

RETURN
W PAT S.
BOYD PETTY
MIKE C.
REVIEW STAFF
DISTRICT OFFICES



Clement Fire and Safety Co.

P.O. Box 1364 • Metairie, LA 70470-1364
New Orleans: 526-1111 Mandeville: 626-7227

January 30, 1996

Mr. Jerry Jones
Office of the State Fire Marshal
5150 Florida Blvd.
Baton Rouge, LA 70806

Re: Unprotected Cooking Appliances

Dear Mr. Jerry:

IF A COOKING APPLIANCE IS UNDER A HOOD, IT NEEDS TO BE PROTECTED EVEN IF "NOT-IN-USE". THE APPLIANCE IN PLACE HAS A POTENTIAL USE. IN OTHER WORDS, IF IT IS THERE, IT CAN BE USED. IN ORDER TO GRANT SUCH A REQUEST, THIS OFFICE WOULD HAVE TO POLICE THE USE OF THE APPLIANCE. WE DO NOT HAVE SUFFICIENT MANPOWER TO INSURE THAT THE IN PLACE APPLIANCE IS NOT USED. IF IN PLACE IT MUST BE PROTECTED!

I am writing you in hopes of acquiring written clarification in regards to unprotected appliances.

The Health Care Department of your office feels that if an appliance is currently not properly protected or not protected at all and is not being utilized, it may remain under the hood and the fire system need not be red tagged.

They feel they can issue a letter from their office giving the customer in question a letter of variance. If the appliance is returned to service, then at the next inspection we would inform Health Care of the change and they would then rescind the letter of variance.

My only concern is the amount of time that would pass between their starting to use the appliance and the actual protection of the appliance being installed.

It seems to me that this method above leaves a lot of liability for everyone concerned.

I believe the best policy would be, if it is under the hood used or not, it must be protected. Then they could decide whether to use it or remove it.

Your response is urgently needed.

Very truly yours,

Ernest Maiwald
Ernest Maiwald
Systems Manager

RECEIVED

JAN 31 1996

ARCHITECTURAL SECTION

1091

Vertical handwritten notes on the left margin, including "11/20/95" and "11/21/95".