a multitiered cell block. Help Back Cancel Create

Window 1



Project Information

The first section of Window 1 asks for background information about the project. You may use any convenient name for the project title. *ALARM* uses your title as the file name plus an "FSE" (Fire Safety Evaluation) extension for storing the project data. Enter the state where the facility is located, and a list of cities will appear to the right. The construction cost estimates developed by *ALARM* are based on geographic location factors to provide the most accurate cost estimates. Select the city that most closely resembles the facility location in terms of construction costs. The final listbox asks the user for the number of stories. Number of Stories is the number of floors that are occupied by inmates. For a more precise definition and help in determining the number of stories in your facility, press the Help button. A help screen will appear providing the NFPA's definition of Stories.

Next enter the Use Condition of the facility. As before, the Help button opens a page in the help file designed to assist in determining the proper Use Condition as defined by the NFPA.

After all information has been entered press the Continue button to move to the second Project Information Window. If a message box appears warning of missing data, press OK and recheck the previous entries to make sure all data were entered correctly.

The second Window lists a set of statements that may be true about the facility. The Help button provides definitions of all the statements to assist the user in choosing the correct options. Mark the check boxes that apply to the facility. The Back button allows the user to change any data entered on the first page if necessary. Once all data have been entered correctly in both Project Information screens, press the Create button to finish creating the new project.

Once the project has been created, the data entered in the Project Information screens cannot be changed without creating a new project file. The user may view the project information data at any time after creation by selecting the Edit item on the menu bar, and then choosing the View Project Information option from the drop-down menu.

🗃 Project Informa	tion	_ 🗆 ×
Project Name:	State Penn	
Location:	Silver Spring, MD	
Use Condition:	IV: Impeded Egress	
Stories:	3	
🔽 Building is E:	xisting	
🗖 Building is a	High Rise(>=75 ft high)	
🗖 Building was	renovated or modernized.	
🗖 Cells face on	i corridor.	
🗖 Intervening s	pace greater than 50 feet.	
🗖 There is a m	ultitiered cell block.	
	Clos	e

Project Information Window

3.2 Opening an Existing Project

There are two methods of opening existing projects. You may select the Existing Project from the Welcome Window or the Open option from the File menu. Both methods will display the dialog window, Select a Safety Evaluation File to Open.

Select a Safet	y Evaluation File to Open		? ×
Look <u>i</u> n:	🔁 alarm 🔽	1	
 ■SpringfieldC StatePenn.F 	FFSE		
File <u>n</u> ame:	*.FSE		<u>O</u> pen
Files of type:		•	Cancel
	C Open as read-only		

Selecting an Existing File to Open

This dialog window lets you select any one of your project files. They all have the extension *.FSE (Fire Safety Evaluation).

4.0 Understanding the Project Window

4.1 Layout

Once a new project is started or an existing file is opened, a new window appears called the **Project Window**. For a new project, the window appears as a clean slate, with no safety level boxes color coded and no construction costs or points displayed.

ALARM 2.0												-
le <u>C</u> ompute	<u>E</u> dit Help									-		~
			Pro	oject: New	Project				51	52	53	54
1.Construction	∇(000)	₹(111)	IV(2HH)	III(200)	III(211)	II(000)	II(111)	II(222) or I(ANY)	0	0	0	0
2.Hazardous	Withi	n Residential	Housing Area	C)utside Residenti	al Housing Area	N	o Deficiencies				
Areas	Double Defic	iency	Single Deficiency	Double I	Deficiency	Single Defici	iency		0	0	0	0
3.Fire Alarm	No A	larm	No FD N	otification		With F	D. Notification					
					No M	anual Alarm	Man	ual Alarm	0	0	0	0
4.Smoke	None			Residential (Housing Area		1	'otal Building				
Detection		_	Large Sleeping Rooms	s All Sleep	ing Rooms	Full Cover	age	Ŭ	0	0	0	0
5.Automatic Sprinklers		None		Residential I	Housing Areas		Entire Build	ling	0	0	0	0
6.Interior Finish (Corrs <u>E</u> gress)		Class C		Cla	uss B		Class A		0	0	0	0
7.Interior Finish (Other Areas)		Class C		Cla	uss B		Class A		0	0	0	0
8.Cell/Sleeping	Cells face o	n Corridor		Interv	ening Common S	pace in Resid. Ho	using Area					
Room Enclosure			Oj	pen	Smoke Re	sistant <1 hour	Fire Resi	stant ≥1 hour	0	0	0	0
9.Separation of Residential		Incomplete		Smoke Res	istant≤1 hour		>1 Hour Fire Re	sistance	0	0	0	0
10.Exit System 🗌	<2 Ra	outes			Mult	iple Routes						
			Def	icient	No I	Deficiencies	Direct	Room Exits	0	0	0	0
11.Exit Access		Dead Ends	,	No I	Dead Ends >50ft	and Travel is:		<= 150 ft				
	>100 ft		>50 ft	>200 ft	<=200 ft >	150 ft <	≔150 ft		0	0	0	0
12.Vertical		Or	en or Incomplete Enclo	sures			Enclosed					
Openings	Thru 4>= Fl	oors	2-3 Floors	1 F	loor	Smoke Resi	stant F	'ire Resistant	0	0	0	0
13.Smoke	No Co	ntrol		Smoke Co	mpartments		Heat + Smo	ke Vent System				
Control			Pas	ssive	Mechan	ically Assisted			0	0	0	0
								Points Earned:	0	0	0	0
								Points Needed:	9	12	10	14
								D. C. 1				

New Project Window

The Project Window is designed to mirror Worksheet 5.5.3: Safety Parameter Values, from NFPA 101A. At the top of the window the title of the current project is displayed. There are 13 rows in the worksheet, each representing a safety parameter. Each parameter row has a set of labeled boxes, representing all the safety levels possible for that parameter.

The right side of the window provides a tally of the points earned in the project. The four columns are titled "S1," "S2," "S3," and "S4." These are derived from the weighting factors in Worksheet 5.5.4 of the NFPA 101A and represent the four safety evaluation goals, Fire Control (S1), Egress (S2), Refuge (S3) and General Fire Safety (S4). The

box at the end of each safety parameter shows the points earned by that parameter for each of the point evaluations. The points are tallied at the bottom of each column.



The Point Tally consists of three rows. The first is Points Earned, which displays the sum of all the points earned from the selected Initial Safety levels. Because this is a new project the points earned are initially zero. The next row, Points Needed, displays the points required to achieve compliance with the *Life Safety Code*, based on the Mandatory Safety Requirements specified in Worksheet 5.5.5. The final row shows the point **Deficit**, computed by subtracting the Points Needed from the Points Earned. Once all the minimum point requirements are achieved the final row will show a **Surplus**.

4.2 Color Coding

Once data have been entered, the appearance of the Project Window changes to reflect the new information. Below is an image of an Existing Project with some data entered.

👪 ALARM 2.0												
<u>File</u> <u>C</u> ompute	e <u>E</u> dit Help											
			Pro	ject: State	Penn				S1	S2	S3	S
1.Construction	V(000) V(111) IV(:	2HH)	III(200)	III(211)	II(000)	II(111)	II(222) or I(ANY)	0	0	0	C
2.Hazardous	Within Reside	ential Housing Area	L	0	utside Residentia	l Housing Area	No	Deficiencies				
Areas	Double Deficiency	Single Det	iciency	Double I	Deficiency	Single Deficient \$ 7772	у		-4	-2	-4	-4
3.Fire Alarm	No Alarm		No FD Noti	fication		With F.D.	Notification					
					No Me	nual Alarm	Manu \$	al Alarm 3698	1	1	0	1
4.Smoke	None			Residential I	Housing Area		Te	otal Building				
Detection		Large Sleepi	ng Rooms	All Sleep	ing Rooms	Full Coverage		\$ 4519	2	4	0	4
5.Automatic Sprinklers	None	•		Residential F \$8	Iousing Areas 4636		Entire Build: \$ 86491	ing	0	0	0	0
6.Interior Finish (Corrs <u>E</u> gress)	Class	C		Cla	ss B		Class A		0	0	0	0
7.Interior Finish (Other Areas)	Class	C		Cla \$ 1	ss B 5256		Class A \$ 15256		-1	0	0	1
8.Cell/Sleeping	Cells face on Corrid	lor		Interv	ening Common Si	oace in Resid. Housi	ng Area					
Room Enclosure			Oper	ι	Smoke Re:	sistant <1 hour	Fire Resis	tant >1 hour	0	0	0	0
9.Separation of Residential	Incompl	lete		Smoke Resi	stant<1 hour		>1 Hour Fire Res \$ 16645	istance	2	1	2	2
10.Exit System	<2 Routes				Multi	ole Routes						
			Deficie	nt	No D	eficiencies	Direct F \$ 1	toom Exits 15214	0	0	0	0
11.Exit Access	Dead Ei	nds	1	No I	Dead Ends >50ft :	and Travel is:		<= 150 ft				
	>100 ft	>50 ft		>200 ft	<=200 ft >1	50 ft <=1 \$.50 ft 1019		0	-2	0	-2
12.Vertical		Open or Incomp	lete Enclosur	res			Enclosed					
Openings	Thru 4>= Floors	2-3 Fl	oors	1 F	loor	Smoke Resista	nt Fi	re Resistant \$26142	0	0	0	0
13.Smoke	No Control			Smoke Co	mpartments		Heat + Smol	æ Vent System				
Control			Passiv	re	Mechani	ally Assisted \$		\$	0	2	2	2
								Points Earned:	-1	4	0	1
								Points Needed:	- 7	10	8	11

Existing Project Window

The colors on the screen, allow you to quickly interpret data in the box. *ALARM* provides a convenient reference to understanding the color scheme in the Legend Window.



Legend Window

To view the Legend Window, select Edit from the menu bar and choose Show Legend. The Legend Window explains the color-coding on the main window. A safety level marked white is the Initial, or current safety level of the facility. Dark gray safety levels have been Excluded from the analysis. *ALARM* automatically marks safety levels as Excluded if they have a lower point value than the Initial level or if there is no feasible way to improve safety from the Initial to the Excluded level. You may also mark as Excluded any safety level that you do not want to consider in your safety improvement plan. Yellow safety levels are achievable from the Initial safety level, but are missing quantity and cost. Green safety levels contain data and will be considered in the analysis when the project is optimized. Aqua levels signify the optimum safety levels and will only appear after the Optimize function under the Compute Menu finds the least-cost compliance plan.

In addition to providing a comprehensive overview of the facility's status, the Project Window is also used for data entry. To see how the window is used to collect data about your facility continue to the next chapter.

5.0 Data Entry

5.1 Selecting an Initial Level

A sample project file with most of the necessary data already entered has been provided to assist you in the data entry process described in this chapter. Open the file "State Penn.FSE" to display the tutorial in the Project Window.

Pice Compute Edit Heip Since Since No Perject: State Perm Since No Perject: Since	ALARM 2.0												_
$\begin to the field of the fi$	<u>F</u> ile <u>C</u> ompute	<u>E</u> dit Help											
1. Construction V(000) V(111) IV(2HH) III(200) III(211) II(000) II(111) II(222) or				Pr	oject: State	Penn				S1	S2	S3	S4
2.Hzardobus Writin Residential Housine Area Outside Residential Housine Area No Deficiency Single Deficiencies Single Deficiencies <t< td=""><td>1.Construction</td><td>∇(000)</td><td>₹(111)</td><td>IV(2HH)</td><td>III(200)</td><td>III(211)</td><td>II(000)</td><td>II(111)</td><td>II(222) or I(ANY)</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></t<>	1.Construction	∇(000)	₹(111)	IV(2HH)	III(200)	III(211)	II(000)	II(111)	II(222) or I(ANY)	0	0	0	0
Area Double Deficiency Single Deficiency Double Deficiency Single Deficien	2.Hazardous	Within	Residential Ho	using Area	0	utside Residenti	al Housing Area	No	Deficiencies				
3 Fixe Alarm No Alarm No FD Notification Writh FD Notification Writh FD Notification No Manual Alarm Manu	Areas	Double Deficie	ncy	Single Deficiency	Double I	Deficiency	Single Deficient \$ 7772	vу		-4	-2	-4	-4
ASmole Nome Residential Housing Area Total Builing 2 4 0 0 4 Smole None Residential Housing Area Full Coverage Entite Builing 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	3.Fire Alarm	No Ala	am	No FD No	tification		With F.D.	Notification				_	
						No M	anual Alarm	Manu \$	al Alarm 3698	1	1	0	1
Detection Large Skeping Rooms All Skeping Rooms Full Coverage \$ 4519 2 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	4.Smoke	None			Residential I	Housing Area		Te	otal Building				
S Automatic Sprinklers None Residential Housing Areas \$ 044036 Entire Buiking \$ 044036 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 <t< td=""><td>Detection</td><td></td><td>L</td><td>arge Sleeping Rooms</td><td>All Sleep</td><td>ing Rooms</td><td>Full Coverage</td><td>•</td><td>\$ 4519</td><td>2</td><td>4</td><td>0</td><td>4</td></t<>	Detection		L	arge Sleeping Rooms	All Sleep	ing Rooms	Full Coverage	•	\$ 4519	2	4	0	4
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	5.Automatic Sprinklers		None		Residential F \$ 8	Iousing Areas 4636		Entire Build \$ 86491	ing	0	0	0	0
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c } \hline Class C & Class C & Class C & Class A & S & 15256 & S & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0$	6.Interior Finish		Class C		Cla	ss B		Class A			•	•	
Interior Finish (Other Areas) Class G Class B Class A Class A Intervening Common Space in Resid Housing Area S 15256 Intervening Common Space in Resid Housing Area Intervening Common Space in Resident >1 hour Intervening Common Space in Resident >	(Cons <u>E</u> gress)									U	U	U	U
ScalisSepting Room Enclosure Cells face on Contridor Intervening Common Space in Resid Housing Area Fire Resistant >1 hour Fire Resistant >1 hour 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 <td>7.Interior Finish (Other Areas)</td> <td></td> <td>Class C</td> <td></td> <td>Cla \$ 1</td> <td>ss B 5256</td> <td></td> <td>Class A \$ 15256</td> <td></td> <td>-1</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>-2</td>	7.Interior Finish (Other Areas)		Class C		Cla \$ 1	ss B 5256		Class A \$ 15256		-1	0	0	-2
Noon EnclosureOpenSmoke Resistant <1 hourFire Resistant >1 hour0000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000	8.Cell/Sleeping	Cells face on	Corridor		Interve	ening Common S	pace in Resid. Housi	ing Area					
9.Separation of Residential Incomplete Smoke Resistant<1 hour \rightarrow 1 Hour Fine Resistance \$ 16645 2 1 2 2 10 Exit System <2 Routes	Room Enclosure			Op	en	Smoke Re	esistant <1 hour	Fire Resis	tant ≥1 hour	0	0	0	0
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	9.Separation of Residential	I	ncomplete		Smoke Resi	stant<1 hour		>1 Hour Fire Res \$ 16645	sistance	2	1	2	2
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	10.Exit System	<2 Rot	ites			Mult	iple Routes						
11 Exit Access Dead Ends No Dead Ends >50ft No Dead Ends >50ft $< =150 ft$ $< = 150 ft$ $< =150 ft$ $< = 150 ft$ $ = 150 ft$				Defic	cient	No I	Deficiencies	Direct F \$	loom Exits 15214	0	0	0	0
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	11.Exit Access	I	Dead Ends		No I)ead Ends ≥50ft	and Travel is:		<= 150 ft				
12. Vertical Openings Open or Incomplete Enclosures Image: Enclosure Simple Enclosures Smoke Resistant Fire Resistant 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 1 </td <td></td> <td>>100 ft</td> <td>></td> <td>50 ft</td> <td>>200 ft</td> <td><=200 ft ></td> <td>150 ft <=1 \$</td> <td>150 ft 1019</td> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td>-2</td> <td>0</td> <td>-2</td>		>100 ft	>	50 ft	>200 ft	<=200 ft >	150 ft <=1 \$	150 ft 1019		0	-2	0	-2
Openings Thru 4>= Floors 2-3 Floors 1 Floor Smoke Resistant Fire Resistant 0 0 0 0 0 13 Smoke Control No Control Smoke Compartments Heat + Smoke Vent System 0 0 2 2 2 13 Smoke Control Passive Mechanically Assisted Heat + Smoke Vent System 0 0 2 2 2 13 Smoke Points Earnel: -1 4 0 1 Points Needed: 7 10 8 11 Deficit: -3 -6 -3 -0	12.Vertical		Open	or Incomplete Enclos	ures			Enclosed					
No Control Smoke Compartments Heat + Smoke Vent System 0 2 2 2 Passive Mechanically Assisted \$ Points Earned: -1 4 0 1 Points Needed: 7 10 8 11 Deficit: -3 -6 -3 -0	Openings	Thru 4>= Flo	ors	2-3 Floors	1 F	loor	Smoke Resista	nt Fi	ire Resistant \$26142	0	0	0	0
Control Passive Mechanically Assisted \$ 0 2 2 2 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	13.Smoke	No Cor	drol		Smoke Co	mpartments		Heat + Smol	te Vent System		_	_	
Points Earned: -1 4 0 1 Points Needed: 7 10 8 11 Deficit: -3 -6 -3 -10	Control			Pass	sive	Mechan	ically Assisted \$		\$	0	2	2	2
Points Needed: 7 10 8 11 Deficit: -3 -6 -3 -10									Points Earned:	-1	4	0	1
									Points Needed:	7	10	8	11
									Deficit:	-8	-6	-8 -	-10

Project Window

To mark the initial safety level, you may either right click or double click on the desired safety level box. Double clicking immediately sets the initial safety level. Right clicking leads to a menu allowing the initial safety level to be set.

Sprinklers		\$ 84636	\$ 86491	Ŭ	Ŭ	Ŭ	ĭ
6.Interior Finish (Corrs <u>E</u> gress)	Class C	Class B	Class A	0	0	0	0
7.Interior Finish (Other Areas)	Class C	<u>S</u> et Initial UnSet Initial	Class A \$ 15256	-1	0	0	-2
8.Cell/Sleeping Room Enclosure	Cells face on Corridor	Enter Data LSpa Disqualify Safety Level Resi	ace in Resid. Housing Area stant <1 hour Fire Resistant >1 hour	0	0	0	0
9.Separation of Residential	Incomplete	<u> </u>	>1 Hour Fire Resistance \$ 16645	2	1	2	2

Setting an Initial Level

Another choice on the drop-down menu is Help. Help can assist you in identifying and selecting the Initial safety level. When selecting Help the help window displays documentation on the relevant safety parameter. The documentation includes tips on identifying your Initial safety level and definitions relevant to the safety levels of that parameter. The documentation directly quotes relevant parts of the NFPA codes.

Once a Initial safety level has been set for a parameter, you will notice changes in the boxes for all safety levels of that parameter. Double click now on the Class B box for Parameter 6. The Class B box has turned white to indicate its status as the Initial or current safety level. The Class C level has been disqualified because it has a lower point value than the Initial level. The Class A is yellow indicating that it is possible to improve safety from Class B to Class A, but that quantity and cost data have not yet been entered. The points columns at the far right have been updated. Now instead of zeros, four numbers are displayed representing the point values earned toward the four safety goals (S1: Fire Control, S2: Egress, S3: Refuge, and S4: General Fire Safety) as a result of being at the selected Initial safety level. The change is also reflected in the totals for Points Earned and Deficit/Surplus at the bottom right of the screen.





5.2 Data Entry

Once the Initial safety levels have been marked, data on the scale of the safety improvements are needed to complete the optimization. As mentioned above, yellow safety levels are those awaiting data. To enter data, right click on the safety level to activate the drop down menu and select the **Enter Data** option. The box will temporarily turn red to identify it as the safety level being worked on, and a window titled Measurements Needed to Estimate Cost will appear.

Measurements Needed to Estimate Cost		
Measurement	Quantity	Units
Area of interior finish in corridors to be removed.	0	Sq. Ft.
Area of interior finish in corridors to be coated.	0	Sq. Ft.
Area of interior finish in corridors to be covered.	0	Sq. Ft.
		Ok

Measurements Window

This window lists all measurements needed to estimate the costs of safety improvements. Enter the Area of interior finish in corridors to be removed, the area to be coated and the area to be covered. In this case the initial quantity is zero, but if there is another number in the quantity slot, it is based on information entered earlier, possibly for another safety level whose cost depended on the same measurements. A warning: If you change such pre-existing data, previously computed cost estimates will also change. For this tutorial, enter 33,000 for all three of the quantities.

Once the data have been entered, press OK to display the Alternatives Window, which lists all the construction alternatives to improve the Initial safety level to the new, higher, safety level.

Choice	Alternative	Cost Estimate	Review
•	Remove Class B materials exposing Class A material	\$ 14009	Review
0	Coat Class B material with fire retardant coating	\$ 90387	Review
0	Install gypsum board(drywall) to cover all Class B interior Finish m	\$ 21488	Review

Alternatives Window

The Alternatives Window shows a description of each alternative with its estimated cost. To see more information about any alternative and its cost estimate, click on the **Review** button to display the Cost Estimates Window.

🔁 Cost Estimates			
Alternative: Remove Class B materials exposing Class A material			
Task	Cost	Quantity	Total
Remove Class B interior finish from corridors and egress routes	\$ 0.42	33000	‡ 4009
		(эк

Cost Estimates Window

The Cost Estimates Window offers an itemized description of all tasks needed to complete the alternative. This example has only one task, but alternatives can be more involved. There is a unit cost and quantity breakdown for each task. You may override the total cost of the alternative. Once you are satisfied with the cost estimates, click the OK button to return to the Alternative window. If the estimate was overridden, the change will be reflected in the Alternative window. The cost estimates provided by *ALARM* take the geographic location of the facility into account.

Once back in the Alternatives Window you should select which alternative is to be used in the analysis. Once the alternative is selected, click the **OK** button. The box of the safety level will change from red to green, and the cost estimate of the selected alternative will be displayed in the box. If you chose the least-cost alternative, "Remove Class B materials…" the Interior Finish safety parameter will look like this:



Data is Entered and Cost is Displayed

If, on the other hand, you reviewed the alternatives and decided that none were feasible for the project, you may select **Disqualify State**. This will turn the safety level box dark gray and remove that safety level from consideration in the optimization.

Now select an initial state and enter data for safety Parameter 8. At this point all thirteen of the Initial safety levels have been marked, and data have been entered for all the safety levels to be considered. The next step is optimization to find the least cost improvement plan.

6.0 Finding the Least-Cost Improvement Plan

6.1 Optimizing

Optimizing is the mathematical procedure that ALARM uses to find the least-cost method of achieving compliance with the *Life Safety Code*. The software will not allow you to optimize until all thirteen Initial safety levels have been marked. The optimization procedure considers all green safety levels as possible improvements from the Initial safety levels. The program interprets yellow levels as disqualified because there are no cost estimates for implementing those safety levels. To start the optimization procedure, click on the Compute menu and select the Optimize item.



ALARM 2.0			une uno v		iaj od a		0101	ecaed i			50	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		
File Compute	e Edit Help													
	- '		Cost of C	Optimal Solu	tion: \$ 7	0902				S1	S2	S3	S4	
1.Construction	∇(000)	₹(111)	IV(2HH)	III(200)	III(211)	II(0	00)	II(111)	II(222) or I(ANY)	0	0	0	0	
2.Hazardous	Within	Residential H	Iousing Area	0	utside Residenti	ial Housing A	rea	No	Deficiencies					
Areas	Double Deficie	ncy	Single Deficiency	Double I	Deficiency	Single I \$	Deficiency 7772			0	0	0	0	
3.Fire Alarm	No Ale	arm	No FD	Notification		Wi	ith F.D. No	tification						
					No M	lanual Alarm		Manu \$	al Alarm 3698	1	2	0	2	
4.Smoke	None			Residential I	Housing Area			Te	otal Building			_		
Detection		1	Large Sleeping Roor	ns All Sleep:	ing Rooms	Full	Coverage		\$ 4519	2	4	0	4	
5.Automatic Sprinklers		None		Residential F \$ 8	Iousing Areas 4636			Entire Build \$ 86491	ing	0	0	0	0	
6.Interior Finish (Corrs <u>E</u> gress)		Class C		Cla	ss B			Class A \$ 13869	1	0	-1	0	-1	
7.Interior Finish (Other Areas)		Class C		Cla \$ 1	ss B 5256			Class A \$ 15256		-1	0	0	-2	
8.Cell/Sleeping	Cells face on	Corridor		Intervening Common Space in Resid. Housing Area			Intervening Common Space in Resid. Housing Area		Interven					
Room Enclosure				Dpen	Smoke Re \$	esistant <1 ho 16645	our	Fire Resis	tant≥1 hour	0	0	0	0	
9.Separation of Residential	I	ncomplete		Smoke Resi	stant<1 hour		>	1 Hour Fire Res \$ 16645	istance	4	2	4	4	
10.Exit System	<2 Roy	utes			Mult	iple Routes					_	_		
			De	eficient	No I	Deficiencies		Direct F \$ 1	loom Exits 15214	U	0	U	0	
11.Exit Access	I	Dead Ends		No I)ead Ends >50ft	and Travel is	s:		<= 150 ft		~			
	>100 ft		>50 ft	>200 ft	<=200 ft >	150 ft	<=150 \$ 10:	1ft 19		U	U	U	U	
12.Vertical		Oper	n or Incomplete Enc	losures				Enclosed			_	_		
Openings	Thru 4>= Flo	ors	2-3 Floors	1 F	loor	Smoke	Resistant	Fi	ire Resistant \$26142	1	2	2	2	
13.Smoke Control	No Cor	ıtrol	P	Smoke Con assive	mpartments Mechan	ically Assiste \$	ed	Heat + Smol	se Vent System \$	0	2	2	2	
									Points Earned:	7	11	8	11	
									Points Needed:	7	10	8	11	

The screen refreshes and the answer is displayed using color-coded safety level boxes

The Least-Cost Compliance Plan

The yellow and green safety levels have been recolored either dark gray or aqua. Aqua indicates a safety level improvement that is included in the least-cost construction plan to reach compliance. In the least-cost plan displayed here, five improvements are needed to satisfy the total points required for all four of the safety goals. In Parameter 2: Hazardous Areas you need to upgrade from a double deficiency outside housing areas to a single deficiency. The second improvement in Parameter 3: Fire Alarm requires moving from No Manual Alarm to a Manual Alarm with Fire Department Notification. The third improvement in Parameter 8 calls for moving from Open space to Smoke Resistant < 1 hour. In Parameter 9 you need to improve from Smoke Resistant < 1 hour separation to \geq 1 hour Fire Resistance. Finally, in Parameter 12: Vertical Openings you must upgrade from Smoke Resistant Enclosure to Fire Resistant Enclosure.

Other information provided on this screen is the Total Optimum points, bottom right, and the Cost of Optimal Solution, top center banner. The former shows the total points earned by the least-cost compliance plan toward each safety goal. Note that now there is a positive or zero Surplus of Points Earned over Points Needed for all four of the mandatory safety goals of the *Life Safety Code*. The latter is the total cost of all improvements in the least-cost compliance plan.

Once the project has been optimized, no more data can be entered. To modify the data and redo the analysis, first save the project under a different file name, open that new file, edit the data or add new data, and then re-optimize.

6.2 The Report

Once optimization is complete *ALARM* takes the data that you have entered and compiles a comprehensive report on the Least Cost Construction Plan for the Facility. *ALARM* then asks if you would like to view the facility report. The report may also be viewed by selecting the Compute Menu and choosing Report so that the Report Preview Window appears.

Least-Cost Construction Plan for Life Safety Compliance Excility: State Rem. Lotsin:: Sher Spring, MD Date of Analysis: 10/18/2001 Total Cost of Ban: \$ 763371 This moortikenifier the kerteorphan wathere compliance with the Life Safety Code for prices publied by the Main and The Posician Association (MPPA). The information's based on the MPPA 101A, Code and Analysis: 10/18/2001 The moortikenifier the kerteorphan wathere compliance with the Life Safety Code for prices publied by the Main and The Code and Analysis: 100 and Main Allows and administ from the US Assessore the MPPA 101A, Code and Analysis: 100 and Main Allows and Analysis The moortification: The the of the facility and the net critical in helping thermine the kertcort plan for Life Safety compliance 1. Actively Specification: The the of the facility and the proposal kertory plan for the indiance of the facility and the proposal kertory plan for Life Safety compliance 2. Safety Least and Plancher 2: the safety keys and each by webshore plan for Life Safety compliance 3. Construction Plance 1: the indiance the indiperature of the facility and the proposal keystory plan and the cort of major and the facility of the Life Safety Compliance 4. Comparison with the price of the key the safet of the keystory and the safet of the keystory here we have of the keystory in the proposal keystory in the safet of the keystory in the safet of the keystory and the safet of the keystory in the safet of the keystory and the safet of the keystory in the safet of the keystory in the safet of the keystory and	🔄 Report Preview			_ 🗆 ×
Least-Cost Construction Plan for Life Safety Compliance Reflix: State Pan. Location: Silver Spring, MD. Date of Analysis: 10.032/001. Total Cost of Ban: \$ 763371 This moorthamilies the hart-corplane achieve compliance with the Life Safety Cole for prices publied by the Networtham Analysis: 10.0182/001. Total Cost of Ban: \$ 763371 The moorthamilies the hart-corplane achieve constituent WDFA. Cost of Cost frame approaches 1 Life Safety 2001 attinue of frame does the NDFA 101A. Cost of Safety Leave Low of the facility that an oritical in labeling documents is used to the NDFA 101A. . Safety Leave Low Bookstow: Life safety work and eachy evaluation points for seaf-safety parameters all safety and 16 soft to the facility safet and eachieve compliance. . Action Life Safety compliance. . Comparison with Practifying Compliance (Comparison of the hard-cortrafing have been facility and the Safety Code and NDFA 101A. . Comparison with Practifying Code compliance (Comparison of the hard-cortrafing have been facility and the proceedings weakanet by individual have with hard hord of marks and the proceedings. . Comparison with Practifying Code compliance (Comparison of the hard-cortrafing have been facility. . Action Life Safety Cost of Safety Code and NDFA 101A. . Action Life Safety Cost of Safety Code and NDFA 101A. . Comparison with Practrifying beacharders to the hard-cost facility have bea				
Facility: State Pern. Location: Silver Spring, MD Date of Analysis: 10.782/2001 Total Cost of Ham: \$ 763371 This moortification for the key-coortplane with the Life Safety Cole for prices publicle by the Method Information's based on the MTPA 101A, Cole on Alemantic Approache > Life Safety 2001 testion. Alemantics is based on the MTPA 101A, Cole on the Alemantic Approache > Life Safety 2001 testion. Alemantics is based on the MTPA 101A, Cole on Alemantic Approache > Life Safety 2001 testion. Alemantics is based on the MTPA 101A, Cole on Alemantic Approache > Life Safety 2001 testion. Alemantics is unally the mathematic and the set over phane in Ale. Masse by compliance. 1. Reality Specification: Check of the facility that an articulin helping the main test he set over phane in Life Masse by cold fact with the Life Safety compliance. 2. Construction Theoremain Comparison of the facility and the proposed her toortplane in the set over the head and the cortiform hematication. 3. Construction Theoremain Compliance (Comparison of the hertoertracking years and each years of the Masse in the Safety Compliance. 4. Comparison with Descripting Compliance (Comparison of the hertoertracking years in white a difference in the masses of the Life Safety Compliance. 4. Comparison with Descripting Compliance (Comparison of the hertoertracking years in the hertoertracking years and each years of the Masse in the hertoertracking years and each years of the safety Cost in Masse in the hertoertracking years and each years of the masses of the Life Safety Compliance. 4. Comparison with Descripting Compliance the her	Least-Cost Construction Plan for Life Sa	afety Compliance		
Location: Silver Spring, MD Bate of Analysis: 10.18/2001 Total Cost of Ham: \$ 763371 Fublication of the bart cost of Ham: \$ 763371 Fublication of the Dischard Cost of Ham: \$ 763371 Fublication of the Cost of Ham: \$ 763371 Fublication of the Dischard Cost of Ham: \$ 763371 Fublication of the Cost of Ham: \$ 763371 Fublication of Ham: \$ 763 Fublication fublication of Ham: \$ 763 Fublication of Ham: \$ 763 Fublication of Ham: \$ 763 Fublication fublication fub	Facility: State Perm			
Date of Analysis: 10/18/2001 Total Cost of Han: \$ 763371 This monthlanding the hartwortplan to achieve compliance with the Life Sufety Code for prices published by the Natural Ham Powerback Association (ITEPA). The information's based on the ITEPA 101A, Could on Ahmanita Asynolasis & Life Sufety (2014) Edition and materials. The monthland into fine section: 1. Knollby Specifications: Life safety have and ratio of the facility that an critical in helping the termine the hartwort plan for Life Sufety compliance. 2. Safety Law Lead Muchanization: Life safety have and ratio of the facility and the proposed heat control in planes that is facility compliance. 3. Construction Plan: Summary of actions b be implemented to achieve Life Safety compliance with safety point gained and the control implementation of the Safety code in NTPA 101A, with these that would be acquired the proceeding Code compliance wing the FEES in NTPA 101A, with the loss of thing, with each point of the proceeding Code compliance wing the FEES in NTPA 101A, with the loss of thing, with each point of the loss of the life Safety Code in NTPA 101A, with the loss of thing, uniford rumber of Theory Samara, 90 43 Locally Labor ContRictor (100 = US Awara, 90 43) Use Codition Zoom Number of Theory 3 Locally Makriak ContRictor (100 = US Awara, 90 43) Use Codition Not Impedial Egners L the building a high rise? Not Locally Makriak ContRictor (100 = US Awara, 90 43) Locally Makriak ContRictor (100 = US Awara, 90 44) Locally Makriak ContRictor (100 = US Awara, 90 44) L	Location: Silver Spring, M	D		
Total Cost of Han: \$ 763371 This moortilastifies the hastroortplants achieve compliance with the Life Schipy Cole for prices published by the Network Encodentia (JPEA). The information's based on the NPEA 101A, Origina Cole and match Agence is the factory 2001 effects for the OF Avenue of the Network of the Network of the Network of Avenue of the Network	Date of Analysis: 10/18/20	01		
This most illustifies the Networthent Association (NTPA). It informations haved on the NTPA 101A, Colling an Albanate Association (NTPA). The informations haved on the NTPA 101A, Colling and the States year of States and Association and States and Association. Allocates and Association and States and Association and States and Association. The most is defined into fine sections: 1. Reality Specifications: Life safety have and earbed from the US Association of the Sociation and States and St	Total Cost of Han: \$ 763	371		
Ibs myoris disided into fine sections: 1. Keilby Specifications: Darks of the facility that an critical in helping determine the hest-cost planes. 2. Safe y Law lead Hestawizs: Life safe y have and safety evaluation point for each safety parameter and safety y to be the initial coalition of the facility and the proposed hest-cost plan. 3. Construction Plan: Summary of actions to be implemented to achieve Life Safety compliance with subject to be the initial compliance wing the PWES in MPPA 101A. with these that would be negative subject the initial compliance wing the PWES in MPPA 101A with these that would be negative by the planes. 4. Comparison with Prescriptine Compliance wing the PWES in MPPA 101A with these that would be negative by the planes. Comparison of the heart-costrafiely have b found by ALASAM by achieve to be implemented by individual tool with the closest that would be negative by the planes. 1. Facility Specifications 3 I. Facility Specifications 3 Number of Flacos 3 I. coality Labor Cost Flactor (100 = US Average) 301 Locality Makriak Cost Flactor (100 = US Average) 94.9 Use Coalition 10 I. the builting states of modernined N No B. the builting states of a condensined N No D. the calk incommerce of a modernined N No D. the calk incomerce of a consilor? No D. the calk incon the comission? No	This mportailantifies the least-costplants achieve compliance v publicled by the National Fin Protection Association(MEPA). 1 Guile on Allematine Approaches to Life Safety, 2001 edition. 1 costs found in R.S. Means by multiplying locality cost facture fo	with the Life Safety Code for pricons the information's based on the MEPA 101A, All cost am derived from the US Average r labor and materials.		
1. Kacilly Specifications: Datale of the facility that an critical in helping determine the heart-cost plan for Life Schry compliance. 2. Schry Level and Bushawins: Life schry head and schry evaluation points for each schry pain for the fact by the initial condition of the facility and the proposed heart-cost plan for achieve plan. 3. Construction Plan: Summary of actions to be implemented to achieve Life Schry compliance with schry point for both the initial continuon of the heart-cost schry heak found by ALA&M to achieve full kits Schry Code compliance wing the FRES in NFPA 101. 2. 4. Comparison with Proceingine Compliance wing the FRES in NFPA 101. 2. 5. Action Datal: Datale of each action to be implemented by achieve four house that would be agained of the heart-cost of action. Zoom ++ J. Action Datal: Datale of each action to be implemented by individual heart with the locat data sche to of the law to be cost data and the balance of action. Zoom I. Facility Specifications 3 2 Number of Floor 3 3 Locality Labor Cost Ractor (100 = US Average) 80.1 80.1 Locality Matriak Cost Ractor (100 = US Average) 96.9 0K Use Condition 10' Impeded Egness 0K I the building a high rise? No 0K Has the building a high rise? No 0K I the instructure of the coritlos? No No	The report is divided into fine sections :			
2. Sufey Lavel and Fundations: Life softhy have and sufery evaluation points for each softhy gatements and suffy goal for both the initial condition of the facility and the proposed hast-costplan. Softwing compliance. Construction Plan: Summary of actions to be implemented to achieve Life Suffy compliance with suffy points gained and the cost of implementation. Comparison with Protocytime Compliance: Comparison of the hast-cost suffy back found by ALARM to achieve full ife Suffy Cole compliance with suffy Cole compliance with the suffy Cole in MPPA 101A with these that would be acquired by the protocytime to compliance with suffy Cole in MPPA 101A with these fact would be acquired by the protocytime to explain the integration of the hast-cost suffy back found by ALARM to achieve function to the implemented by individual task, with task cost driver, undirect number of unit, extended cost of task, and total cost of action. Action Detail: Details of each action to be implemented by individual task, with task cost driver, undirect number of the back cost of task, and total cost of action. Action Detail: Details of each action to be implemented by individual task, with task cost driver, undirect number of the back cost of task, and total cost of action. Facility Specifications Locality Labor Cost Factor (100 = US Average) Soft Soft Soft Soft Soft Soft Soft Soft	 Reality Specifications: Datails of the facility that are a plan for Life Safety compliance. 	rifical in helping determine the least-cost		
3. Construction Plan: Summary of actions to be implemented to achieve Life Suffry compliance with early point gained and the cost of mplements. 4. Comparison with Proceedings Compliance (Comparison of the hast cost early by the Will be mained by the proceedings compliance would be may and by the proceedings would be mained by individual to 1 with the second times, miriteory number of mits, extended costs of to 1 and to 10.1 with the second times, miriteory number of mits, extended costs of to 1 and to 10.2 with the second times, miriteory number of mits, extended costs of to 1 and to 10.2 with the second times, miriteory number of mits, extended costs of to 1 and to 10.2 with the second times, miriteory number of mits, extended costs of to 2 and to 10.2 with the second times, miriteory floors Image: Coord times, and the second times, and the second times, with the second times, miriteory floors 1. Facility Specifications 3 Image: Coord times, and the second times, and tit times, and times, and times, and times, and times, and tits, and	 Safety Level and Evaluations: Life safety levels and s parameter and safety goal for both the initial condition of for achieving compliance. 	afisty suchation points for each safely f the facility and the proposed heat+cost plan		
 4. Comparison with Prescriptine Compliances: Comparison of the hast cost stafty have is found by ALARM to achieve full Life Stafty Code compliance using the FXES in NFPA 101A with those that would be required by the prescriptine tension of the Life Stafty Code in NFPA 101. 5. Action Lethil: Details of each action to be implemented by individual to A with the location runther of mite, articulate of the A and to below to faction. 1. Facility Specifications Number of Floors Jocality Labor Cost Factor (100 = US Auerage) 80 1 Locality Labor Cost Factor (100 = US Auerage) 96 9 Use Condition Use Con	Construction Plan: Summary of actions to be implement with safety points gained and the cost of implementation.	anted to achieve Life Safety compliance		
J. Action Rebail: Debuils of seach action to be implemented by individual to A with the local driver, mitrors a number of mits, artended costs of task and to belocate faction. Zoom I. Facility Specifications 3 Number of Floor 3 Locality Labor Cost Factor (100 = US Average) 801 Locality Materials Cost Factor (100 = US Average) 96.9 Use Condition IV: Impeded Hymer J. the building reaveconstruction? No Lot the building high rise? No Do the calls face on the corritor? No Lot the sould ing base monovered or modernined? No An the calls in a multi timed bloci? No	4. Comparion with Prescriptine Compliance: Compariso ALARM to achieve full Life Safety Code compliance wi would be mquind by the prescriptine version of the Life	n of the least-cost safety levels found by ng the FSES in NFPA 101A with those that Safety Code in NFPA 101.		Zoom ++
Number of Floors 3 Number of Floors 301 Locality Labor Cost Flactor (100 = US Auerago) 301 Locality Materials Cost Flactor (100 = US Auerago) 94.9 Use Condition IV: Impeded Hymes Use Condition IV: Impeded Hymes Is the building teaconstruction? No Locality flactors on the condition? No Locality flactors	 Action Details: Details of each action to be implement unitsost number of units, extended costs of task, and total 	nd by individual tash, with tash cost driver, leost of action.		
Number of Hoors 3 Locality Labor Cost Harber (100 = US Auerage) 80 1 Locality Material: Cost Harber (100 = US Auerage) 96 9 Use Condition IV: Impeded Hyness L the building new construction? No L the building high nies? No Has the building beam move bed or modermined? No Lot the intervening space graver than 10 file? No An the calls in a multi timed block? No	1. Facility Specifications			Zoom
Locality Labor Cost Harber (100 = US Average) 80 1 Locality Materials Cost Harber (100 = US Average) 96 9 Use Condition IV: Impeded Hymes Is the building new construction? No Is the building a high rise? No Has the building bean mnovesh or modermined? No Io the cells face on the corrilor? No Is the intervening space generate than 10 face? No Am the cells in a multi-tianed bloch? No	Number of Floors	3		
Locality Materiak Cost Factor (100 = US Average) 94.9 Use Condition IV: Impeded Egnes Is the building new construction? No Is the building a high rise? No Has the building been mnowed or modernised? No Do the cells face on the corrilor? No Is the intervening space gneater than 30 files? No An the cells in a multi-teard bloch? No	Locality Labor Cost Factor (100 = US Avaraga)	801		Print
Use Condition IV: Impeded Egnes Is the building new construction? No Is the building a high rise? No Has the building bean neovested or modernised? No Do the cells face on the corrilor? No Is the intervening space greater than 10 files? No Ano the cells in a multi-tioned bloch? No	Locality Materials CostFactor (100 = US Average)	969		
Is the building new construction? No Is the building a high nise? No Has the building bean merowered or modernized? No Do the cells face on the corrilor? No Is the intervening space greater than 10 face? No Are the cells in a multi-timed block? No	Use Condition	IV: Impeded Egnee		1
Is the building a high rise? No Has the building bean neroward or modernized? No Do the cells face on the corrilor? No Is the intervening space greater than 50 files? No Are the cells in a multi-timed block? No	Is the building new construction?	No		OK
Has the building bean mouve ad or modernized? No Do the calk face on the corridor? No Is the intervening space graver than 10 files? No Ano the calk in a multi-tiened block? No	Is the building a high nise?	No		
Do the cells face on the corridor? No Is the intervening space graves than 10 files? No Ano the cells in a multi-tiened block? No	Has the building been mouvand or modernized?	No		
Is the intervening space gmater than 50 files? No Ane the calls in a multi-tiened block? No	Do the calls face on the comidor?	No		
Ano the calls in a multi-tianed bloch? No	Is the intercenting space gmater than 50 feet?	No		
	An the cells in a multi-tiszed bloch?	No		
			_	
	1/8 + - •		•	

Report Preview Window

The report is composed of five separate sections. A sample report showing the optimization of State Penn.fse is included as an appendix. The first page provides a basic overview of the report explaining all five sections. It also prints out the information about the facility entered in the initial Project Information windows. Click on the "+" symbol at the bottom left to display page 2 of the report.

The second page of the report provides the safety levels and safety evaluation points earned for each parameter and safety goal, both for the initial condition of the facility and for the proposed least-cost plan for achieving compliance. The third page is a summary of the construction plan. The table illustrates the actions that must be implemented to achieve Life Safety compliance. The page shows the cost of implementation and the safety points gained for each improvement.

The fourth section provides a comparison of the least-cost safety levels found by *ALARM* to achieve full *Life Safety Code* compliance using the FSES in NFPA 101A to those that would be required by the prescriptive version of the *Life Safety Code* in NFPA 101.

The final pages describe in detail of the actions needed to achieve compliance. The descriptions document each task, the task cost drivers, unit cost, number of units, extended costs of the task, and the total cost of each action.

7.0 Technical Background: How ALARM Finds the Least Cost Plan

7.1 Linear Programming

Linear programming is a powerful mathematical method for solving the problem of allocating limited resources among multiple competing activities. This method has been used to allocate production resources, plan shipping routes, assist in agricultural planning, and even design radiation therapy techniques. Linear programming uses a mathematical model to describe the problem of interest. The model is constructed of a series of mathematical linear functions. The model is then systematically solved to find the optimal solution.

Linear programming is the ideal tool to be used in identifying the least-cost construction plan for achieving compliance with the *Life Safety Code* because the safety goal requirements are all based on a linear summation of points earned by each safety parameter. *ALARM* uses a linear programming model to cost-effectively allocate a limited construction budget among competing activities by searching through all possible combinations of safety improvements that will satisfy the compliance requirements of the *Life Safety Code*.

To address the *Life Safety Code* a special type of linear programming, called zero-one, is implemented in *ALARM*. The zero-one approach is used when each of the choice variables are either true or false. In this model the choice variables are all of the individual safety levels of all the 13 safety parameters. A level is either selected for inclusion in the compliance plan or it is not. Each safety parameter is represented by one equation in the model. Each equation consists of the sum of all the safety level variables in the parameter being set equal to one. For instance, the equation for Parameter 5 would look like this:

$$X_{5,1} + X_{5,2} + X_{5,3} = 1$$

Note that in this zero-one model, each of the X's can take on only the values zero or one. Thus setting the equation equal to one ensures that one and only one of the safety levels can be included in the compliance plan. This is true for all 13 safety parameters.

The four safety goals of Fire Control (S1), Egress (S2), Refuge (S3), General Fire Safety (S4) are modeled in a similar way using the special weighting factors from Worksheet 5.5.4: Individual Safety Evaluations of the *Life Safety Code*. In this case there are four equations, one for each safety goal. The left-hand side of each equation is the sum of the products for all safety level variables over all 13 safety parameters of the points for each level times the corresponding weighting factors (0, 1, or 0.5) in Worksheet 5.5.4. Each of these linear expressions is set equal to the required number of points for each safety goal found in Worksheet 5.5.5: Mandatory Safety Requirements.

The objective function to be minimized is the cost function defined by summing the products of all safety level variables times their construction costs across all 13 safety

parameters. In this way, only the costs of those safety variables included in the solution (i.e., with values equal to one rather than zero) would be included in the total cost computation.

7.2 Modeling the Interdependencies

The nine footnotes found at the bottom of Worksheet 5.5.3 presented a special challenge in the modeling of the *Life Safety Code* for prisons. These footnotes indicate circumstances that trigger alternative point values for many of the levels as shown in the parenthetical values in the body of the Worksheet. The conditions can be classified into two types, predetermined and interdependent, depending on whether or not the truth value of the condition can be changed within the model by changes in the values of the safety level variables. Predetermined conditions are those which it is assumed the building manager cannot alter when trying to improve the point score of any safety parameter. Examples of predetermined conditions are the number of floors, construction type, whether the building is new or existing construction, and if the cells are facing an access corridor. Interdependent conditions are those that are affected by the safety level of other parameters. For instance, any safety level whose points depend on the value of Parameter 5 is considered to be affected by an interdependent condition.

Each footnote lists one or more conditions that are used to determine the alternative parenthetical point value that should be awarded for that safety level. To evaluate an interdependency, an equation or series of equations is created using the primary safety level variable and a special parenthetical variable. Each equation is entered as an additional row in the large linear matrix. These additional equations determine the truth value of the conditions and activate the appropriate (either the primary or the alternative parenthetical) point value for the safety level. The point values of each of the primary and parenthetical variables are included in safety goal equations at the bottom of the matrix.

7.3 The Zero-One Integer Programming Method

Once the zero-one integer programming model for the *Life Safety Code* and its many footnotes was constructed, software code to efficiently solve the set of equations was sought. Public domain computer code written in the C programming language, called lp_solve , was identified and evaluated for robustness and efficiency in solving zero-one problems. The original versions of the code up through version 1.5 were written by Michel Berkelaar of the Eindhoven University of Technology in the Netherlands. Revisions of the code up to the current version (2.3) used in *ALARM* were developed by Jeroen Dirks. The code has been successfully tested on many different models including very large ones involving 30,000 variables and 50,000 constraints. The code addresses zero-one integer problems using a version of the Branch and Bound algorithm widely cited in the operations research literature.

Before incorporating the *lp_solve* code into the *ALARM* software, we tested it on over 200 projects involving the *Life Safety Code* for health care facilities that had already been solved using the previous version of *ALARM*. The previous solutions were based on a two-stage process involving the Revised Simplex Method to solve the non-integer

version of the problem and then applying heuristic techniques to estimate the true integer solutions. The solutions obtained using *lp_solve* were either as low or lower in cost than the solutions previously found. Once the accuracy and efficiency of *lp_solve* were confirmed by these tests, we adapted the code and compiled it as a Dynamic Link Library (DLL) file which is called directly from *ALARM 2.0*. The DLL function receives as a parameter the large integer matrix of the model that is built from the data entered in the Project Window. The function returns an array of the (non-zero) safety level variables that are included in the least-cost solution. The solution array that defines the least-cost compliance plan is then shown in the Project Window by coding the improved safety levels in the aqua color.

8.0 Safety Improvements and Cost Data

While the safety levels of the FSES are defined as a part of the NFPA 101A for detention and correctional occupancies, the construction methods used to improve from one level to another are not explained in the NFPA code. A major feature of *ALARM* is the detailed description of the tasks and costs associated with making improvements in safety levels. To find accurate safety improvements, Hughes Associates Inc, a fire and safety engineering firm in Baltimore, MD, was contracted to assist in developing a complete list of safety improvements and to collect cost data needed for the improvements.

8.1 Safety Improvements

A comprehensive list and detailed specifications for all fire safety improvements that apply to each of the thirteen fire safety parameters included in NFPA 101A was compiled. The analysis was performed for each parameter to determine the various methods available for upgrading from an existing condition to each condition having a higher score. Where more than one method was available, each method was listed.

Unit terms (i.e., Cost Drivers) such as linear feet, square feet, or quantity were determined for and assigned to each element of the tasks associated with a candidate upgrade. Typical elements included doors and frames, smoke detectors, sprinklers, and interior finish. In cases where an upgrade required two or more separate elements, the term for each of these items was identified separately but marked as being linked to the specific upgrade. For example, in Parameter 13 the provision of a "Heat and Smoke Vent System" required both the actual smoke removal system and an automatic smoke detection system to initiate smoke control.

8.2 Cost Data

Most materials and labor cost data for safety improvements were collected by Hughes Associates from R.S. Means, *Means Facility Cost Data, 1999*, R. S. Means Company: Kingston, MA, a nationally recognized source of data for construction cost estimation. Minor refinements were made in some of the estimates based on feedback from inquiries to several organizations familiar with detention and correctional facility construction costs. This information was obtained by contacting several government as well as private correctional organizations, including the following: National Institute of Corrections, American Correctional Association, National Sheriffs' Association, and Maryland Department of Corrections, Capital Construction Division.

For some safety improvement tasks the baseline data available from R. S. Means did not provide adequate detail. For such special cases as retrofitting a fire alarm system, automatic sprinklers or a smoke removal system, manufacturers and installers were contacted directly to obtain supplemental cost estimates.

The data were based on construction costs for the Washington DC/ Maryland suburban area. *ALARM* automatically adjusts all cost data to the locality of the facility. When the

zip code is entered at the creation of a new project, all costs are adapted for the geographic location of the facility. Some improvements require cost estimates that are very region specific, such as the creation of a water supply. In these rare cases the user is asked to obtain a specific cost estimate.

8.3 Cost Algorithms

The cost algorithm used to estimate the costs associated with a specific safety improvement are based on the unit cost of each driver and the element quantity needed. The basic form of the algorithm took the following form:

Total Upgrade Cost = \sum Unit Cost of Driver* Element Quantity, summed over all tasks required to achieve the safety upgrade.

Unit Cost of Driver = The labor and materials costs for each dimensional unit or count of the element or task involved in the upgrade.

Element Quantity = The quantity of each element (number of dimensional units or count) required to be installed to achieve the design upgrade and qualify under NFPA 101A for the upgraded state and score being sought.

The total upgrade cost is the summation of the costs of all of the elements associated with a particular upgrade.

Some safety improvements, such as sprinkler or smoke detection installation, required more complex algorithms. These cases can be seen in *ALARM* where special calculators are necessary to determine the number of units of each cost driver needed. These algorithms were also designed by Hughes Associates.

References

Berkelaar, Michel, *lp_solve.c*, version 2.3 (February 24, 1999), Eindhoven University of Technology, Department of Electrical Engineering, Eindhoven, Netherlands.

Chapman, Robert E., "Assessing the Costs of Fire Protection in Health Care Facilities," *Fire Safety Journal*, Vol. 9, No. 2, 1985, pp. 221-231.

Chapman, Robert E. and Hall, William G., *Programmer's Manual for the Fire Safety Evaluation System Cost Minimizer Computer Program*, National Bureau of Standards, NBSIR 83-2749, Washington, DC, 1983.

Chapman, Robert E. and Hall, William G., "Code Compliance at Lower Costs: A Mathematical Programming Approach," *Fire Technology* Vol. 18, No. 1 (February 1982), pp. 77-89.

Chapman, Robert E. and Hall, William G., *A Computerized Approach for Identifying Cost-Effective Fire Safety Retrofits in Health Care Facilities*, National Bureau of Standards, NBSIR 79-1929, Washington, DC, 1980.

Gass, Saul I., *Linear Programming: Methods and Applications*, 4th edition, McGraw-Hill Book Company: New York, 1975.

Hillier, Frederick S. and Lieberman, Gerald J., *Introduction to Operations Research*, 3rd edition, Holden-Day, Inc.: San Francisco, 1980.

National Fire Protection Association, "Fire Safety Evaluation System for Detention and Correctional Facilities," Chapter 5 of NFPA 101A, *Guide on Alternative Approaches to Life Safety*, 2001 edition, Quincy, MA, 2001.

National Fire Protection Association, *NFPA 101, Life Safety Code*, 2000 edition, Quincy, MA, 2000.

Nelson, Harold. E. and Shibe, A. J., *A System for Fire Safety Evaluation of Health Care Facilities*, National Bureau of Standards, NBSIR 78-1555, Washington, DC, 1980.

R. S. Means, Facilities Cost Data, 1999, R. S. Means Company: Kingston, MA, 1999.

Weber, Stephen F. and Lippiatt, Barbara C., "Cost-Effective Compliance with Life Safety Codes," *Fire Technology* Vol. 32, Number 4 (Nov/Dec 1996).

Weber, Stephen F. and Lippiatt, Barbara C., *ALARM 1.0: Decision Support Software for Cost-Effective Compliance with Fire Safety Codes*, National Institute of Standards and Technology, NISTIR 5554, Gaithersburg MD 20899, December 1994.

Appendix A

Least-Cost Construction Plan for Life Safety Compliance Facility: State Penn Location: Silver Spring, MD Date of Analysis: 10/23/2001 Total Cost of Plan: \$ 72365

This report identifies the least-cost plan to achieve compliance with the Life Safety Code for prisons published by the National Fire Protection Association(NFPA). The information is based on the NFPA 101A, Guide on Alternative Approaches to Life Safety, 2001 edition. All costs are derived from the US Average costs found in R.S. Means by multiplying locality cost factors for labor and materials.

The report is divided into five sections:

1. Facility Specifications: Details of the facility that are critical in helping determine the least-cost plan for Life Safety compliance.

2. Safety Level and Evaluations: Life safety levels and safety evaluation points for each safety parameter and safety goal, for both the initial condition of the facility and the proposed least-cost plan for achieving compliance.

3. Construction Plan: Summary of actions to be implemented to achieve Life Safety compliance with safety points gained and the cost of implementation.

4. Comparison with Prescriptive Compliance: Comparison of the least-cost safety levels found by ALARM to achieve full Life Safety Code compliance using the FSES in NFPA 101A with those that would be required by the prescriptive version of the Life Safety Code in NFPA 101.

5. Action Details: Details of each action to be implemented by individual task, with task cost driver, unit cost, number of units, extended costs of task, and total cost of action.

1. Facility Specifications

Number of Floors	3
Locality Labor Cost Factor (100 = US Average)	80.1
Locality Materials Cost Factor (100 = US Average)	96.9
Use Condition	IV: Impeded Egress
Is the building new construction?	No
Is the building a high rise?	No
Has the building been renovated or modernized?	No
Do the cells face on the corridor?	No
Is the intervening space greater than 50 feet?	No
Are the cells in a multi-tiered block?	No

Safety Parameter	Safety Level	Individual Safety Evaluations				
		Fire Controls(S1)	Egress(S2)	Refuge(S3)	General(S4)	
1. Construction	III(211)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
2. Hazardous Areas	Double Deficiency	-4.0	-2.0	-4.0	-4.0	
3. Fire Alarm	No Manual Alarm	0.5	1.0	0.0	1.0	
4. Smoke Detection	Full Coverage	2.0	4.0	0.0	4.0	
5. Automatic Sprinklers	None	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
6. Interior Finish (Corrs&Egress)	Class B	0.0	-1.0	0.0	-1.0	
7. Interior Finish (Other Areas)	Class C	-1.0	0.0	0.0	-2.0	
8. Cell/Sleeping Room Enclosure	Open	0.0	0.0	-3.0	-3.0	
9. Separation of Residential Areas	Smoke Resistant<1 hour	2.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	
10. Exit System	No Deficiencies	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
11. Exit Access	<=200 ft >150 ft	0.0	-2.0	0.0	-2.0	
12. Vertical Openings	Smoke Resistant	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
13. Smoke Control	Passive	0.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	
Total Poin	its Earned:	-0.5	3.0	-3.0	-3.0	
Minimum	Points Required	7.0	10.0	8.0	11.0	
Deficit(-)/S	Surplus(+)	-7.5	-7.0	-11.0	-14.0	

2a. Safety Levels and Individual Safety Evaluations: Initial Condition

2b. Safety Levels and Individual Safety Evaluations: Proposed Least-Cost Solution

Safety Parameter	Safety Level	Individual Safety Evaluations			
		Fire Controls(S1)	Egress(S2)	Refuge(S3)	General(S4)
1. Construction	III(211)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. Hazardous Areas	Single Deficiency	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3. Fire Alarm	Manual Alarm	1.0	2.0	0.0	2.0
4. Smoke Detection	Full Coverage	2.0	4.0	0.0	4.0
5. Automatic Sprinklers	None	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. Interior Finish (Corrs&Egress)	Class B	0.0	-1.0	0.0	-1.0
7. Interior Finish (Other Areas)	Class C	-1.0	0.0	0.0	-2.0
8. Cell/Sleeping Room Enclosure	Smoke Resistant <1 hour	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Separation of Residential Areas	Smoke Resistant<1 hour	4.0	2.0	4.0	4.0
10. Exit System	No Deficiencies	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Exit Access	<=200 ft >150 ft	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
12. Vertical Openings	Fire Resistant	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
13. Smoke Control	Passive	0.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Total Poin	its Earned:	7.0	11.0	8.0	11.0
Minimum	Points Required	7.0	10.0	8.0	11.0
Surplus		0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0

Safety Parameter	Points Gained	Cost	Action to be implemented
1. Construction	No Change	\$0	No Improvement Needed
2. Hazardous Areas	4	\$ 7772	Provide fire resistive enclosure protection for all nonsprinklered
3. Fire Alarm	1	\$ 3698	Install fire alarm activation
4. Smoke Detection	No Change	\$0	No Improvement Needed
5. Automatic Sprinklers	No Change	\$0	No Improvement Needed
6. Interior Finish (Corrs&Egress)	No Change	\$0	No Improvement Needed
7. Interior Finish (Other Areas)	No Change	\$0	No Improvement Needed
8. Cell/Sleeping Room Enclosure	3	\$ 18108	Replace open separation with new smoke resistant walls and doors as
9. Separation of Residential Areas	2	\$ 16645	Upgrade separation walls and doors to 1-hr fire resistant ratings
10. Exit System	No Change	\$0	No Improvement Needed
11. Exit Access	2	\$0	No Improvement Needed:
12. Vertical Openings	2	\$ 26142	Alternative Point Value Earned Enclose all vertical openings with fire resistive enclosures
13. Smoke Control	No Change	\$0	No Improvement Needed

3. Construction Plan: How to Achieve Least-Cost Compliance

.

4. Comparison with Prescriptive Compliance

The NFPA offers two versions of the Life Safety Code. The prescriptive version (NFPA 101) specifies in great detail exactly what must be done to achieve compliance. It offers only one solution, with no flexibility or substitutions permitted. The alternative version (NFPA 101A), on which the ALARM software is based, does not have fixed requirements. Rather, it allows facility managers to use any combination of safety levels for the 13 fire safety parameters, as long as the required point scores are earned for all four safety goals: fire control, egress, refuge, and general safety. This system of trade-offs among the safety parameters is called the Fire Safety Evaluation System (FSES) and provides facility managers with many alternative compliance solutions that are equivalent in life safety to prescriptive code compliance with NFPA 101. The flexibility provided by the FSES of the Alternative Approaches to Life Safety (NFPA 101A) allows for major cost savings in achieving compliance with the Life Safety Code. The table below compares the increases in safety levels that your facility would need for compliance with the prescriptive code with those it would need under the plan found by ALARM using the FSES.

Safety Parameter		Safety Levels	
	Initial	Least-Cost Plan	Prescriptive Requirement
1. Construction	III(211)	No Increase Needed	No Increase Needed
2. Hazardous Areas	Double Deficiency	Single Deficiency	No Deficiencies
3. Fire Alarm	No Manual Alarm	Manual Alarm	Manual Alarm
4. Smoke Detection	Full Coverage	No Increase Needed	No Increase Needed
5. Automatic Sprinklers	None	No Increase Needed	No Increase Needed
6. Interior Finish (Corrs&Egress)	Class B	No Increase Needed	No Increase Needed
7. Interior Finish (Other Areas)	Class C	No Increase Needed	No Increase Needed
8. Cell/Sleeping Room Enclosure	Open	Smoke Resistant <1 hour	Smoke Resistant <1 hour
9. Separation of Residential Areas	Smoke Resistant<1 hour	>1 Hour Fire Resistance	No Increase Needed
10. Exit System	No Deficiencies	No Increase Needed	No Increase Needed
11. Exit Access	<=200 ft >150 ft	No Increase Needed	No Increase Needed
12. Vertical Openings	Smoke Resistant	Fire Resistant	Fire Resistant
13. Smoke Control	Passive	No Increase Needed	No Increase Needed

5. Action Details : Breakdown of costs by task

Safety Parameter 2: Hazardous Areas

Provide fire resistive enclosure protection for all nonsprinklered hazardous areas in the building.

Tasks	Cost Driver	Unit Cost	Units	Total Cost
Enclose the walls and ceilings of all hazardous areas in fire resistive enclosures. 1-hr enclosure except for 2-hr enclosures for separation of areas not incidental to residential housing and new boiler or fuel fired heating rooms.	Area of wall and ceiling that is less than 1 hour fire resistant.	3.21	1800	5784.75
Install fire doors hazardous areas in fire resistive enclosures. 1-hr enclosure except for 2-hr enclosures for separation of areas not incidental to residential housing and new boiler or fuel fired heating rooms.	Each opening into or out of the hazardous area.	993.54	2	1987.08

Total Cost: 7771.83

5. Action Details : Breakdown of costs by task

Safety Parameter 3: Fire Alarm

Install fire alarm activation stations(fire alarm boxes).

Tasks	Cost Driver	Unit Cost	Units	Total Cost
Install fire alarm activation stations(fire alarm boxes).	Fire Alarm Box Stations(use calculator)	205.43	18	3697.65
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

Total Cost: 3697.65

5. Action Details : Breakdown of costs by task

Safety Parameter 8: Cell/Sleeping Room Enclosure

Replace open separation with new smoke resistant walls and doors as needed.

Tasks	Cost Driver	Unit Cost	Units	Total Cost
Replace all portions of cell faces that are not 1-hour fire resistance with slab to slab faces having at least 1-hour fire resistance ratings.	Area of separation wall that is less than 1 hour fire resistant.	3.21	5000	16068.75
Replace all cell door that have less than 1-hour fire resistance with doors having 20 min. or greater fire resistance.	Number of exits in separation wall.	339.80	6	2038.77
	and a second			

Total Cost: 18107.52

5. Action Details : Breakdown of costs by task

Safety Parameter 9: Separation of Residential Areas

Upgrade separation walls and doors to produce 1-hr fire resistant ratings and raise fire resistance of entire building to 1-hr fire resistance.

Tasks	Cost Driver	Unit Cost	Units	Total Cost
Replace all portions of cell faces that are not 1-hour fire resistance with slab to slab faces having at least 1-hour fire resistance ratings.	Area of separation wall that is less than 1 hour fire resistant.	3.21	4545	14606.49
Replace all cell door that have less than 1-hour fire resistance with doors having 20 min. or greater fire resistance.	Number of exits in separation wall.	339.80	6	2038.77

Total Cost: 16645.26

5. Action Details : Breakdown of costs by task

Safety Parameter 12: Vertical Openings

Enclose all vertical openings with fire resistive enclosures.

Tasks	Cost Driver	Unit Cost	Units	Total Cost
2-hr protection for openings (shafts, etc.) connecting 4 or more floors in new construction.	Area of partition necessary to enclose vertical opening.	3.21	60	192.83
Install fire doors 2-hr protection for openings (shafts, etc.) connecting 4 or more floors in new construction.	Number of unprotected openings in shafts.	993.54	9	8941.86
1-hr protection for openings (shafts, etc.) connecting 3 or less floors in new construction.	Area of partition necessary to enclose vertical opening.	3.21	60	192.83
Install fire doors1-hr protection for openings (shafts, etc.) connecting 3 or less floors in new construction.	Number of unprotected openings in shafts.	853.37	9	7680.29
1/2-hr protection for openings (shafts, etc.) in existing construction.	Area of partition necessary to enclose vertical opening.	3.21	60	192.83
Install fire doors 1/2-hr protection for openings (shafts, etc.) in existing construction.	Number of unprotected openings in shafts.	993.54	9	8941.86

Total Cost: 26142.48