

PUBLIC HEARING
before
COMMISSION TO STUDY GOVERNMENTAL LAWS AND REGULATIONS
RELATING TO FIRE SAFETY STANDARDS

Held:
September 22, 1981
City Council Chamber
Camden City Hall
Camden, New Jersey

MEMBERS OF COMMISSION PRESENT:

- Senator John P. Caufield (Chairman)
- Senator Barry T. Parker
- Assemblyman Thomas F. Cowan
- Assemblyman Anthony M. Villane
- Donald M. O'Brien
- Wilbur H. Lind
- Robert M. Brody
- Theodore Primas
- Catherine Aratow-Harding
- Charles Schilling
- Stephen Szczepaniak
- Bruce Scott, representing Alfred Pouzenc
- Francis X. Donovan, representing John Dries

New Jersey State Library

ALSO:

Geraldine K. Van Horn, Research Assistant
Office of Legislative Services
Secretary to the Commission to Study Governmental Laws and
Regulations Relating to Fire Safety Standards

* * * * *
974.90
S128
1981
v. 2

Handwritten text, possibly a signature or name, located in the lower-left quadrant of the page.

I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
Francis X. Donovan New Jersey State Fire Prevention Association	1
William Dukes Deputy Fire Marshal Camden County, New Jersey	7
Robert Singer Chief Pennsauken Fire Department	11
Edward Garrity Investigator County Prosecutor's Office	12
William Schultz Fire Protection Subcode Official of Hyland Park, and President of Middlesex County Fire Prevention Association	13
Vincent Grande Chief Fire Inspector East Brunswick, New Jersey	16
William Paul Scheuffele Fire Marshal, District 3 Cherry Hill, New Jersey	18

* * * * *

SENATOR JOHN P. CAUFIELD (Chairman): Ladies and gentlemen, may I first of all welcome you to the public hearing. We are delighted to see you here, and we hope we will have a good day. Before calling on the first witness, I would like to have the people on the Commission introduce themselves. First of all, I am Senator John Caufield from Essex County. On my far left is Dr. Villane. Will you please start the introductions, Dr. Villane?

ASSEMBLYMAN VILLANE: I am Assemblyman Anthony Villane from Monmouth County, the 10th Legislative District.

MR. SZCZEPANIAK: I am Stephen Szczepaniak, Business Manager of Local 696, Sprinkler Fitters.

MR. SCOTT: I am Bruce Scott, First Vice President of the New Jersey State Fire Chief's Association.

MR. PRIMAS: I am Theodore Primas, retired Fire Chief from the City of Camden.

ASSEMBLYMAN COWAN: I am Assemblyman Thomas Cowan, Assemblyman from the 32nd Legislative District, Hudson County.

MS. VAN HORN: I am Gerry Van Horn, staff member to the Commission.

MR. LIND: I am William Lind, Past President of BOCA.

MR. SCHILLING: I am Charles Schilling, representing the State Paid Chief's Association.

MR. BRODY: I am Robert Brody, Executive Vice President of Murray Construction Company, and I represent the National Association of Industrial and Office Park Developers.

MS. HARDING: I am Catherine Aratow Harding, I am the Secretary for the New Jersey Building Officials Association.

MR. O'BRIEN: I am Donald O'Brien, Executive Vice President of the New Jersey Hotel-Motel Association.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: And, for those of you who don't remember, Don O'Brien was the Editor of the Fire Fighter Engineering. And, for how many years were you with the International Association of Fire Chiefs?

MR. O'BRIEN: Ten.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: For ten years you were the main man there.

Okay. Our first witness is Bernard Carney, Chief of the Ashland Fire Company. Chief Carney is not present.

Francis X. Donovan, New Jersey State Fire Prevention Association.

F R A N C I S X. D O N O V A N: Good morning. I want to say it is a pleasure for me to be here this morning and to have this opportunity - I want to thank the Commission for giving me this opportunity - to present some of the views of the New Jersey Fire Prevention Association. I have been a member of the Association for ten years. I am the immediate past President.

The officers and members of the New Jersey State Fire Prevention Association have been striving for years to unify and strengthen fire safety for all occupancies and all the people of New Jersey. At times it has been very frustrating, and this is due in part to the numerous fire service organizations throughout the State, each with their own varied interests. The fire service, however, does not take the blame for the unorganized and splintered fire safety laws and regulations that we do have in New Jersey today.

It is our hope that the report of this distinguished Commission will focus enough attention on what is wrong in fire safety regulations and that in the end we will see a turnaround resulting in centralization of fire safety

regulations within an agency or division of State government that is staffed by persons who have made a profession of fire protection and prevention.

Time restrictions, of course, prevent a detailed analysis of all our problems, but a few examples can be highlighted and I will try to take a more positive rather than a negative view.

First of all, a state central fire focus or authority is a crying need. If ever there was a state that needed such an agency, New Jersey is that state. We do not have an agency in the State that comes near to dealing with the fire problems we have. We have many great fire departments within the State, but they must be primarily concerned with fire suppression activity and, aside from some regional mutual aid agreements, the fire service is not a unified service. A State Fire Authority could bring it all together and provide the motivation that is needed to unify the fire service and its attendant associations.

To whom do our legislators turn when they require accurate advice on fire protection or prevention which they may need when drafting legislation or when they are voting on it? Who evaluates fire safety regulations proposed by the numerous departments, divisions, and bureaus of the State government? Where can counties or municipalities seek advice on fire protection matters? Where can fire departments, or for that matter, fire districts or fire companies get an accurate data base on which to base their decisions? We feel there must be a central fire authority in the State.

The New Jersey State Fire Prevention Association, as oriented as we are to fire protection and prevention in New Jersey, cannot give you an estimate of the fire losses in New Jersey, nor what particular occupancy is having a fire problem. We cannot tell you what is burning, where it is burning, and with what frequency these burnings are taking place, nor the cause. These figures and statistics are available in other states because they have a state agency to gather the information and disseminate it. New Jersey, of course, does not.

We do not have an agency to evaluate new products in the marketplace, which may pose serious fire hazards. There is no agency to license or oversee service companies that sell and service fire protection equipment. There are many good companies, but there are also many poor companies who do need a lot of regulation. Regulation and licensing is also needed to control, to some extent, private investigators, but most of all public adjusters who keep their scanners tuned to the fire service radio frequencies. They respond to fires to sign fire victims to contracts while they are still in shock. There are many reputable companies, but, again, there are also many who would take advantage of fire victims.

There are firefighters who take many training courses and many higher educational courses. There is no agency in this State to evaluate these programs, and no one to give them certification that they have achieved a particular level of efficiency. We have need of an authority to certify the courses offered, to certify the instructors, to certify the testing methods, and, finally, certify the firefighter, fire officer, the fire inspector, the fire investigator, and the fire education specialist- that they have attained level 1, level 2, or level 3 of that specialty in accordance with established national standards. You referred to the NFEA standards. A State Central Fire Authority is sorely needed, and along with it a knowledgeable advisory committee to guide

it.

We need some changes in the State Uniform Construction Code, and I want to start this topic on a more positive note. The Act has been a step forward when we look at the State as a whole. We now have a Construction Code in all 567 municipalities and we have a code that is not written on a match-book cover. The fire service, which has seen the results of poorly enacted, or poorly administered codes, now has a place in reviewing plans, making inspections of the construction sites, and signing off on a Certificate of Occupancy before it is issued. I think there are few, if any, states that allow this, or that have carried the concept to the limits that New Jersey has. But, still all is not rosy and bright.

In the interest of reciprocity with other states, New Jersey has adopted the mini-maxi code concept, which is the adoption of minimum standards that become the maximum regulations that can be enforced. We accept the regulations of a model code writing body, such as NFPA and BOCA, and then say this is our code, regardless of whether those regulations are the best for our State, and we say then that a municipality can't change those regulations. In a sense this may be a proper posture if we are to have uniformity throughout the country and that uniformity is the only criterion to be considered. But, you should be aware that when these model codes are promulgated, they carry the notation that they are minimum standards and the adopting jurisdiction may make such changes in the adapting document as is needed to best suit the needs of the jurisdiction.

What we have done, in effect, is to delegate our code writing to independent bodies who are geared to writing a minimum code, as is proper for those bodies, rather than have an optimum code for the State of New Jersey.

New Jersey needs to revise or institute a new code change procedure. Now, I offer for consideration two considerations:

1. Institute a code change caucus or congress that will receive proposed amendments to the model codes, much the same as the code writing bodies do now. The difference would be that the persons who would be voting on the changes would be New Jersey residents and enforcement officials who are concerned about what is right for New Jersey, not for only for other states or municipalities where amendments to codes are permitted. We feel that the caucus could convene annually or bi-annually, or as often as is necessary to accomplish its purpose.

The procedure that has been adopted by DCA to try to effect change at the model code level alone has not been and will not be the way to properly balance the fire protection that we want to attain for New Jersey.

The other recommendation I would make to go along with the code change caucus would be to allow certain municipalities to make amendments within their jurisdictions if they have adopted a Master Plan for Fire Protection, which is not an easy task for any municipality to accomplish.

The present system does not permit jurisdictions to even consider the idea, since a major part of the plan deals with building laws, among other items.

Essentially, a Master Plan for Fire Protection permits a city to undertake an evaluation of the fire hazards within its boundaries and assess the abilities of its fire protection facilities to deal adequately with those hazards. Then, based on these evaluations and assessments, the planners might recommend greater fire protection be built into those occupancies which,

because of their construction, degree of fire hazard potential, or lack of water supply in the area, and other factors create an undue burden on the fire forces and on taxpayers who must support a larger fire department.

This Master Planning concept gains more favor as cities are forced to reduce the level of fire protection they can provide, as budget caps reduce the tax revenues in relation to expenses which, of course, continue to rise above the five percent cap.

Without the ability to change built in fire protection facilities by code amendments, the city is forced to reduce services and sooner or later the result will be greatly increased monetary fire losses, with attendant increases in fatalities and injuries to firefighters and citizens. I might add that a great many of volunteer fire departments are beginning to experience a decrease in the number of men they can turn out for a fire, and they may very well have to be relying on master planning for fire protection of their communities.

The exemption of certain occupancies from the requirements of the Uniform Construction Code should be looked into and ended. The Departments of Education and Health are permitted to write their own regulations which include fire protection. There would be little or no objection from the enforcement community if these departments adopted construction regulations more restrictive than the Uniform Construction Code, such as the Department of Education has done with the alarm systems in the schools; however, we feel they should not be permitted to reduce the already minimum requirements.

The Uniform Construction Code subcodes should be amended to include occupancies which are either not covered or which are not covered adequately, where they do not fit comfortably into the Model Code classification of occupancies, such as the boarding and rooming houses, which deliver services in addition to providing shelter.

Fire safety regulations should be deleted from special legislation such as the Boarding and Rooming House Act, and placed either in the Uniform Construction Code or, for existing properties, in the proposed State Fire Prevention Code, after a critical review by the proposed State Fire Authority.

A State Fire Prevention Code should be implemented. The Code should be a minimum code that would allow local jurisdictions to amend the regulations so that the code is tailored to the needs of the municipalities and this should be done without creating construction standards that would be in conflict with an amended Uniform Construction Code.

There are many municipalities that are in need of such a code, but the powers that be are reluctant to give the authority to their volunteer fire service especially. They are willing to accept the free firefighting manpower and in many instances the free equipment to fight the fires, but they are unwilling to give them the authority to abate the fire hazards that would take some of the risk out of their firefighting efforts.

We seem to have the urge to paint every town with the same brush and claim that the State is the only one who can do things right, and we wind up involving everyone in a lot of bureaucracy.

Not every municipality is in need of State regulations, such as we are talking about here with the Fire Prevention Code. They have very adequately demonstrated their ability to enact, administer, and enforce their own fire safety regulations and codes. Some municipalities do pay only lip service

to fire prevention and protection activities and are in need of some prodding from the State to either upgrade their fire prevention activities or possibly face takeover by the State.

Municipalities, fire departments, fire districts, or fire companies that have demonstrated their ability to enact, administer, and enforce a fire prevention code should not be compelled to take part in a state program. Those which have a code but who have been lax in aggressively pursuing violators, for whatever reason, should be given an opportunity to review the State law and if they opt to increase their efforts, they should be given reasonable time to upgrade their enforcement. If they fail to do so, then a state mandated enforcement might be in order.

We feel that a State Fire Prevention Code should be administered by the proposed State Central Fire Authority and advisory board. We are aware that BOCA has proposed a Fire Safety Act, and a draft has been given some limited circulation. Now, without the opportunity to study that document, we can't make any comments, except to say that we are reasonably certain the exemptions noted above are not included. The DCA on this matter had promised to consult with the State Fire Prevention Association and the Fire Protection Subcode Committee of the Uniform Construction Code while still working on the draft and before releasing it. This was not done for one reason or another, and we have no idea who the fire authorities were who helped to write the document.

Just one last item, very briefly: This Commission must look at the unreasonable charges levied on those who properly protect their property from fire. If there is any one deterrent to the installation of fire protection systems, other than inadequate laws, it is the standby service charges imposed by some of the water companies in the State. Now, I know you have had testimony on this at Seton Hall and I won't carry it any further except to say that the State Fire Prevention Association is totally in favor of the elimination of these charges, or of reducing them to a minimum.

Gentlemen, I want to thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak before you today. It is the hope of the New Jersey State Fire Prevention Association that our views will be given careful consideration when you meet to finalize your report. Thank you.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: Thank you, Chief Donovan. Are there any questions?

MR. SCOTT: Mr. Donovan, does the State Prevention Association have any structure in mind for the centralized agency you mentioned -- the proposed Centralized State Agency?

MR. DONOVAN: Yes, we have some very definite ideas. It is pretty detailed and to go into them at this time--

MR. SCOTT: That proposed structure might be interesting to the Commission if you would care to submit it sometime in the future.

MR. DONOVAN: Maybe we will do that at one of the other hearings, in in Asbury Park or wherever one is held.

MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

MR. O'BRIEN: Chief, are there any communities in the State of New Jersey that have already prepared fire master plans?

MR. DONOVAN: I know Orange has started one. The City of Bayonne had started to look into it, and then the Uniform Construction Code came along and there was no sense in doing it. Maybe what we had to do was to put the burden of the price of fire protection on the people who were creating

the hazard, and the only way to do that was through building code laws, and we can't amend the State department structure.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: Are there any further questions?

MR. PRIMAS: Chief, don't you think that if a Uniform Code were established under the aegis of a state authority, that that authority would be somewhat at a disadvantage if municipalities were allowed changes -- I think your term was to "suit their own needs"? Wouldn't this be a disadvantage for enforcement?

MR. DONOVAN: To allow municipalities to make amendments?

MR. PRIMAS: Yes.

MR. DONOVAN: I think there are situations where there can be a set of guidelines and rules laid down. Within certain municipalities I think there are problems that other municipalities don't have, and working within a set of guidelines I think there can be exceptions made.

ASSEMBLYMAN COWAN: Chief, in your statement you sort of summarized the fact that there was a decreasing number of volunteer firefighters participating in the fire services, and I was wondering just what do you attribute that to?

MR. DONOVAN: Coming from a paid department, Assemblyman Cowan, I can't really put my finger on what the cause is. We do hear at our meetings all the time that the volunteer fire service is beginning to lose members. We have seen that the departments are starting to hire and becoming part-paid because of the manpower situation. This is primarily in the day time. People are working out of town and they can't turn out the forces. I don't believe that too many have a problem at night when everybody is home.

ASSEMBLYMAN COWAN: Departments have a shortage of manpower mostly because the men are preoccupied with their occupations?

MR. DONOVAN: Correct.

MR. LIND: One question, Chief. If this Commission recommends a prevention code of some type is it the Fire Prevention Association's preference to be able to allow municipalities to change these on the municipal level, or would you consider - along with your thought of a caucus - an authority to review these changes?

MR. DONOVAN: As needed on the municipal level, within established guidelines.

MR. LIND: Not to go before an authority or state caucus, such as you recommended for the building codes?

MR. DONOVAN: There is no reason why that couldn't be done at the same time as you would be--

MR. LIND: In other words, there may still be some master group to sort of keep us from going off too far?

MR. DONOVAN: Yes, I think it could be the same as is done with the BOCA organization, where a time is set aside for the mechanical code, the plumbing code, the fire prevention code, and the building code.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: Chief, just one comment. You know, Thursday there is a meeting of the Subcommittee, headed by Chief Dries, on the Fire Prevention Code, and anything that is submitted of course is going to be considered by that Committee. That Committee will make the final recommendations to the full Commission. I am sure Chief Dries will be in touch with you. That meeting will be held on Thursday in Hackensack.

The Chief not only represents the New Jersey Fire Prevention Association today, but he is also the alternate for Chief Dries. Chief, would you like

to come up here and take a seat with us for the rest of the hearing?

We also have somebody with us who arrived a short time ago. On the far left is another one of our Senators, Barry Parker.

David Aron, Chief Fire Marshal, Camden County. (not present) Is somebody going to take his place? Fine, would you state your name, please?
W I L L I A M D U K E S: I am William Dukes. I am the Deputy Camden County Fire Marshal here in Camden. On behalf of the Chief, I wish to extend his apologies for registering and not being able to attend. He has been registered in a class, operated by the Attorney General's Office, which requires him to attend for three weeks, and he cannot miss for any extended period of time or else he would not be able to graduate from the class. The Chief has asked me to stand in and speak in his place.

What we intend to do is to show you how Camden County attempts to handle some of its fire problems through a centralized agency, the office being a full-time office. We accept all the problems and try and assist the 37 municipalities here in our County, which has 82 stations. In some cases, some are full time Marshals, and in most cases the biggest percentage are volunteer Fire Marshals or Fire Chiefs in the County. We are used mostly as a reference agency and we supply large amounts of equipment and expertise that the volunteers don't have in our County, and, as I heard earlier today, a central agency to channel many of these problems, particularly in reference to arson cases that we have handled. They channel information through our office, from one municipality to another municipality, which has turned up many, many arrests and eventual convictions. Without channeling this information, there would never have been an exchange between the municipal government agencies.

Our slide presentation shows you some of the things that our office provides that these municipalities obviously could not have before because of budgetary reasons. I hope that with the poor lighting everybody will be able to see the slides as I explain them. I will go through this as quickly as possible.

The first slide is very, very light, and it shows a picture of our office. It is in the next building, and I would like to invite everyone on the Committee, when we have completed here this afternoon, if you wish, to go over and see the facility and see what we have to offer. The office started approximately nine years ago as a part time office, with Chief Aron working out of his residence. Since then, the office has snowballed and now employs three full time employees, and covers twenty-two hundred square feet of space in the County Administration Building.

We have three vehicles available for response. We also have an unmarked vehicle, which is not shown for obvious reasons. Each vehicle contains a large amount of equipment which, again, each volunteer service, or each service in the County of municipality, whether it be the city of the companies out in the county, cannot afford. We carry sifters, which are often very expensive, and quite a bit of evidence retaining equipment for liquid samples and solid samples. And, at this time we are starting to get involved a little more with emergency response for hazardous materials. We are starting to carry some of that equipment.

After we have completed an investigation, our job as the task force effort here in Camden County for the fire service is to do the determination at the point of origin for cause. In other words, where the fire started

and how it started. We collect the necessary evidence. We photograph it. We diagram, and we retain all of this at our office in case it later turns into a subrogation hearing for repayment to an insurance company or a criminal case, which we handle the most.

Incidentally, the report that we furnish gets furnished not only to the other investigating agencies that we might have worked with but it also gets furnished to the local Chief and to the local Fire Marshal -- also to the local prosecutor's office.

Again, because of monetary reasons, each municipality doesn't have the facilities or the money to be going out and actually photographing or retaining these photographs from each and every fire they handle. This is what our office does. It retains all of this and gives a central location for the exchange of all of this information, and it brings all of these photographs into one area. And, again, most of the fire companies out there in our County, the 82 of them, don't even have the photographing equipment which we provide for them.

We have handled the evidence in the county now for the last five years, and it has been acceptable by the prosecutor's office. In this particular case, we retained 71 pieces of evidence, which was retained at our headquarters. We have an evidence vault which no one else in the county has, specifically for arson evidence, and one case eventually was brought to court and the individual was found guilty, convicted, and sentencing is to be some time this month. The interesting thing I can point out here is, some agencies, even the fire agencies, are a little skeptical of a centralized agency, such as the County Fire Marshal's office, eventually coming down and telling them what to do. In this particular situation, and in all the investigations that we work on now, we work along with the local agencies. In no way, shape, or form do we try to cut them out, move them out of the way, or overstep our bounds. We believe in a local authority, and the local authority in this case was the local Fire Marshal, and the fellow you see in the picture is the local detective. We used both of these gentlemen in this case on the day that it happened. Just the collection of evidence lasted 14 hours, and of course many, many hours after that processing evidence, etc. But, they were both involved, and they continue to be involved all the way through with the case.

Our evidence vault is situated in the County Administration building and, again, houses all the evidence. This keeps the continuity. We ran into problems prior to our retaining the evidence. In some areas it would be placed in the police vaults throughout the county and when it came time for the court case it was unavailable, either because it was lost or misplaced, or it was found somewhere in the evidence locker but was it was too late to use it.

Our office not only handles the fire investigation, but we get very heavily into assisting at or attempting to coordinate fire prevention programs through all the municipalities. We try and coordinate them so that they are exactly the same. This is one of the displays that we had.

We also because of monetary reasons pick up the majority of the fire prevention material handouts that the volunteers hand out during the fire prevention programs, either during fire prevention week or throughout the year. We attempt, through our budget, to try to furnish these other companies and the fire marshals with as much material as we possibly can.

Interestingly enough, a lot of times the municipalities are finding it more and more, because of the court cases they are going to, difficult to find the time to actually follow up on their municipal problems. What they will do is, they will contact our office and ask us to come down and handle the problem for them and we will follow it all the way through, either until the problem is corrected or until the court has corrected the problem -- which in some cases we have done. And, this has proven very, very efficient.

We are proud that through the efforts of all the volunteers in the county - the 82 Chiefs and Chief Aron - they have developed - and it is in service and it has been in service for about two years now - a 100% reporting system. Each and every company, when they hit the street to go out on a run, upon returning has a classification for each run. You can just about see it on the slide, unfortunately. When they return to the station, the Captain or the Chief in charge of the job will call the county radio and through the computer will enter a specific code number for each type of fire they had. Also, eventually, when the computer is upgraded and its capabilities are expanded, it will have the capability of showing the fire loss, or how extensive the fire was, and possibly even the cause of the fire. This is all done by coding. Before we had this coding in effect, here in the county -- where a Chief could come back and actually report to us what type of fire he had -- we were only retaining about 56% of the reporting on a voluntary basis, where we sent a form out each to the Chief, asking him to fill it out and send it back to us indicating what types of fires he had and what his problems were. Obviously, that wasn't very efficient, so now we have this reporting system that has proved very effective. Computer sheets come out every month and they show us where some of the problems may be, whether they are in the city or whether we have a specific problem out in the county. The MO and the method of the operation of some of the fires also has started to come up. If we have a problem area, we might even come up with a suspect from this.

Both for the Prevention Code and any of the other codes, our office has run numerous classes in an attempt to get as much information out to the volunteers in order to get them as well schooled as we possibly can. Again, if they run into a problem, they feel very comfortable, I am sure, in turning to our office and asking us for any type of assistance.

We have been after many of the industries in the county and have graduated many, many industrial fire brigades in the county. And, of course, most of the industrial fire brigades that we have gone out and worked with, we have spend many, many hours with in order to graduate them. And, they are in the areas that either don't have full time Fire Marshals, or the Fire Marshal in that municipality, because he is volunteer, doesn't have the time to put the time and effort into these men to get them trained to supress a fire even before the fire department is notified -- or at least make an attempt to supress the fire.

We also run many, many, many schools for the firefighters in the County, again, in an attempt to get some type of training facility, which is the way now in Camden County.

We do also hold-- Again, because of financial reasons, the County Chiefs Association has a film library and we have supplemented this film library with many training films and many fire prevention films which

are available to all of the county agencies for use at any of their meetings, or at whatever it may take to get the point across.

I have also brought with me today, and I believe they will be on the schedule, Senator, two other speakers. One of them is Chief Robert Singer from the Pennsauken Fire Department. He was picked at random. We asked the Chief if he could come in and explain further to the Commission how our office is functioning, and how well the Task Force effort is working in Camden County -- the efforts that are being accomplished.

Also, once Chief Singer has completed his testimony, I would like to ask you to call on Investigator Edward Garrity from the Camden County Prosecutor's Office, with whom we work hand-in-hand in an attempt to suppress the arson problem we have here in Camden County.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: Okay. Are there any questions?

MR. PRIMAS: Chief, as you know, the Commission is interested in, along with the type of program that you have - and you have a fine program; I am familiar with it - the day-to-day fire prevention activities that a uniform code would provide. Do you in your County foresee any problems with enforcement? For example, you indicated that many of the departments are volunteer. Do you foresee any problems with enforcing a uniform code in a day-to-day operation of certain type of occupancies?

MR. DUKES: Yes, sir, I do. I believe in what Chief Donovan said earlier. We don't have the personnel. The volunteers are starting to drop off. They don't have the time to put into it, such as the central agency that we provide here. We feel very strongly that these agencies are required to channel this information, such as the Fire Marshal to a county Fire Marshal, from the county to the local level, and the input going back from the local to the county to the State. This is the only way that we feel the State of New Jersey is going to correct many of the problems we have. They have to have input from every area, no matter how small or how large it is. So, all of this information goes into one area, such as the State Fire Marshal's Office, in an effort to either correct a situation or to ask the Legislature to take steps that will correct it.

But, at this time I do feel - and I have to agree 100% with Chief Donovan - we don't have the men out there who are available to do this, and if they do have the time they don't have the education available to them. They probably wouldn't have the time to put into it. Ten years ago, the volunteer had the extra time. He didn't have to work an extra job. He had the time to put in. But now, it has become so complex and he just doesn't have the time. Most of them are working two jobs to keep ahead of everything.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: Are there any other questions?

MR. LIND: Could you explain to me in a little more detail exactly the nature of the makeup of the area? I would like to know roughly how many people are residents of Camden County. What is the population there?

MR. DUKES: I believe the population of Camden County is about 500,000.

MR. LIND: And about how many square miles does that county have?

MR. DUKES: Two hundred and twenty-two square miles.

MR. LIND: How many people within your office are paid?

MR. DUKES: We had five at one time. There were three fellows that were full time and two fellows that were part time. Because of budgetary reasons, in April we lost the two part time fellows.

MR. LIND: Are these all investigators?

MR. DUKES: Yes, sir, we are all actively involved in investigation and prevention.

MR. LIND: Do you have any clerical assistants?

MR. DUKES: Yes.

MR. LIND: How many.

MR. DUKES: One.

MR. LIND: How many vehicles do you have?

MR. DUKES: Four.

MR. LIND: Thank you. One other thing: What is your approximate budget?

MR. DUKES: Over and above the salaries, or including the salaries?

MR. LIND: Including the salaries.

MR. DUKES: The budget excluding the salaries is approximately \$35,000 a year to run the office. The average salary of the deputies -- the base pay is \$12,900, and the Chief is at a pay of, I believe, \$18,000. We do receive overtime, time and one-half for anything over forty.

MR. SCOTT: How long has it taken you to achieve this present level of efficiency in the department in this operation? Is this something that has been going on for two years or ten years?

MR. DUKES: Approximately eight years, sir. Eight years ago we weren't at the level we are now, and I will be honest with you, it took eight years to sell ourselves, or to sell the office, to prove to the individuals that it can work and it has worked. This is why I asked Chief Singer to attempt to also speak with you and maybe answer some of your questions to show that it does work in our county, and it is very, very efficient. I am sure that out of the 82 Chiefs that 99% of them would be very satisfied with our office.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: Are there any further questions? (no response)
If not, thank you very much, Bill.

The next speaker will be Robert Singer, Chief of the Pennsauken Fire Department.

ROBERT SINGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As Chief Dukes has stated, we have a very serious problem, and Chief Donovan has also alluded to this. One of the serious problems we have is the problem of volunteers. I am from the Pennsauken Fire Department. We have approximately 1500 or 2000 fire emergencies a year. As a small community, this is extremely high as far as numbers go. It is certainly not high compared to the numbers that some of the major cities have. But, in a very small community I find a situation where we running into a great deal of difficulty. I think 80% to 90% of the country is protected by volunteers. We would like to be egotistical and say, "Yes, we are doing a good job," but also being realistic, I think that we have to say that we are losing ground very, very rapidly.

One of the questions the Commission asked about is why in fact do we lose the numbers of people we are losing. I think it is happening in two separate areas. The first is that the numbers of calls or incidents are increasing. The second thing is that because of today's economy many of our men are working two jobs. They can't make it with a single salary, so they are spending more and more time just trying to provide for their own families.

I like to, in my own place, say that just like Scott Tissue there are many more sheets on the roll; I have more sheets than probably Scott Paper

has on a roll, but at this point they are not doing any good. I find I have to rely more and more on the services of the Fire Marshal.

We had one incident where we spent approximately 13 hours on the firefighting effort. As a result of this, we had to go through the Fire Marshal's office and we now find that we are not only faced with arson but we are involved in the prosecution of murder and drugs.

I have had, personally, nine years as a Chief and of those years I have been associated with the County Fire Marshal's office for at least six or seven years. I have used their facilities and I can say that they have really helped us tremendously. It is not that we in the volunteer service don't have the ability and it is not even that we don't have the training. The problem is the time. We do not have the time, and I think if there are any fears on the local level-- And, certainly myself as a district chief, I have no fear of bringing in an outside Authority, be it a county Fire Marshal's Office or the State. Again, Chief Dukes did mention that he is able to keep us up with what is happening.

One other thing, if I may, with reference to the Fire Marshal's office, and that is the problem of arson, countrywide. At the Federal level where there are budget cuts taking place, there is talk about cutting back on the fire alarms. Arson is increasing tremendously and the men are missing a lot of time from work and this again might be one reason why some of these volunteers are moving out of the fire service. They wind up getting injured and depriving their families of a livelihood. But, arson is increasing and I see massive cuts on the federal level. We have had more arrests and convictions since the Fire Marshal's Office has beefed up its efforts and I think there should be more of a state effort to assist the County Fire Marshal's Office.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: Are there any questions for the Chief? (no response)
All right, Chief. Thank you very much.

Edward Garrity, Investigator for the Camden County Prosecutor's Office.
E D W A R D G A R R I T Y: Good morning, gentlemen. My purposes in being here today is, I am the arson investigator for the Camden County Prosecutor's Office, and there are two other investigator's in that office. Our motto is: You ignite and we will indict. This is not done by an "I", it is done by a "We." When I say we, I mean all the local fire services in our community - our 37 municipalities and the Camden County Prosecutor's Office. There is a liaison between these fire departments.

We have two separate investigations when we have a fire. First of all, we have a investigation to determine if it is arson, and the second investigation is to connect the perpetrator of the crime. In Camden County we have tried to establish this concept: That the fire investigation is begun by the local municipality, the fire officials, who then call in the County Fire Marshal. We respond with the County Fire Marshal in an effort to lay the groundwork for a criminal investigation. We try, at the fire scene, to build a solid foundation for a criminal investigation. When the scene switches from a fire investigation to an arson investigation, it now becomes a crime scene. The local fire departments have been trained, through the County Fire Marshal's office, to protect and preserve the evidence at the scene of a crime.

The County Fire marshal's office collects the evidence. They locate it; they record it; they collect it; and they take it to the laboratory where they sort it.

The County Prosecutor's Office collects all other traces of evidence at the scene of the fire, they plastercast footprints, they take fingerprints using a hot flame soot method, and the control of the evidence and its continuity is kept in perspective in this manner.

The Prosecutor's Office now has the evidence stored and the continuity has been maintained and they can make that available for a case or for discovery. As I said, when we arrive there we first try to get the consent of the owner, and, second, if we meet with resistance we resort to the administrative warrant, and then, finally, to the judicial search warrant. We also have a prosecutor who responds to the fire scene and he is sensitive to and can feel the pulse of the local fire officials on the scene.

I don't know what more I can add, except that the County Fire Marshal's Office, in cooperation with the local fire officials and the Fire Marshal's Office-- The County Fire Marshals act as a last line with the local fire departments, and we act as the last line with the police departments and we work together as a team. It is a team effort. Thank you.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: Okay. Are there any questions? (no questions)
Thank you very much.

Our next speaker will be William Schultz, Fire Protection Subcode Official of Highland Park and the President of the Middlesex County Fire Prevention Association.

W I L L I A M S C H U L T Z: Good morning. I think you remember me. I spoke to you at the last meeting we had in North Jersey. The only thing I would like to say this morning, and I am speaking on behalf of my county fire association, is that I don't know how many of you are familiar with the old Garry Moore show, "I've Got a Secret," but we found the best kept secret in the fire service just about a week ago. I don't know how many Commission members are aware of this but the Department of Community Affairs is already writing a Fire Safety Act and I just want to make you aware of this. If you don't know about it, we have copies and we will distribute them to you.

This act reintroduces the same problems that the Uniform Construction Code introduced to the fire service. That's all it does. We have read through it very briefly. I believe that is what you have there, Senator. We haven't studied it very well. We will, and then come back to one of the later Commission meetings with our findings on it. But, if this is any indication of what a fire safety act is going to be, I think we are in trouble. I think the citizens of this state are going to be in deep trouble, because all this does is recreate the problem. As far as fire safety is concerned, this really isn't going to do it. Thank you.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: Bill, just a moment. First of all, let me assure you that nobody is writing the code, or trying to write a code for the Commission. DCA or anyone else certainly has a right to draw up their suggestions and submit them, and that is the status right now. There is a meeting of that committee in Hackensack - the Subcommittee - and they certainly will be considering anything that they receive, plus their own input of course.

MR. SCHULTZ: We are not questioning that, Senator. We realize they have a right to draw up one. But, the thing is, everytime we talk to representatives from DCA this isn't in the process. There is nothing like this going on. I am talking about prominent state fire officials in this State. They know nothing

about this. I can bring people here who can give you testimony that I saw this act in the past three or four days, and I don't know how long it has been out -- this proposed legislation. And, they didn't even know anything about it. These are people that should know about it in the State of New Jersey.

We have State Fire Prevention Association representatives on the State Uniform Construction Code 13 member advisory board. They don't even know anything about this. Who are the fire people that are advising on this? We asked this the last time and we would like to have it investigated. Let's find out who these fire experts are that are writing these things, because they are the problem; they are not the solution.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: Well, again I will repeat that the experts who will be dealing with this are with the subcommittee under Chief Dries, and then from that point on it will come before the whole Commission. And, certainly, we want all the input we can get from the fire service.

Are there any other questions? Doctor?

ASSEMBLYMAN VILLANE: I think what Mr. Schultz has in mind is something that was brought to my attention by our fire company in Monmouth County, and that is this act that is proposed by the Commissioner of Community Affairs. I think that each one of the Commission members ought to have this, and I think we need the input from you people concerning this act.

MR. SCHULTZ: Well, we are going to review what this says and we will be back here.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: All right. Jerry VanHorn, who is doing our staff work, does have a copy and she is making copies for the members of the Commission. If anybody else wants a copy of this, I am sure she will make it available.

Incidentally, anyone who is here today, or anyone else who may want to, if you want to get on our mailing list, all you have to do is, after this hearing, come up and see Jerry and give her your name and address. Then, anything that we send out -- you know, meeting notices and so forth -- will be sent to anybody on that mailing list.

Chief Primas, do you have something to add?

MR. PRIMAS: No. This is all new to me. You may not know that I sit on the Advisory Board of the State Uniform Construction Code. You said they are the problem. I wonder if you could explain what you mean by "they are the problem" in light of whatever you know?

MR. SCHULTZ: Well, sir, I think if you read the transcripts of the last hearing, we went into that rather deeply.

MR. PRIMAS: Well, I would like you to restate it in general terms now as to what the problem is, for the benefit of those who were not at the first meeting.

MR. SCHULTZ: Basically, what they have done with the Uniform Construction Code is good in concept, and I stated that at the last hearing. The problem is that they have annihilated the fire service. They have taken fire prevention officials out of fire prevention bureaus and put in department heads. The same thing with this act; this is what I feel is going to happen here. We are going to wind up with five different fire departments in one community.

MR. PRIMAS: I assume you are talking about under the Uniform Construction Code.

MR. SCHULTZ: Under the Uniform Construction Act you have a whole set of fire conditions. You have one dealing with new construction. You have one dealing with fire prevention. And, you have one dealing with suppression. You have three fire departments in one community, and you can have three department heads.

MR. PRIMAS: Are you speaking from the standpoint of a large municipality or a small municipality?

MR. SCHULTZ: I am speaking from probably one of the smallest municipalities in the State of New Jersey. We are only about 17,000 people in one square mile.

MR. PRIMAS: Well, is there an objection against a subcode official in a town and a firefighter?

MR. SCHULTZ: The objection is the breaking up of the fire service, and that is exactly what's happening in the Department of Community Affairs. You have in each community a fire subcode official who does not have to have any relationship with the Fire Chief nor the fire prevention inspectors. You have fire prevention inspectors and now according to this act they may not have a relationship with the Fire Chief nor the fire subcode official, and the Fire Chief is the person who is responsible for suppression in the community. So, you wind up having three department heads in every community. How many Police Chiefs do you have in a town?

MR. PRIMAS: In this town?

MR. SCHULTZ: In any town. You have one Police Chief and he is responsible. Here we have three people now who are to be responsible. What is it going to be next year, four or five?

MR. PRIMAS: I still want to get to the point. Are you saying that the municipalities are not geared to handle a subcode official? There are not enough people there, and because of the way the law is it is breaking up the town? Is this what you are saying? Or, are you saying that the fault lies with the concept of a Uniform Construction Code? I don't quite understand.

MR. SCHULTZ: We agree with the concept 100%. The mini-maxi code concept we don't agree with. The concept of a Uniform Construction Code, as we stated before, we agree with. The thing that we don't agree with is having all these different department heads. And, this is what I see coming out of this proposed regulation -- another department head; somebody in charge of fire prevention. You are going to have somebody in charge of the fire subcode official. You are going to have the Fire Chief. You are going to wind up with too many department heads. You will wind up with constant confusion in your fire service.

MR. PRIMAS: In your small community - the one you are talking about - could it be that the same official, the subcode official, that is now in your town could also act as the fire prevention officer?

MR. SCHULTZ: That's very possible. In many communities that's the way it is.

MR. PRIMAS: Would you recommend that type of approach?

MR. SCHULTZ: That probably would be the best approach.

MR. PRIMAS: In a small community?

MR. SCHULTZ: Probably in most communities. You were the former Fire Chief here in Camden, right?

MR. PRIMAS: That's correct.

MR. SCHULTZ: Were you the fire subcode official?

MR. PRIMAS: No.

MR. SCHULTZ: Do you know that the fire subcode official -- you know; you worked on the commission that wrote the uniform construction code -- had the final say with regard to construction in your community? You did not. You were the Fire Chief, but he had the final say.

MR. PRIMAS: Let me explain something to you. I was the Fire Chief, but also the fire subcode official worked under me. He worked under me, as I worked under my boss. We do have hierarchies in any--

MR. SCHULTZ: Well, I beg to differ with you. That may be administratively in your community, but that is not the State Statute.

MR. PRIMAS: You also have specialists. Certainly Commissioner LeFante is not a specialist in fire protection, but he is the Commissioner of DCA, which organization does have specialists. I can understand your concern, but I just wanted to see what your rationale was. You have answered my question. Thank you.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: Are there any other questions? (no questions) Bill, I would hope that you give us some of your thoughts on this in writing.

MR. SCHULTZ: Senator, I wasn't prepared to speak today. I only got this a few days ago, so we were caught a little short. I don't know how long ago it was drawn up. I have no idea.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: Will you give us your thoughts on that. Would you submit it to Jerry?

MR. SCHULTZ: Yes. No problem.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: All right. Thank you very much.

MR. SCHULTZ: Thank you.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: Our next speaker is Vincent Grande, Chief Fire Inspector of East Brunswick.

V I N C E N T G R A N D E: Good morning, Senator. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I will just give you a little background on myself. I am the Chief Fire Inspector for the township of East Brunswick, approximately 24.9 square miles, with a population of 38,000. We have three volunteer fire companies and one paid fire inspector, and that is me.

In 1977, the Uniform Construction Code went into effect. When that went into effect my feelings are they took about 100 firemen away from our township because of the simple fact that in a township like East Brunswick we had a sprinkler ordinance that we adopted in 1971. It was very effective. It was very restrictive. Many companies and builders refused to build in the town of East Brunswick, but they still do it, and I didn't see anyone move out. We still have the same people we have had for years. The point I am bringing out is we lost this ordinance and I went to Assemblyman Bornheimer of the 18th District in Middlesex County and we tried to put it through the State Legislature. We did succeed at the Assembly level and we lost out in the Senate, because it was the end of the year at that time and we had to start over.

Now, the town of East Brunswick, when I was appointed Fire Inspector, had five sprinklered buildings in our community. Today, up to 1977, we have 159 buildings, a total of, right now, approximately 300 occupancies that

are sprinklered.

Now, with the Uniform Construction Code, I feel that we are losing fire power. As Chief Donovan stated before, it is a problem to get volunteers. In the town of East Brunswick we have a problem. We have a lot of blue collar workers and we have a lot of white collar workers. We have many lawyers living in the township. We have many doctors, and many big people that work in New York and who do not have the time to spend on a volunteer fire company, which takes a heck of a lot of time. So, gentlemen, I have copies here, for everyone on the Committee of the ordinance and I am also sending to Senator Caufield his questionnaire form. I would like to let you look at it and study it, and gentlemen I feel it will help the State of New Jersey with our fire protection problem.

Another thing I will not elaborate on because it was said at the last hearing is the standby water charge. It is very strict in many areas. In my area it isn't because we have our own water system, so we don't have the problem of high charges.

Mr. Ken Lane of the Automatic Sprinkler Association spoke at the last meeting and I think he presented this problem very well.

The third thing I would like to bring before the Committee is the licensing of sprinkler contractors. We are going into a very serious problem in my town -- I guess the other towns are having the same problem -- with the 1981 building code. It states in there that you can come in with a limited sprinkler system. You are allowed to go up to 20 heads and it can come off your domestic system. Gentlemen, I can give you plumbers in our town doing fire protection work and they want me to engineer the job because they don't know what's in Pamphlet 13 that tells you what to do with sprinkler systems. So, I think the Commission, in my opinion, should look into this very closely -- licensing qualified sprinkler people.

And, gentlemen, in my closing remarks I would like to say one thing: Ashes do not pay taxes. Thank you.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: Thank you very much, Chief. Are there any questions? (no questions) I thank you very much.

MR. GRANDE: You are welcome.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: Oh, would you come back, please, Chief?

MS. ARATOW-HARDING: I have a question for you. In your opinion-- (question inaudible)

MR. GRANDE: Would you repeat the question? May I come closer? I have a tin ear over here.

MR. ARATOW-HARDING: In your opinion who would be the best person to qualify to enforce the fire prevention code in a municipality, especially one that has volunteer fire service?

MR. GRANDE: Well, ma'am that is a very hard question to answer. Our township has myself and the township has spend many, many dollars on training me and making me what I am today. Maybe we have communities that do have all volunteer people. Make it a law that they have to have so many hours, like OCA did. Before I was made subcode official, I had to be licensed and I had the education program. I think this should also be in a Fire Prevention Code if one is established in the State of New Jersey.

MR. ARATOW-HARDING: Do you see that person operating under the State Construction Code our outside of it?

MR. GRANDE: Well, my feelings on that are it is two separate hats -- fire protection and fire prevention are two different hats.

MS. ARATOW-HARDING: Perhaps I should have said the DCA.

MR. GRANDE: Well, I am talking about the DCA ma'am. The DCA governs us as fire subcode officials now, but not the fire prevention people. That is a different area altogether. I think the Commission should make all fire prevention personnel hold a license, like DCA has done with the fire subcode officials and the construction officials. That is only my opinion.

MS. ARATOW-HARDING: You agree with the licensing procedure but not necessarily with the administrative authority?

MR. GRANDE: No. I believe they should be licensed, yes, but not by DCA; that is a division of their own -- unless you feel differently.

MS. ARATOW-HARDING: Thank you.

MR. GRANDE: Thank you.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: Just one more question, Chief.

MR. PRIMAS: Have you experienced, as the other speakers have, a problem in the volunteer community -- the problem of enforcement in the volunteer community? Are you experiencing that? I think that is what I understood you to say.

MR. GRANDE: Yes, sir, I am.

MR. PRIMAS: Now, the positions that obviously are necessary under the UCC subcode official-- You are the paid subcode official in your town?

MR. GRANDE: That is correct. And, I am the fire prevention officer.

MR. PRIMAS: Okay. Would you suggest that the fire prevention officer in any of these towns should be a paid position?

MR. GRANDE: Yes. A lot of volunteer organizations vote for their fire inspector for a year or two years, like they change their chiefs. I feel that a man can't get started on the job and clean up a township and make it as fire safe as he can in one year's time. It has taken me 16 years, sir, to get where I am in the township of East Brunswick, and it is a hell of a lot of work.

MR. PRIMAS: Do you think in your town that you have the raw talent in your fire service to develop people who are, shall we say, fire prevention people that would be subordinate to you? Do you have the raw talent, and if they were paid, do you have takers for those jobs in your particular town?

MR. GRANDE: Yes.

MR. PRIMAS: And, would say there is a money problem rather than a talent problem?

MR. GRANDE: Yes, it is a money problem. In our town they treat us very well, but I feel money is a big problem. Everybody knows that today they way things are.

MR. PRIMAS: Thank you.

MR. GRANDE: You are welcome.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: Okay. Thank you very much.

The next speaker is the Fire Marshal of District 3, Cherry Hill, W. P. Scheufele.

W I L L I A M P A U L S C H E U F E L E: My name is William Paul Scheufele. I am the Fire Marshal for District 3 in Cherry Hill Township. Senator and Commission members, I full agree with something being done in the State of New Jersey. When the Commission was announced, I sent a letter to Senator

aufield congratulating him on the commission's establishment. I think most people in the fire service realize that if we don't do something soon, we are not going to have any areas left to live in and we are not going to have areas left to work in.

My colleagues over here from the Department of Community Affairs know me well. I was part of the subcode committee, when it was working on the fire subcode officials. I disagreed with them in many ways, and probably will continue to disagree with them. My whole philosophy is that we must save life and we must save property.

Up until the adoption of the Uniform Construction Code in 1977, Fire District 3 in Cherry Hill Township had adopted a fire prevention code. We required that all buildings over a certain square footage would be sprinklered, regardless of use or occupancy. We required that all buildings that were not meeting that square footage would have a minimum detection system established for those occupancies. We also required that these occupancies as well as sprinklered buildings be supervised and report to a central communication location to allow the fire department to know if there is a fire in a building and to allow the public to know if there is a fire in a building.

We have progressed along these lines, and had been doing so until recently when we were challenged by the construction official of Cherry Hill Township, who has now told us that we can no longer protect life and property in any building built after the Uniform Construction Code was adopted.

We feel this is the first step the Commission is going to have to make: to change the Uniform Construction Code, to provide adequate protection for the public, for the property owner, and for the firefighters who must go into those buildings.

Assemblyman Cowan asked about the volunteer firemen. Yes, we are having trouble getting men to volunteer their time, number one, because of the increase in runs; number two, because of the fact that we are now, in the suburban areas, being overrun by people coming from the cities who don't even now it is a volunteer company. They believe it is a paid company. My fire company happens to be part paid and part volunteer because of the fact that we do have an industrial area that we must protect during the daytime. We still do depend on volunteers, however. All our paid firemen become volunteers at night, and respond as volunteers to calls.

As far as alarm systems are concerned, we required minimum systems. We did not even require the owner of the property to put in an Underwriter's laboratory system. Yes, we do increase our calls periodically, thanks to Ma Bell and their telephone linemen going up the poles checking for an open wire and setting off the fire alarm system. But, when we do respond, we have lessened the amount of hours that our volunteers have to put in, fighting those fires. And, of course, if they are a false alarm, the equipment can be turned around rapidly. That is the only disadvantage we have found at this point by making business people - making owners of places that the public comes into - put in minimum alarm systems. We have lost buildings twice recently because the gentlemen were stalling putting the systems in. One of them now admits that if he had the system in the building not only would he have saved a large inventory, but he also would not have lost money due to the insurance company leading him to believe it was covered by insurance. But, he did lose it. He also lost

sales people and customers who could not wait for his building to be rebuilt. He now, even though he is not required under the Uniform Construction Code to do so, is going to put in an alarm system which will transmit a signal. Numerous buildings in our district have had minor fires, but thanks to the alarm systems we have been able to get there on time and put the fire out, even though the building was unoccupied, and the next morning they were able to open.

This is what the Commission is going to have to look at to start. Yes, there is no doubt in my mind and in the minds of the other people in the fire service that I have talked to, that we need a Division of Fire in the State of New Jersey. When I deal with people outside the State they cannot understand that a state as old as ours does not have some central place for a fire service to even communicate with. Yes, we do need the State Fire Marshal to be moved out from under the Division of State Police and put into an area where he can function and be the authority and the person who will be responsible to help fire companies not only enforce the codes, but interpret the codes as well. Unfortunately, we are not all like Mr. Primas, who I believe has a law degree which probably assisted him when he was performing his functions.

The authority still must come back down to the local authority. We know what is in our area. We know the problems that exist. We know what is happening with the volunteer fire companies. We know our water supplies. The DCA gentlemen on the state level have done an excellent job helping upgrade those communities that have no codes. But, it short of hurt those communities that had codes that were providing for life and safety.

We need a fire prevention code in the State of New Jersey. We need a code to be adopted that has been tried, true, and tested, not one that is going to be made up by a group of individuals and when we go to court have it ripped to pieces.

We also need the education that can be provided through the State for our people. I happen to be an adjunct professor at Camden County College. We have established a fire prevention and fire suppression course, which includes a BOCA construction code course, a construction code for the fire department course, and a fire prevention and education course. So, the fire service is beginning to come alive. But, sometimes we need a push and some help on the State level to keep it going. Thank you.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: Thank you very much. Are there any questions?
(no questions) You did mention that there should be changes in the Uniform Construction Code, is that correct?

MR. SCHEUFELE: Yes, sir.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: But, you didn't go into what they were. Are you prepared to go into some of those now, or would you submit them in writing to us?

MR. SCHEUFELE: No, I will submit them in writing to you, sir.

SENATOR CAUFIELD: We would appreciate that. Thank you very much.

Are there any other people who would like to be heard? If not, we have exhausted the list of speakers. I would just like to say to all the members of the Commission that we have another meeting two weeks from today at the State House in Trenton, and I would hope that all of the subcommittee, if they

haven't been, will be meeting between now and then, so we can really start sinking our teeth into something.

Four weeks from today is a hearing in Asbury Park -- October 20th. Again, I want to thank all of you for being here -- all of the people who have spent time and given us their thoughts and feelings. I want to also thank Chief Primas for extending to us the hospitality of the City of Camden and for making available the City Council Chamber for today's hearing. It is very much appreciated, Chief.

There being no further statements from the members of the Commission, this hearing will stand adjourned.

(hearing concluded)

