

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
WESTERN DIVISION**

**FURLANDARE SINGLETON, Individually and as
Administrator of the Estate of DEQUAN SINGLETON,
SYNDI SINGLETON, AND HAYLEE SINGLETON,
Decedents; and CLYDE HATCHETT, Individually,
and as Administrator of the Estate of EMILY
BEAVERS, Deceased**

PLAINTIFFS

V. NO. 4:15-cv-00205-KGB

**ARKANSAS HOUSING AUTHORITIES PROPERTY
& CASUALTY SELF-INSURED, Inc.(Specifically,
THE JACKSONVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY, a/k/a
THE MAX HOWELL PLACE HOUSING PROJECTS);
EVANSTON INSURANCE COMPANY, an Illinois
Corporation; PHIL NIX, in His Individual and Official
Capacity as Executive Director of The Jacksonville
Housing Authority; CITY OF JACKSONVILLE;
BRK BRANDS, INC.; JACKSONVILLE FIRE DEPT;
WAYNE TAYLOR; LARRY HAMSHER; CHRIS
McDONALD; TONY SUTHERLAND; DEWAN
LEWIS; JOHN DOES 1 - 50; and JANE DOES 1- 50**

DEFENDANTS

AND

**MARILYN LOUISE BEAVERS, Individually, and as
Administrator of the Estate of MARILYN BEAVERS,
DECEASED**

PLAINTIFFS

V.

**ARKANSAS HOUSING AUTHORITIES PROPERTY
& CASUALTY SELF-INSURED, INC. (Specifically,
THE JACKSONVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY, a/k/a
THE MAX HOWELL PLACE HOUSING PROJECTS);
EVANSTON INSURANCE COMPANY, an Illinois
Corporation; PHIL NIX, in His Individual and Official**

**Capacity as Executive Director of THE JACKSONVILLE
HOUSING AUTHORITY; BRK BRANDS, INC.;
CITY OF JACKSONVILLE; BRK BRANDS, INC.;
JACKSONVILLE FIRE DEPT; WAYNE TAYLOR;
LARRY HAMSHER; CHRIS McDONALD; TONY
SUTHERLAND; DEWAN LEWIS; and
JOHN DOES 1 - 10**

DEFENDANTS

**MOTION TO STRIKE AFFIDAVIT OF DANIEL GOTTUK AND
TO EXCLUDE HIS TESTIMONY IN THIS MATTER**

1. Plaintiff Marilyn Louise Beavers, Individually, and as Administrator of the Estate of Marilyn Beavers, deceased, moves the Court to strike the Affidavit of Daniel Gottuk and to exclude Mr. Gottuk from offering expert testimony in this matter.

2. Plaintiff contends that the method on which Mr. Gottuk bases his opinions, fails to meet the requirements for admissibility of expert testimony under Fed. R. Evid. 702 and under Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 509 U.S. 579 (1993).

3. In particular, the methods used by Mr. Gottuk are not reliable, because they have not undergone sufficient scientific testing and have not received widespread acceptance from the broader scientific community.

4. The methods used by Mr. Gottuk can not link the soot depositions on the smoke detector horn to a specific fire, nor can they determine whether

the alarm sounded in a timely manner as to give the occupants of the apartment sufficient warning.

5. The following exhibits are attached in support of this Motion.

Exhibit A: Affidavit of Daniel Gottuk

Exhibit B: Affidavit of B. Don Russell, Ph.D., P.E.

6. A supporting brief is being filed contemporaneously with this Motion.

7. For the reasons stated herein, and in the accompanying supporting brief, Plaintiff asks the Court to strike Mr. Gottuk’s affidavit, and to exclude Mr. Gottuk from offering opinions or testimony in this case.

**MARILYN LOUISE BEAVERS, Individually,
and as Administrator of the Estate of
MARILYN BEAVERS, Deceased, Plaintiff**

**By: /s/ David Hodges
DAVID A. HODGES
Attorney at Law
212 Center Street, Fifth Floor
Little Rock, AR 72201-2429
Arkansas Bar No. 65021
Telephone: 501-374-2400
Facsimile: 501-374-8926
E-Mail: david@hodeslaw.com**

and

E. DION WILSON
Attorney at Law
423 Rightor Street
Helena, AR 72342
Telephone: 870-338-6487
Facsimile: 870-338-8030

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on May 18, 2016, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system, which shall send notification of such filing to the following:

Mr. William M. Hatchett
Hatchett, DeWalt, Hatchett
485 Orchard Lake Road
Pontiac, MI 48341

Ms. Sheila Campbell
Attorney at Law
P.O. Box 939
North Little Rock, AR 72115

Mr. William Griffin
Friday, Eldredge Clark
400 W. Capitol Avenue, Suite 2000
Little Rock, AR 72201-3493

Mr. John Walker
Mr. Shawn Childs
Walker Law Firm
1723 Broadway
Little Rock, AR 72206

Ms. Teresa Wineland
Kutak Rock, LLP
124 W. Capitol Avenue, Suite 2000
Little Rock, AR 72201-3706

Mr. Baxter D. Drennon
Wright, Lindsey & Jennings
200 West Capitol Avenue, Suite
2300
Little Rock, AR 72201

Mr. John L. Wilkerson
Attorney at Law
301 W. 2nd Street
North Little Rock, AR 72115

Mr. E. Dion Wilson
Wilson & Associates
423 Rightor Street, Suite One
Helena, AR 72342-3219

Mr. James H. Heller
Cozen O'Conner
1900 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Ms. Kathryn A. Pryor
Wright, Lindsey & Jennings
200 W. Capitol Avenue, Suite 2300
Little Rock, AR 72201

/s/ David Hodges

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
WESTERN DIVISION

FURLANDARE SINGLETON, *et al.*

PLAINTIFFS

v.

Case No.: 4:15-CV-205-KGB

ARKANSAS HOUSING AUTHORITIES PROPERTY
& CASUALTY SELF-INSURED FUND, INC., *et al.*

DEFENDANTS

AFFIDAVIT OF DANIEL GOTTUK

I, Daniel Gottuk, of lawful age and having been duly sworn, upon my oath states as follows:

1. My name is Daniel T. Gottuk. I am employed by Jensen Hughes of Baltimore, Maryland.

2. I have been retained by the Defendants, Jacksonville Housing Authority, Evanston Insurance Company and Phil Nix, in this matter.

3. My Curriculum Vitae is attached as **Exhibit 2-A** to this Affidavit. The Curriculum Vitae outlines my credentials to testify as to the matters below. I have been specifically retained to review all information regarding the smoke alarm at issue in this case.

4. In preparation for this matter, I reviewed the Amended Complaint and jury demand in this case. I note that in State Counts II, V, and VI, Plaintiff alleges that there was a "non-working smoke detector/alarm" or that Defendants "failed to ensure properly working and accessible smoke alarms/detectors were properly installed in Decedents' apartment unit."



5. I have also had the opportunity to review the other portions of Plaintiffs' Complaint and, based upon a review of the evidence that I have seen to date, I do agree with Paragraph 37 of the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint where it is indicated that Marilyn Beavers was awake, recognized the fire, and attempted to extinguish it.

6. The Plaintiffs' claims appear to emanate from a claim that the smoke alarm was not working properly, despite the fact that the Plaintiff was apparently awake and attempted to extinguish the fire. I conducted an examination of the smoke alarm evidence to determine whether, in fact, it was operating at the time of the fire. On December 7, 2015, an inspection was held at the Jacksonville Police Department at 1400 Marshall Road, in Jacksonville, Arkansas. At that time, Cassie Blackerby produced the smoke alarm which was in the Plaintiff Marilyn Beavers' apartment unit at the time of the fire. At that time, the experts for all of the parties, including the Plaintiffs, had an opportunity to examine the smoke alarm.

7. Upon examination of the smoke alarm, it is clear from enhanced soot deposition evidence that it did sound.

8. As an expert, I can confidently state that the smoke alarm's horn sounded. There is tell-tale evidence left on the smoke alarm itself that demonstrates that its horn sounded. This evidence is consistent with the scientific technical literature, and NFPA 921, and experimental testing conducted under my supervision.

9. Many recent studies have demonstrated the utility of enhanced soot deposition around the openings of smoke alarm horns as an indication as to whether the device sounded during a fire. I have extensively studied smoke detectors and alarms and the presence or absence of enhanced soot deposition patterns on various alarms. As a result of those examinations, there is an accepted methodology for determining whether a smoke alarm has sounded which is accepted by experts in the field. I applied that same methodology in this case. From my evaluation of the soot deposition around the smoke alarm horn opening in this case, it is my expert opinion that the horn sounded during the fire which occurred on or about March 22, 2012.

10. **Exhibits 2-B and 2-C** to this Affidavit are photographs taken during the December 7th inspection which show the soot deposition around the smoke alarm horn and which in my opinion demonstrate unequivocally that the horn sounded during the fire.

11. At some point during the course of the fire, the smoke alarm was displaced from the ceiling and fell to the floor. See **Exhibit 2-D**. The photo attached hereto as **Exhibit 2-E** shows a large scratch in the ceiling next to the displaced smoke alarm.

12. Photographs taken shortly after the fire demonstrate the location where the smoke alarm was lying on the floor after the fire. As shown in the photo attached hereto as **Exhibit 2-F** there is a clear ring where the smoke alarm was sitting on the floor and there is soot around the remainder.

13. From a review of all the evidence, the smoke alarm sounded on the morning of March 22, 2012. Marilyn Beavers was awake at the time of the fire and attempted to extinguish the fire, thereby sustaining burns. The smoke alarm's horn did sound for a period of time and, at some point, was displaced from the ceiling and fell to the floor.

14. Contrary to all Plaintiffs' allegations of negligence or fault on the part of Phil Nix, Jacksonville Housing Authority and Evanston Insurance Company, there was a working smoke alarm that did sound at the time of the fire in this case.


FURTHER, AFFIANT SAYETH NOT.



DANIEL T. GOTTUK
VP of Specialty Services, Technical
Director

Dated: 1-11-16

SUBSCRIBED and SWORN to before me this 11 day of January, 2016.


Notary Public

My Commission Expires:

May 19, 2019





DANIEL T. GOTTUK, PE, PhD
VP of Specialty Services, Technical Director

Experience: 26 Years
Joined JENSEN HUGHES: 1992

Education

Ph.D., Mechanical Engineering, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1992

B.S., Mechanical Engineering, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1989

Registered PE

AL, No. 29227-E (2008)

RI, No. 7087 (1999)

MD, No. 23144 (1998)

Associations

- Member, National Fire Protection Association (NFPA)
- Member, The International Association for Fire Safety Science (IAFSS)
- Member, The Society of Fire Protection Engineers (SFPE)

Security Clearances

DoD, Secret

(410) 737-8677

dgottuk@jensenhughes.com

Daniel Gottuk, PE, PhD, is VP of Specialty Services and Technical Director. With 26 years of experience, he is a recognized expert in fire detection and fire dynamics and is well published in the technical literature. He draws on his extensive experimental background and his long involvement in national codes and standards to provide clients practical and technically sound solutions to their problems. Dr. Gottuk has evaluated fire development and fire protection systems in shipboard, residential and industrial applications. He has forensically analyzed a wide range of consumer products and assisted clients in product development and litigation matters. His research includes both basic and applied forensic studies to develop fundamental understanding of fire dynamics, pattern formation and damage assessment as well as to develop practical forensic tools for fire scene investigations and analyses.

PROFESSIONAL HIGHLIGHTS

VP of Specialty Services, Technical Director, JENSEN HUGHES (formerly Hughes Associates), Baltimore, MD, present (Senior Engineer, 1992–2012; Director of Forensics and R&D, 2012–2014). Responsible for the supervision and management of senior and staff engineers. Project manager for a variety of fire related research, testing, and development programs. Responsible for the planning execution and analysis of experimental fire research and development studies in the areas of fire dynamics, fire detection and suppression, instrument development, and material performance. Work also includes the use of fire dynamics principles and models in applications of fire hazard analyses, fire investigations, and fire protection code equivalency assessments. Examples of projects include the evaluation and development of advanced fire detection systems; the evaluation of liquid fuel fires; and backdraft explosion environments. Work includes experimental and analytical work in support of litigation. Responsible for the determination of origin and cause, and the analysis of fire growth and the response of fire protection systems.


Researcher, Mechanical Engineering Department, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, VA, 1989–1992. Conducted experimental research and chemical kinetics modelling of the generation of carbon monoxide in compartment fires. Supervised undergraduate research assistants.

Systems/Integration and Test Engineer, General Electric Astro Space Division, Princeton, NJ, 1988–1989. Developed integration and testing procedures for satellite production.

Research Assistant, Mechanical Engineering Department, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, VA, 1988–1989. Conducted research and development in the study of flame detection. Examined the feasibility of using flame spectroscopy and chemiluminescence as a fast response method for flame detection.



DANIEL T. GOTTUK, PE, PhD, VP of Specialty Services, Technical Director


JENSEN HUGHES

PROFESSIONAL STANDING (CONTINUED):

Committees, Boards, and Panels

Member, Technical Committee on Single- and Multiple-Station Alarms and Household Fire Alarm Systems (SIG-HOU), NFPA 72
Member, Technical Committee on Carbon Monoxide Detection (SIG-CAR), NFPA 720
Member, Technical Committee on Fire Investigation (FIA-AAA), NFPA 921
Member, Technical Committee on Fire Investigator Professional Qualifications (PQU-FIV), NFPA 1033
Member/Chair, Fire Detection & Alarm Research Council
Member, UL Standards Technical Panel 217 for Smoke Detectors and Alarms
Member, UL Standards Technical Panel 2034 for Carbon Monoxide Alarms and Gas Detectors

Technical Journals and Books


Editor of the *8th Symposium of the International Association of Fire Safety Science*
Editorial Board, *Fire Technology*
Editorial Board, *Fire Science Reviews*
Reviewer, *International Symposium on Fire Safety Science*
Reviewer, *Fire and Materials*
Reviewer, *Journal of Fire Sciences*
Reviewer, *Fire Safety Journal*

Awards

Ronald K. Mengel Award for the most outstanding detection presentation at *Suppression, Detection and Signaling Research and Application Symposium*, SUPDET 2010
Jack Bono Engineering Communications Award for the *Journal of Fire Protection Engineering* paper that most contributed to the achievement and application of professional fire protection in 2006, 2007
Harry C. Bigglestone Award, Excellence in Communication of Fire Protection Concepts, 2004
Royal Institute of Naval Architects/Lloyds Register, Safer Ship Award, Advanced Damage Control Technology, 2003
Alan Berman Research Publication Award, Naval Research Laboratory, 2003
Alan Berman Research Publication Award, Naval Research Laboratory, 2000

PATENTS

Roby, R.J., Gottuk, D.T., and Bayler, C.L., "Multi-signature Fire Detector," U.S. Patent No. 5,691,703, November 25, 1997









EXHIBIT
2-C







AFFIDAVIT OF B. DON RUSSELL, PH.D., P.E.

STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF BRAZOS

1. My name is B. Don Russell. I am over 21 years of age. I am qualified by experience and education to offer the following opinions. I hold B.S., M.E., and Ph.D. degrees in electrical engineering. My resume setting forth my qualifications and experiences is attached.
2. I appear as an employee of B. Don Russell Consulting Engineers, LLC having been employed in this matter by Sheila F. Campbell, P.A.
3. I currently hold the position of Distinguished Professor in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at Texas A & M University. I am a Regents Professor of the Texas A&M University System and hold the Bovay Endowed Chair in engineering.
4. I serve as the Director of the Texas A&M Engineering Experiment Station Smoke Detector Test Facility. In this capacity I have, over the last 25 years, conducted numerous experiments and tested hundreds of smoke detectors in full-scale fires. I am fully qualified to evaluate the performance of residential smoke detectors under a wide range of fire conditions.
5. I was asked to evaluate the statements and opinions set forth in the affidavit of Daniel Gottuk dated January 11, 2016, including evaluating his conclusions as to the sounding of the residential smoke detector during the subject fire.
6. In paragraph 7 of his affidavit Mr. Gottuk states that "it is clear from enhanced soot deposition evidence that it did sound", referencing the subject smoke detector. From his statement, I conclude that Mr. Gottuk believes that the subject detector was powered and that its horn was capable of operating and did sound in the subject fire.
7. Mr. Gottuk calls the method he uses to reach his conclusions "enhanced soot deposition", a phrase I will hereafter adopt and refer to in this affidavit as ESD. I am familiar with this method which was developed and has been used by a very limited number of individuals in the fire community.
8. Those using the ESD method contend that certain soot patterns on a piezoelectric horn in a smoke detector are evidence that the horn sounded in a fire. The method purports to distinguish between soot patterns that would be normally found on various surfaces after a fire versus specific patterns formed by the smoke detector as it sounds.
9. For the EDS method to be considered reliable, as with any scientific theory, certain requirements must be met. If any of these requirements are not fulfilled, the theory must



be considered unreliable and cannot be used to draw scientific conclusions. For a theory to be reliable, all of the following requirements must be met:

- The EDS theory must have been tested using acceptable scientific protocols with a statistically significant number of experiments to validate the results.
 - The researchers testing the theory must be independent and objective, without bias or conflicts.
 - The error rate for the EDS method, including occurrence of false positives and false negatives, must be experimentally determined and known.
 - The EDS theory must be subjected to peer review. By peer review I do not mean mere publication, but rather peer scientific evaluation. The theory has not received widespread acceptance or use in the broader scientific community and is not governed by any standards that establish a use protocol.
 - The EDS method must be demonstrated to be experimentally repeatable by independent peer experts.
 - The EDS method must be tested under the wide variety of fire conditions that can reasonably be anticipated to occur in a home.
10. The EDS method used by Mr. Gottuk to reach his conclusions cannot be considered reliable and therefore cannot be utilized in this case since the above listed criteria have not been fully met. There has been little or no testing of the method by independent researchers. The number of scientific experiments and tests that have been conducted on this method is extremely limited and have been primarily performed by a small group of researchers with vested and specific interest in the outcome of the tests. There has been no publication of the data from a statistically significant number of full scale fire experiments conducted under a wide range of fire conditions analyzed and evaluated by independent researchers.
11. Without respect to the scientific validity of the EDS theory, the conclusions reached by Mr. Gottuk are unreliable as further described hereafter.
12. Soot deposits on a smoke detector horn cannot be uniquely linked to a specific fire. It is not known and likely cannot be known whether a previous fire occurred before the subject incident, such as a kitchen fire, and created smoke that caused the detector to sound. A detector sounding in a previous fire could cause smoke deposition patterns on the horn. These smoke patterns would represent latent and pre-existing conditions which pre-dated the subject fire and therefore do not provide evidence of sounding in the subject fire. There has been no scientific analysis presented as to a means to distinguish which soot patterns relate to which of multiple fire events that may have occurred.
13. Mr. Gottuk states that the smoke deposition patterns indicate the detector sounded. However, he does not say and cannot say when the detector sounded in the subject fire. Even if we assume that the patterns he describes show that the subject smoke detector sounded in the incident fire, the smoke detector may have sounded very late in the fire

and therefore did not provide a timely or adequate warning to residents, allowing time for escape.


- 14. Given that the EDS theory has not been proven scientifically; and, given that we cannot know that the soot patterns referenced by Mr. Gottuk are uniquely associated with the subject fire; and, given that we cannot know precisely when the smoke detector sounded or how long it sounded, if it sounded at all, in the subject fire, we must conclude that the opinions of Mr. Gottuk are unreliable and/or not helpful to our understanding of what occurred in the time sequence of the subject fire.

Further affiant sayeth not.



B. Don Russell, Ph.D., P.E.

Sworn to and subscribed before me on this the 13th day of May, 2016.



NOTARY PUBLIC
My Commission Expires May 17, 2018



BIOGRAPHICAL DATA
February 16, 2016

B. Don Russell

Regents Professor
Distinguished Professor
Harry E. Bovay, Jr. Endowed Chair

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
Texas A&M University

PROFESSIONAL INTERESTS:

Electric Power Engineering; Power System Protection, Control, and Computer Automation; Energy Systems; Fire Detection Technology; Forensic Engineering; Engineering Economics; Engineering Ethics, Professionalism, and Public Policy

EDUCATION:

Ph.D., Electrical Engineering, University of Oklahoma, 1975
M.E., Electrical Engineering, Texas A&M University, 1971
B.S., Electrical Engineering, Texas A&M University, 1970
Post Graduate Studies, Theology and History, Abilene Christian University

EXPERIENCE:

Administrative

- Associate Vice Chancellor for Engineering Research, Texas A&M University System, 1996-2002
- Deputy Director, Texas Engineering Experiment Station, Texas A&M University System, 1996-2002
- Associate Dean for Research, College of Engineering, Texas A&M University, 1996-2002
- Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs, Texas A&M University System, 1994-1996
- Executive Associate Dean, College of Engineering, 1994-1996
- Assistant Agency Director, Texas Engineering Experiment Station, 1994-1996
- Assistant Department Head, Electrical Engineering, 1986-1992
- Associate Director, Institute for Ventures in New Technology (INVENT), 1982-1985
- Director, Electric Power Institute, 1980-1981

Educational and Research

- Distinguished Professor, Texas A&M University, 2009-present
- Regents Professor, Texas A&M University System, 2000-present
- Harry E. Bovay, Jr. Endowed Chair for History and Ethics of Professional Engineering 2008 - present

- J. W. Runyon, Jr. '35 Professorship I, 2002- 2008
- Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Texas A&M University, 1988-present
- Director, Power System Automation Laboratory, 1981-present
- Associate Professor, 1979-1988
- Member, Graduate Faculty, Texas A&M University, 1977-present
- Principal Investigator, Electric Power and Power Electronics Institute, 1976-present
- Assistant Professor, 1976-1979
- Visiting Instructor, Electrical Engineering, University of Oklahoma, 1973-1975
- Instructor of Physics and Member of Graduate Faculty, Abilene Christian University, 1971-1973
- Graduate Teaching Assistant, Texas A&M University, 1970

Industrial

- President, Power Solutions, Inc., 1988-present
- President and Chief Consultant, Micon Engineering Inc., 1978-1990
- Consultant and Principal, Entek Associates, 1979-1980
- Power Systems Research Manager, Electric Power Research Institute, 1975
- Power Systems Engineer, Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company, 1974 (Summer internship)
- Assistant Government Contracts Property Administrator and Manufacturing Engineering Assistant, Texas Instruments, Inc., Dallas, Texas (Co-op Internship 1967-1970)
- Industrial Consultant/Contractor, 1974-present; Clients include:

American Electric Power (AEP)
Boeing Aircraft
Consolidated Edison
Dow Chemical Company
Electric Power Research Institute
Entergy
Frontier Enterprises
General Electric Company
Hughes Research Laboratories
Korea Electric Power Company
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
Maytag Corporation
Oklahoma Gas & Electric

Oncor
Pirelli Corporation
Public Utility Commission of Texas
Rockwell International
Schlumberger/Sangamo
Southern California Edison
Southern Company
Texas Energy and Natural Resources Advisory Council
TXU Electric Delivery
3M Corporation
United Technologies
Westinghouse Electric
Numerous law firms as forensic engineer

Research Funding and Management (Partial Listing)

“Prevention of Power Line Caused Wildfires”, State of Texas, 2013-2016, \$3,000,000 with Carl Benner

"Integration and Demonstration of Distribution Fault Anticipation (DFA) Technology at Southern Company," Electric Power Research Institute, 2011-2012, \$180,000, with Carl Benner.

"Investigation of DFA Technology on Transmission Lines at Southern Company Services," Southern Company Services, Inc., 2010-2011, \$138,100, with Carl Benner.

"Ongoing Monitoring, Interaction, and Event Investigation – DFA Arizona Public Service," 2009-2014, \$296,000, with Carl Benner.

"DFA Technology Demonstration for Reliability and Smart-Grid Integration at CenterPoint Energy," CenterPoint Energy Houston Electric, 2009-2012, \$357,200, with Carl Benner.

"DFA Technology Demonstration at Arizona Public Service," Electric Power Research Institute, 2009-2011, \$216,000, with Carl Benner.

"DFA Technology Demonstration at Tennessee Valley Authority," Electric Power Research Institute, 2009-2010, \$80,000, with Carl Benner.

"DFA Technology Demonstration at Alabama Power Co.," Electric Power Research Institute, 2009-2010, \$50,000, with Carl Benner.

"Low-Voltage Fault Detection Research Services, Task Order No. 2: Network Instrumentation and Data Collection," Consolidated Edison Company of New York, 2008-2013, \$1,350,000, with Carl Benner.

"Comparative Characterization of Parallel Distribution Sensors under Field Conditions," Power Systems Engineering Research Center (PSERC), 2007-2010, \$150,000, with Carl Benner and Ward Jewell.

"Low-Voltage Fault Detection Research Services, Task Order No.1: Initial Problem Study and Definition," Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc., 2006-2007, \$27,000, with Carl Benner.

"Distribution Fault Anticipation, Phase III: System Integration," Electric Power Research Institute, 2006-2008, \$720,000, with Carl Benner.

"Development and Demonstration of Advanced Monitoring Systems for Fault Location, Analysis, and Prediction," U.S. Department of Energy, 2005-2007, \$100,000, with EPRI Solutions, Inc. and Carl Benner and \$450,000 with Power Solutions, Inc.

"Preliminary Examination of Technology for PowerMedia Communications," PowerMedia Communications, 2005-2006, \$8,000, with Carl Benner.

"Reliability Based Vegetation Management through Intelligent System Monitoring," Power Systems Engineering Research Center (PSERC), in collaboration with EXELON Corporation, 2004-2007, \$109,075, with Carl Benner, Jim McCalley, and Ward Jewell.

"Increased Electricity Supply through Real-Time Power System Monitoring and Control," Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, 2002-2004, \$141,000, with Carl Benner.

"Online Detection of Underground Distribution Cable Failure," Electric Power Research Institute (Tailored Collaboration with TXU Delivery Services), \$97,008, 2002-2004, with Karen Butler-Purry.

"Distribution Fault Anticipator Phase II: Prototype Development and Monitoring," Electric Power Research Institute, 2001-2005, \$2,397,000, with Karen Butler-Purry and Carl Benner.

"Acquisition of Test Equipment to Advance Research and Education in Distributed Energy Systems (DES)," funded by National Science Foundation, \$150,000, 2001-2005, with C. Singh, et al.

"Data Collection of Underground Distribution Cable Failure," TXU, \$40,000, 2001-2002, with Karen Butler-Purry.

"On-Line Detection of Underground Distribution Cable Failure," TXU (Formerly Texas Utilities), \$47,357, 2000-2001, with Karen Butler-Purry.

"New Techniques for Maintaining Reliability in the Restructured Electric Utility Industry," funded by Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, \$156,200, 2000-2001, with Karen Butler-Purry.

"Characterization of Underground Cable Failures," Texas Utilities Services, \$43,000, 1998-1999, with Karen Butler-Purry.

"Ongoing Tech Transfer Support of High Impedance Fault Detection Technology," General Electric Company, 1997-2007, \$66,886, with Carl Benner.

"Distribution Fault Anticipator/Locator Phase I: Proof of Concept," funded by Electric Power Research Institute, 1997-2001, \$1,308,411, with Karen Butler and Carl Benner.

"Detection of Arcing Faults-Algorithm Development," funded by General Electric Company, 1997-1998, \$57,418.

"Detection and Location of Incipient Faults," funded by TU Services, Inc., 1996-1998, \$52,378, with Karen Butler.

"Power Distribution Feeder Failure Prediction," funded by Keyin Systems (South Korea), 1995-1997, \$81,000, with Carl Benner.

"Acquisition of Advanced Instrumentation and Test Equipment for Research, Education and Training in Electric Power Quality," National Science Foundation, 1995-1997, \$251,743, with Prasad Enjeti, et al.

"Detection Techniques for 480 Volt Network Faults", Electric Power Research Institute, 1993, Phase I, \$50,000, with Carl Benner and Michael Aucoin.

"Detection Techniques for 480 Volt Network Faults," Electric Power Research Institute, 1993, Phase II, \$125,000, with Carl Benner and Michael Aucoin.

"An Expert Decision Maker for Feeder Protection," General Electric Co., 1993-1994, \$50,000.

"Field Evaluation of High Impedance Fault Detection Technology," Electric Power Research Institute, 1991-1993, \$136,000.

"Development of Detection Techniques for High Impedance Fault Detection," Electric Power Research Institute, 1990-1992, \$285,000.

"Intelligent Power Distribution Protection System Development," David Taylor Research Center, U.S. Navy, 1990-1995, \$325,000.

"Knowledge Based System for Improved Adaptive Relaying and Diagnostics on Distribution Feeders," Electric Power Research Institute, co-funded by Houston Lighting and Power, 1990-1992, \$100,000.

"An Instrumentation and Data Analysis System for Monitoring Industrial and Commercial Energy Use," funded by the Texas Energy Research in Applications Program, 1989-1993, \$259,260.

"Development of High Impedance Fault Test Facility," grants from Texas Utilities and Houston Lighting and Power, 1989, \$73,000.

"Methods for High Impedance Fault Detection," Electric Power Research Institute, 1988-1989, \$235,989.

"Characterization and Detection of Electrical Faults," sponsored by National Science Foundation, FY 1988, \$91,611; FY 1989, \$95,535.

"Protection of Spaceborne Power Systems," sponsored by NASA-JSC, 1987-1988, \$68,000.

"Advanced Power System Protection and Incipient Fault Detection," sponsored by NASA-JSC, 1986-1987, \$60,000.

"Development of Knowledge Based Expert Systems for the Protection of Electric Distribution Feeders," Center for Energy and Mineral Resources, 1986-1987.

"Assessment of the Effects of Electrical Power Disruption upon Operations of Selected Industry Sectors in the USA," Department of Defense-Central Intelligence Agency, 1983-1984 with D. Bragg (classified).

"Evaluation of Electromagnetic Interference and Grounding Problems with Traffic Control Automation Equipment," Texas Highway Department, 1982-1984, with W. Cunningham.

"Distribution Feeder Protection Research Utilizing Microcomputer," funded by Houston Lighting and Power Co., 1982-1983, \$29,880.

"Evaluation of Highway Luminaire Failures Due to Electrical Transients Caused by Wind Induced Vibrations," funded by Texas Department of Highways and Texas Transportation Institute, 1981-1983, with E. Red.

"Electromagnetic Field Measurements during 500 kV Fault Tests," funded by Northern States Power and Electric Power Research Institute, 1980-1982, \$36,770.

"Test Data Acquisition Support Services," funded by Electric Power Research Institute, 1980-1982, \$114,000.

"Distribution Substation Electromagnetic Environment Evaluation," funded by General Electric Company, 1980-1982, \$18,000.

"Microprocessor-Based Distribution Feeder Protection Research," funded by Public Service Company of New Mexico, 1980-1982, \$18,000.

"Transient Recorder Utilizing Computer Control (TRUCC)," funded by Electric Power Research Institute, 1979-1983, \$199,300.

"Microcomputer Overcurrent Relay Development," funded by DOW Chemical, 1978-1982, \$30,000.

"Detection of High Impedance Faults on Distribution Circuits," funded by Electric Power Research Institute, 1978-1982, \$252,177.

"Evaluation of the Electrical Environment in High Voltage Substations," funded by Electric Power Research Institute, 1978-1983, \$300,950.

"Energy Management in the Food Industry," funded by Center for Energy and Mineral Resources, 1977-1981, \$34,080.

Grants and Fellowships

- General Electric Company - Research Support Grant, 1993-1994, \$100,000
- TAMU International Coordination Research Grant, 1987
- 3M Corporation - Research Grants, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, \$25,000 each
- Oklahoma University Research Fellowship, 1975
- Schmitt Scholar, National Engineering Consortium, 1974
- National Defense Fellowship, Texas A&M University, 1971

- Munson Foundation Scholarship, Texas A&M University, 1966-1970

PROFESSIONAL LICENSES:

- Registered Professional Engineer, Texas #43696, 1978-present
- Registered Professional Engineer, Alabama #28421-E
- Certified Energy Auditor, Texas

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETY MEMBERSHIPS:

- National Academy of Inventors (NAI), Fellow, 2015
- National Academy of Forensic Engineers (NAFE), Fellow, 2007
- National Academy of Engineering (NAE), Member, 1999
- The Academy of Medicine, Engineering and Science of Texas (TAMEST) Charter Member, 2004
- Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), Fellow, 1991
- IEEE Power Engineering Society (IEEE PES), Member
- American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE), Member, 1994-2009
- National Society of Professional Engineers (NSPE), Fellow, 2004
- The Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET), Fellow, 2005
- Texas Society of Professional Engineers (TSPE), 1977-present
- International Council on Large Electric Systems (CIGRÉ)
- American Academy of Forensic Sciences (AAFS)
- American College of Forensic Examiners International (ACFEI), Fellow and Diplomate of the American Board of Forensic Examiners
- American College of Forensic Examiners International (ACFEI), Diplomate of the American Board of Engineering and Technology, 2000
- National Fire Protection Association (NFPA), Member, 2004-present
 - Building Fire Safety Systems Section, Member, 2005-present
 - Electrical Section, Member, 2005-present
 - Fire Science & Technology Educators Section, Member, 2005-present
 - Research Section, Member, 2005-present

HONOR SOCIETY MEMBERSHIPS:

- Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society, 2000
- Sigma Pi Sigma, National Physics Honor Society, 1973
- Tau Beta Pi, National Engineering Honor Society, 1970
- Eta Kappa Nu, Electrical Engineering Honor Society, 1969

AWARDS, PATENTS, AND LISTINGS:

Special Awards/Recognition

- Distinguished Member Award, International Council on Large Electric Systems (CIGRE), 2014
- Patent and Innovation Award, Texas A&M University System, 2014
- Patent and Innovation Award, Texas A&M University System, 2013
- Attwood Award, International Council on Large Electric Systems (CIGRE), 2011
- Meritorious Service Award, IEEE PES, 2006
- Students' Choice Award for Best Electrical Engineering Professor, IEEE Student Branch, Texas A&M University, 2005-2006
- Students' Choice Award for Best Electrical Engineering Professor, IEEE Student Branch, Texas A&M University, 2004-2005
- Regents Professor, Texas A&M University System, 2000
- Millennium Medal, IEEE, 2000
- Distinguished Achievement Award in Research, Association of Former Students, Texas A&M University, 1999
- Herman Halperin Electric Transmission and Distribution Technical Field Award, IEEE, 1997
- R&D 100 Award for the development of the Digital Feeder Monitor, 1996
- Electrotechnology Transfer Award, IEEE USAB, 1996
- Outstanding Professor Award, IEEE Student Branch, Texas A&M University, 1994
- SWEMA Outstanding Instructor Award, Industry Meter School, Texas A&M University, 1993
- Dresser Industries Professorship (for outstanding contributions in teaching, research and service), 1993
- Leadership in Student Research Supervision Service Award, IEEE PES, 1993
- Distinguished Service Award (for distinguished service to the Substations Committee), IEEE PES, 1993
- IEEE PES Executive Board Recognition (for distinguished service to the Society), 1993
- Tech-Brief Award (for sponsored research on adaptive protection for space-borne power systems), NASA, 1992
- Outstanding Technical Report, IEEE PES, January, 1992
- Leadership in Student Research Supervision Service Award, IEEE PEEC, 1992
- Fellow (for the development of high impedance fault detection techniques using digital methods), IEEE, January, 1991
- Distinguished Service Award, Power Engineering Education Committee, IEEE PES, 1991
- Halliburton Professorship (for outstanding achievement in education, research and service), Halliburton Education Foundation, 1989
- Outstanding Working Group Award, PES Substations Committee, IEEE PES, 1988
- Distinguished Lecturer, IEEE, 1987, 1988, 1990, 1991
- Working Group Recognition (for contribution to IEEE/ANSI standards), IEEE PES, 1986
- Working Group Recognition (for contribution to EE graduate curriculum development), IEEE PEEC, 1985
- Leadership in Student Research Supervision Service Award, IEEE PEEC, 1985
- Outstanding Technical Paper, Substations Committee, IEEE PES, 1985

- One of the Ten Outstanding Engineering Achievements in the United States (for Arcing Fault Detection System), National Society of Professional Engineers, 1982
- Outstanding Young Engineer, Brazos Chapter, Texas Society of Professional Engineers, 1978
- Outstanding Patent Submission Award, Electric Power Research Institute, 1975
- Baldwin Teaching Award, University of Oklahoma, 1974
- Bolton Award, Outstanding Electrical Engineering Senior, Texas A&M University, 1970

Patents

1. "Electrical Power System Event Detection and Anticipation," U.S. Patent No. 8,457,910, issued 6/4/2013
 2. "Identification of Power System Events Using Fuzzy Logic," U.S. No. 8,370,285, issued 2/5/2013
 3. "Phase Drift Compensation for Sampled Signals" U.S. Patent No. 8,160,195, issued 4/17/2012
 4. "Arcing Event Detection," U.S. Patent No. 7,865,321, issued 1/4/2011
 5. "Load Analysis System for Fault Detection," U.S. Patent 5,600,526, issued 2/4/1997
 6. "Arc Burst Pattern Analysis Fault Detection System," U.S. Patent 5,659,453, issued 8/19/1997
 7. "Expert System for Detecting High Impedance Faults," U.S. Patent 5,550,751, issued 8/27/1996
 8. "Arc Spectral Analysis System," U.S. Patent No. 5,578,931, issued 11/26/1996
 9. "Energy Analysis Fault Detection System," U.S. Patent No. 5,512,832, issued 4/30/1996
 10. "Load Extraction Fault Detection System," U.S. Patent No. 5,506,789, issued 4/9/1996
 11. "Randomness Fault Detection System," U.S. Patent No. 5,485,093, issued 1/16/1996
 12. "High Impedance Fault Detection Apparatus and Method," U.S. Patent No. 4,466,071, issued 8/14/1984
 13. "Digital Protection System for Transmission Lines and Associated Power Equipment," U.S. Patent No. 4,161,027 issued 7/10/1979
- Several foreign patents granted based on the above U.S. patents.

Patents Filed and Under Review

1. "Prioritization of Power System Related Data," Serial No. 12/031,990
2. "Arcing Event Detection," Serial No. 11/865,611

PROFESSIONAL AND PUBLIC SERVICE ACTIVITIES:

National Research Council

- Member, Committee on Enhancing the Robustness and Resilience of Future Electrical Transmission and Distribution in the United States to Terrorist Attack, 2005-2007
- Liaison to National Academy of Engineering, Section 6.

The Academy of Medicine, Engineering and Science of Texas (TAMEST)

- Charter Member
- Member, Membership/Nomination Committee, 2004-2007

National Academy of Forensic Engineers (NAFE)

- Fellow, 2007

The Institution of Electrical Engineers (IEE)

- Fellow, 2005

National Society of Professional Engineers (NSPE)

- Fellow, 2004
- Member, 1976-present

Texas Society of Professional Engineers (TSPE)

- Chapter Director, Brazos Chapter, TSPE, 1984-1988
- State Director, TSPE, 1982-1985
- President, Brazos Chapter, TSPE, 1981-1982
- Vice President, Brazos Chapter, TSPE, 1980-1981
- Member, 1976-present

National Academy of Engineering (NAE)

- Past-Chair, Committee on Membership, 2015-2016
- Chair, Committee on Membership, 2014-2015

- Vice Chair, Committee on Membership, 2013-2014
- Chair, Electric Power and Energy Systems Engineering Section (elected), 2009-2011
- Vice Chair, Electric Power and Energy Systems Engineering Section (elected), 2007-2008
- Member, Membership Policy Committee, 2005-2008, 2015
- Section 6 Search Committee Chair, 2005
- Liaison, Electric Power/Energy Systems Engineering Section, Section 6, liaison to National Research Council (Non-Nuclear), 2004-2006 (Elected)
- Committee on Membership, 2003-2004, 2014-2016
- Chair, Electric Power/Energy Systems Engineering Peer Committee, Section 6, 2003-2004
- Vice Chair, Electric Power/Energy Systems Engineering Peer Committee, Section 6, 2002-2003
- Member, Electric Power/Energy Systems Engineering Peer Committee, Section 6, 2001-2002
- Liaison, Electric Power/Energy Systems Engineering Section, Section 6, to National Research Council, 1999-2000 (Elected)

Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. (IEEE)

- Member, IEEE Standards Association
- Member, Corporate Recognitions Committee, 2001, 2002
- Member, Overhead Allocation Recovery Committee, 2001
- Division VII Director, Board of Directors, 2000, 2001 (Elected)
- Member, IEEE Assembly, 2000, 2001
- Chair, Infrastructure Finance Committee, 2000-2001
- Member, Technical Activities Board Management Committee, 1999, 2000
- Member, Technical Activities Board, 1998 -2001
- Member, Technical Activities Board Electronic Products Committee, 1998-1999
- Member, Technical Activities Board Products Committee, 1996-1999
- Fellow, 1991
- Member, Technical Activities Board, Awards and Recognition Committee
Division VII Representative, 1990-1993
- Member, Awards Planning and Policy Committee, 1990, 1991

Power and Energy Society (PES)

- Chair, Meritorious Service Award Selection Committee, 2007-2012
- Vice President, Meetings Department, 2002-2005
- Chair, Executive Director Search Committee, 2001-2002
- President, 1998-1999 (Elected Position)
- Member, Editorial Board, 1996-2001
- Vice President, 1995-1996 (Elected Position)
- Secretary, 1994-1995 (Elected Position)

- Chair, Constitution and Bylaws Committee, 1994-1995
- Member, Plenary Session Planning Committee, 1994-1995
- Member, Governing Board, 1989-2005
- Chairman, Awards and Recognition Department, 1989-1993
- Member, Technical Council, 1989-1993
- Member, Electric Network Control System Standards W. G., 1989-1992
- Chairman, Substations Committee Awards Subcommittee, 1986-1993
- Member, Data Acquisition, Processing and Controls Subcommittee, Substations Committee, 1986-1993
- Chairman, Power Engineering Education Committee, Honors and Awards Committee, 1982-1993
- Member, Power Engineering Education Committee, Graduate Curriculum Task Force, 1981-1984
- Vice Chairman, Digital Protection System Design Group, 1981-1983
- Member, Power Engineering Education Committee, 1980-present
- Vice Chairman, Application of New Technologies Working Group, 1980-1992
- Member, Bibliography Subcommittee, Power System Relay Committee, 1980-1988
- Member, Relay Electrical Environment Subcommittee, PSRC, 1980-1985
- Member, Substation Committee, 1979-present
- Chairman, Substation Electromagnetic Environment Group, Substation Committee, 1979-1988
- Member, Relay Input Sources Subcommittee, 1979-1985
- Member, Automatic and Supervisory Systems Subcommittee, Substation Committee, 1978-1986
- Member, Relaying Committee, 1978-1985
- Chairman, Digital Input Sources and Processing Working Group, Power System Relaying Committee, 1977-1981
- Member and Chair of additional ad hoc committees and working groups of PES

International Council on Large Electric Systems (CIGRÉ)

- Managing VP and Secretary, USNC Secretariat, 2009-present
- Member, USNC Awards & Recognition Committee, 2006-present
- Member, Administrative Council, Paris, France, 2005-2006 (Elected Position)
- Vice President, United States National Committee, 2002-present
- Chair, United States National Committee Technical Committee, 2002-2009

Special Activities

- Member, UL 217/UL 268 Task Group on Smoke Detection Technologies Underwriters Laboratories, 2007-2014 (corresponding member)

Conference Leadership

- Chairman, TAMU Conference for Protective Relay Engineers, College Station, TX, 1988-present (Annual)
- Member, Planning Committee, US CIGRE Grid of the Future Symposium, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015
- Member, Steering Committee, PowerTech 2011, Trondheim, Norway
- Member, International Steering Committee, PowerTech 2009, Bucharest, Romania
- Member, International Steering Committee, PowerTech 2007, Lausanne, Switzerland July 2007
- Chairman, Joint PES/CIGRE Technical Symposium, 2005
- International Steering Committee, IEEE PES PowerTech '2005, St. Petersburg, Russia, June 27-30, 2005
- International Advisor, IEEE PES International Conference on Power System Technology (POWERCON 2004), Singapore, November 21-24, 2004
- Moderator, University Panel Session: Research and Education Issues in the Power Programs, First Texas Electric Energy Forum-TxEEF: Partnership for Electricity Research, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, November 19-20, 2004
- Member, Founding Committee, PES Power System Conference and Exposition, 2003
- International Advisor, IEEE International Power Engineering Conference, Singapore, 1999, 2001, 2003
- International Advisor, IEEE International Conference on Advances in Power System Control, Operation and Management, Singapore, 1997
- Chairman, IEEE 1st International Conference on Digital Power Systems Simulators, College Station, TX, 1995
- Chairman, Fault Disturbance and Analysis Conference, TAMU, 1991-1994 (Annual)
- Chairman, Southwest Electrical Exposition Conference, Houston, TX, 1984
- IEEE Control of Power Systems Conference
 - General Chairman, 1979
 - Technical Program Chairman, 1977
 - Member, Program Committee, 1975-1980

Other

- President, Texas Society of Energy Auditors, 1979-1981

College/University/System Committees

- Interim Facilitator/Director, Sponsored Research Services, September 2015-present
- Co-Chair, National Academy of Engineering Regional Meeting, 2015
- Chair, Distinguished Professor Executive Committee, 2013-present
- Chair, College 25/25 Department Growth Committee, 2013-present
- Chair, College Faculty Growth Hiring Committee, 2013-2015
- Member, Advisory Board, Texas A&M Institute for Advanced Study, 2011-2014

- Member, Search Committee, Department Head, Electrical and Computer Engineering, 2012-2013
- Chair, Search Committee, Texas A&M University Vice President for Research, 2012-2014
- Member, Search Advisory Committee for the Position of Vice Chancellor and Dean of Engineering and Director of the Texas Engineering Experiment Station, 2011
- Vice Chair, Distinguished Professor Executive Committee, 2010-2012
- Chair, COE DP Review Committee, 2009-present
- Member, Task Force on the Management of Conflicts of Interest in Research, 2009-present
- Member, Distinguished Professor Executive Committee, 2009-present
- Member, Wind Energy Initiative Committee, 2008-2010
- Chair, National Academy of Engineering Regional Meeting, TAMU Organizing Committee, 2008
- Member, Brown Foundation – Earl Rudder Memorial Outstanding Student Award Committee, 2008
- Member, Chancellor's Academic Scholars Enhancement Fund Panel, 2007 - present
- Member, System Intellectual Property Working Group, 2007-2009
- Member, College Conflict of Interest Review Committee, 2006 - present
- Member, College of Engineering Committee on Ethics Instruction, 2006-present
- Chair, CPI AdHoc Committee for Promotion of the Faculty to the Academies, 2006-present
- Member, College of Engineering International Programs Committee, 2004-2007
- Member, University Council of Principal Investigators, 2004-2008
- Chair, College Faculty External Recognition Committee, 2004-present
- Member, University Distinguished Lecture Committee, 2003-2005
- Member, University Committee on Emeritus Status, 2003-present
- Chair, TEES Research Division Committee, 1997-2002
- Member, University Research Council, 1996-2002
- Chair, Nuclear Reactor Safety Board, 1996-2002
- Member, TAMUS Technology Licensing Oversight Committee, 1994-2002
- Member, VISION 2020 - Engineering Education Convocation Planning Committee, 1991
- Member, Engineering Education Program Review Committee (EEPRC), 1990-1993
- Member, Doctor of Engineering - External Relations Program Committee, 1989-1990
- Chairman, Classified and Proprietary Research Subcommittee, Faculty Senate, 1987-1989
- Charter Member, Deputy Speaker, Faculty Senate, 1987-1988
- Member, Faculty Senate Executive Committee, 1986-1989
- Chairman, Research Committee, Faculty Senate, 1985-1989
- Chairman, Engineering Caucus - Faculty Senate, 1985-1987
- Member, Engineering Technology Department Head Search Committee, 1985-1986
- Senator, Faculty Senate, Charter Member, 1983-1989
- Chairman, Engineering Faculty Affairs Council, 1983-1984
- Member, University Long Range Planning Committee, 1983-1984

- Member, University Academic Affairs Committee, 1983-1984
- Member, Dean of Engineering Search Committee, 1983-1984
- Member, TAMU Academic Council, 1982-1984
- TEES Representative, TAMU System Patent Committee, 1981-1987
- Member, Engineering Faculty Affairs Council, 1981-1984
- Member, TEES Research Conference Committee, 1981-1983

Department Committees

- Chair, Faculty Advisor Committee, 2012-2014
- Counselor, IEEE Student Branch Chapter, 2004-2007
- Member, Electrical Engineering Professorship Committee, 2004, 2007
- Chairman, Electrical Engineering Curriculum Committee, 1990-1991
- Chairman, Electrical Engineering Tenure and Promotion Committee, 1989-1991
- Co-Chairman, Electrical Engineering/Computer Science Joint Committee on Computer Engineering, 1989-1990
- Chairman, Electrical Engineering Computing Resources Committee, 1986-1990
- Chairman, Electrical Engineering Strategic Plan Committee, 1986
- Chairman, Electrical Engineering Accreditation Committee, 1985-1986

Journal and Editorial Activities

- Editor in-Chief-Emeritus, Electric Power Systems Research, 2010-present
- Editor-in-Chief, Electric Power Systems Research Journal, 1994-2009
- Associate Editor, Electric Power Systems Research Journal, 1976-1994
- Reviewer, IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery
- Reviewer, IEEE Transactions on Power Systems
- Program Reviewer, several technical conferences
- Reviewer, several book publishers
- Peer Reviewer, National Science Foundation

Public and Community Service

(previous or current service)

- Co-Chair, OPAS Gala, 2013
- Member, Compass Bank, Advisory Board
- Member, Camp of the Hills (underprivileged children's camp), Board of Directors
- Member, Opera and Performing Arts Society (OPAS), Board of Directors
- Deacon, A&M Church of Christ

Short Courses and Tutorials

"Ethics in Engineering Practice," Seminar for professional engineers, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, 2005, 2007, 2008, 2009

"Blackout 101," Seminar for legislators and legislative aids, Washington, DC, February 6, 2004, with Dr. Bruce Wollenberg, University of Minnesota, Mr. John McDonald, KEMA, Inc., Dr. Pete Sauer, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

"High Impedance Fault Detection - Technical Evolution and State of the Art," Invited Tutorial, PG&E, 1992.

Detection of Downed Conductors on Utility Distribution Systems, (contributing author and presenter), *IEEE Tutorial Course*, Text No. 90EH03 10-30PWR, Course organizer: B. D. Russell, presented at the IEEE/PES Summer Power Meeting, Minneapolis, Minnesota, July 1990, awarded the *1992 PES Working Group Recognition Award*

"Distribution Substation Automation Technology - State of the Art Review," Invited IEEE Tutorial, Eighth National Workshop on Electric Energy Distribution, Salvador Bahia, Brazil, September, 1984.

"Research Requirements for Implementation of the TAMU Arcing Fault Detector," Invited Tutorial, Mexico City Division of Mexican National Utility, Mexico City, Mexico, May, 1983.

"Retail Energy Management Seminar: Specification of Energy Management Control Systems," Invited Tutorials, Houston Lighting and Power, 1982, 1983, 1984.

"Principles and Applications of Energy Management Control Systems," Tutorial, Southwest Electrical Exposition and Conferences, 1982, 1984.

"Basics of Engineering Economics," Invited Tutorial, Brazos Electric Power Cooperative, 1982.

"Basic Meter Theory," Meterman Training School, TAMU Electric Power Institute, Annually 1980 - 1997.

"Computer Relaying," IEEE Tutorial, 1979, 1980.

"Industrial Energy Auditing," Short Course, 1977, 1978, 1979.

"Economic Evaluation of Energy Management Alternatives," TAMU Short Course, 1978.

"Economic Evaluation of Engineering Alternatives," Invited Short Course, Dallas Power and Light, 1976, 1977.

"Digital Systems Design with Industrial Applications," Short Course, University of Oklahoma, 1975.

"Symmetrical Components and Fault Current Calculations," Short Course, Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company, 1974.

Speeches, Lectures, and Technical Presentations

- "Causes of Wildfire Ignition by Powerlines – Good Science and Bad Science," Invited Presentation, Wildland Fire Litigation Conference, Monterey, California, May 2015.
- "IEEE in Review," Invited Keynote Address, IEEE Porto Power Tech' Conference, Porto, Portugal, September 10-13, 2001.
- "Residential Smoke Detector Performance - Questions that Need Answers," Tutorial and Technical Presentation, Texas Fire Officer Conference and Exhibition, Kerrville, TX, April 3-6, 2001.
- "Risk Management – Successful Decisions in an Environment of Uncertainty," Invited Keynote Address, 6th International Conference on Probabilistic Methods Applied to Power Systems, Funchal, Madeira, Portugal, September 2000.
- "The IEEE and International Collaboration in Electric Power Engineering," Keynote Address, IEEE Budapest Power Tech' 99 Conference, Budapest, August 1999.
- "Distribution Fault Anticipation/Location," Invited Presentation, EPRI Distribution Business Area Council Meeting, Pasadena, CA, February 1999.
- "High Impedance Fault Detection DFM Relay - Update on Technology," Invited Lecture, 1998 IEEE/PES Winter Power Meeting, Tampa, FL, February 1998.
- "Downed Electric Conductors, Their Characteristics, and the Potential for Public Danger," Invited Lecture, Southwest Electric Claims Exchange, Irving, TX, June 1996.
- "Recent Field Experience with High Impedance Fault Detection," Invited Panelist, IEEE/PES Summer Power Meeting, Portland, OR, July 1995.
- "Applications of High Impedance Fault Detectors," Invited Panelist, IEEE/PES Summer Power Meeting, Portland, OR, July 1995.
- "Distribution Transformer Connections - Their Effect on Protective Relaying," Forty-Seventh Annual Conference for Protective Relay Engineers, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, March 1994.
- "Trends in Integration of Control, Protection and Data Acquisition in Substations," Panel Organizer and Chairman, PES Summer Meeting, San Diego, CA, July 1991.
- "Digital Methods for Fault Detection - State of the Art," Invited Lectures, Third IEEE Chilean Power System Symposium, Valparaiso, Chile, 1990.
- "Electric Power Engineering Education - Enhancement through Industry/University Cooperation," Session Organizer and Speaker, Plenary Session, Power Engineering Society Summer Meeting, Minneapolis, MN, July 1990.

"Automation of Electric Distribution Feeders Using Advanced Technologies," Invited Lectures, Electropaulo International Seminar on Electric Power Distribution, Sao Paulo, Brazil, February 1987.

"Power System Automation Research in the United States," Invited Presentation, Seoul National University, Korea, October 1986.

"Integration of Load Management and Distribution Automation," Invited Panelist, IEEE/PES Transmission and Distribution Conference, Anaheim, CA, September 1986.

"Application of Microprocessors in Feeder Control," Panel Chairman, IEEE/PES Summer Power Meeting, Mexico City, presentation and panel discussion, July 1986.

"The Role of Research as a Linkage between Universities and Industry," Invited Lecture, IEEE/PES Summer Power Meeting, Mexico City, 1986.

"Substation Automation-Combining the Monitoring and Control Function," Invited Lecture, 1985 Fault and Disturbance Analysis Conference, Sangamo, Division of Schlumberger Corporation, October 1985.

"Microprocessors in Power System Automation and Control," Invited Lecture, Sao Paulo Electric, Sao Paulo, Brazil, August 1985.

"Computer Control of Power Distribution for Offshore Production Platforms," Invited Presentation, Petrobras Corporation, Rio de Janeiro, August 1985.

"Integrated Control and Protection of Distribution Feeders," Invited Panelist, PES/IEEE Summer Power Meeting, Vancouver, B. C., July 1985.

"Microcomputer Technology in Distribution System Protection," Invited Lecture, Pirello Corporation, Sao Paulo, Brazil, September 1984.

"Arcing Fault Protection on Multi-Grounded Distribution Systems," Invited Presentation, Companhia Energetica de Sao Paulo, Brazil, September 1984.

"Design Criteria for Computer Relay Protection of Power Distribution Systems," Invited Presentation, Electric Power Research Institute of Mexico and CFE, Cuernavaca, Mexico, May 1983.

"Energy Management Systems in New Designs," Invited Lecture, 11th Architect and Engineers Conference, Dallas, TX, April 1983.

"Economic Aspects of Distribution Automation," Invited Panelist, IEEE/PES Summer Power Meeting, San Francisco, CA, July 1982.

"Microcomputer Applications in the Protection of Utility Distribution Feeders," Invited Presentation, Tokyo Electric Co., Hitachi, and Toshiba Corp., Tokyo, Japan, May 1982.

"Power Substation Automation Research at Texas A&M University," Invited Presentation, Kansai Electric and Mitsubishi Electric, Japan, 1982.

"Facilities Monitoring and Process Control Utilizing Microcomputers," Invited Presentation and Panelist, Industrial Energy Conservation Technology Conference & Exhibition, Houston, TX, April 1982.

"Distribution High Impedance Fault Detection," IEEE Transmission and Distribution Conference, 1981.

"Using Advanced Technology in the Solution of Power System Problems," Invited Lecture, PEEC, Power Engineering Society, 1981.

"Application of Arcing Fault Detectors to Distribution Feeder Protection," Invited Tutorial, IEEE Power Systems Relaying Committee, Cincinnati, OH, May 1981.

"Developments in Systems for Transmission and Distribution Substation Control and Protection," Invited Panelist and Presentation, IEEE/ PES Summer Meeting, Minneapolis, MN, July 1980.

"Energy Management in the Food Service Industry," Invited Address, Texas Restaurant Association Annual Convention, June 1979.

"Microprocessors and the Power Industry," Invited Presentation, Power Engineering Society Relaying Committee, 1977.

"Field Experiences with Substation Automation," Invited Panelist, IEEE/PES Summer Power Meeting, 1977.

PUBLICATIONS:

Books

1. Detection of Downed Conductors on Utility Distribution Systems, IEEE PES Tutorial Course, Course Text No. 90EH0310-3-PWR, IEEE Press, 1989.
2. Computer Relaying, IEEE Tutorial Text, Publication No. 79EH0148-7-PWR, IEEE Press, 1979, with M.S. Sachdev, et al.
3. Power System Control and Protection, Academic Press, Inc., New York, NY, 1978, edited with M.E. Council

Refereed Papers

Wischkaemper, J. A., Benner, C. L., Russell, B. D., and Manivannan, K., "Application of Waveform Analytics for Improved Situational Awareness of Electric Distribution Feeders," *Smart Grid, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 6, pp. 2041-2049, 2015.

Wischkaemper, J. A., Benner, C. L., Russell, B. D., and Manivannan, K., "Online Assessment of Capacitor Banks Using Circuit Health Monitoring Technology", *Proceedings of CIGRE USNC Grid of the Future Symposium, Houston, TX, October 19-21, 2014.*

Wischkaemper, J. A., Benner, C. L., Russell, B. D., and Manivannan, K., "Wildfire Mitigation Through Advanced Monitoring: State of Texas Demonstration Project", *Proceedings of CIGRE USNC Grid of the Future Symposium, Houston, TX, October 19-21, 2014.*

Wischkaemper, J. A., Benner, C. L., Russell, B. D., and Manivannan, K., "Automated Power System Waveform Analytics for Improved Visibility, Situational Awareness, and Operational Efficiency." *CIGRE USNC Grid of the Future Symposium, October 2013.*

Wischkaemper, J. A., Benner, C. L., Russell, B. D., and Manivannan, K., "Reducing Wildfire Risk through the Use of Advanced Electrical Waveform Monitoring Analytics." *CIGRE USNC Grid of the Future Symposium, October 2013.*

Benner, C.L., Russell, B.D. "Intelligent Systems for Improved Reliability and Failure Diagnosis in Distribution Systems," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, Vol. 1, No. 1, June 2010, pp. 48-56.

Russell, B.D., "Educating the Workforce for the Modern Electric Power System; University-Industry Collaboration," *National Academy of Engineering of the National Academies, The Bridge*, Spring 2010, pp. 35-41.

Babrauskas, V., Fleming, J.M., Russell, B.D. "RSET/ASET, a Flawed Concept for Fire Safety Assessment," *Journal of Fire Sciences, Fire Mater*, 14 April 2010, pp. 341-355.

Russell, B.D., Benner, C.L., Cheney, R.M., Wallis, C.F., Anthony, T.L., Muston, W.E., "Reliability Improvement of Distribution Feeders through Real-Time, Intelligent Monitoring," *Proceedings of the IEEE Power and Energy Society General Meeting, Calgary, Alberta, Canada, July 27, 2009.*

Benner, C.L., Russell, B.D. "Automated Fault Analysis Using an Intelligent Monitoring System," *Proceedings of 62nd Annual Conference for Protective Relay Engineers, College Station, Texas, March 30 – April 2, 2009.*

Wischkaemper, J.A., Benner, C.L., Russell, B.D. "Electrical Characterization of Vegetation Contacts with Distribution Conductors – Investigation of Progressive Fault Behavior," Proceedings of the PES T&D Conference and Expo, Chicago Illinois, April 2008.

Richards, C.S., Benner, C.L., Butler-Purry, K.L., Russell B.D., "Electrical Behavior of Contaminated Distribution Insulators Exposed to Natural Wetting," IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery, Vol. 18, No. 2, April 2003, pp. 551-558.

Butler, K.L., Russell, B.D., Benner, C., Andoh, K., "Characterization of Electrical Incipient Fault Signature Resulting from Tree Contact with Electrical Distribution Feeders," Proceedings of the IEEE Power Engineering Society Summer Meeting, Vol. 1, July 18-22, 1999, pp. 408-413.

Butler, K., Khan, S., Russell, B.D., "Analysis of Incipient Behavior of Multiple Distribution Insulators," Proceedings of the IEEE Transmission and Distribution Conference, Vol. 2, April 11-16, 1999, pp. 675-680.

Benner, C.L., Russell, B.D., "Practical High-Impedance Fault Detection on Distribution Feeders," IEEE Transactions on Industry Applications, Vol. 33, No. 3, May/June 1997, pp. 635-640.

Short, S.X., Tantaswadi, P., de Carvalho, R.T., Russell, B.D., Blake, J., "An Experimental Study of Acoustic Vibration Effects in Optical Fiber Current Sensors," IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery, Vol. 11, No. 4, October 1996, pp. 1702-1706.

Mamishhev, A.V., Nevels, R.D., Russell, B.D., "Effects of Conductor Sag on Spatial Distribution of Power Line Magnetic Field," IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery, Vol. 11, No. 3, July 1996, pp. 1571-1576.

Mamishhev, A.V., Short, S.X., Ta-Wei Kao, Russell, B.D., "Nonintrusive Sensing Techniques for the Discrimination of Energized Electric Cables," IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement, Vol. 45, No. 2, April 1996, pp. 457-461.

Short, S.X., Mamishhev, A.V., Kao, T.W., Russell, B.D., "Evaluation of Methods for Discrimination of Energized Underground Power Cables," Electric Power Systems Research, Vol. 37, No. 1, April 1996, pp. 29-38.

Mamishhev, A.V., Russell, B.D., Benner, C.L., "Analysis of High Impedance Faults Using Fractal Techniques," IEEE Transactions on Power Systems, Vol. 11, No. 1, February 1996, pp. 435-440.

Kim, C.J., Russell, B.D., "Analysis of Distribution Disturbances and Arcing Faults Using Crest Factor," Electric Power Systems Research, Vol. 35, No. 2, November 1995, pp. 141-148.

Mamishhev, A.V., Russell, B.D., "Measurement of Magnetic Fields in the Direct Proximity of Power Line Conductors," IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery, Vol. 10, No. 3, July 1995, pp. 1211-1216.

Russell, B.D., Benner, C.L., "Arcing Fault Detection for Distribution Feeders: Security Assessment in Long Term Field Trials," IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery, Vol. 10, No. 2, April 1995, pp. 676-683.

Russell, B.D., Benner, C.L., "Performance of High-Impedance Fault Detection Algorithms in Long-Term Field Trials," Electric Power Systems Research, Vol. 31, No. 2, November 1994, pp. 71-77.

Kim, C.J., Russell, B.D., "High-Impedance Fault Detection System Using an Adaptive Element Model," Generation, Transmission and Distribution, Vol. 140, No. 2, March 1993, pp. 153-159.

Li, S., Russell, B.D., "Optimal Arcing Fault Detection Using Signal Processing Techniques," Electric Power Systems Research, Vol. 21, No. 2, June 1991, pp. 121-128.

Kezunovic, M., Watson, K., Russell, B.D., Heller, P., Aucoin, M., "Expert System Applications to Protection, Substation Control and Related Monitoring of Feeders," Electric Power Systems Research, Vol. 21, No. 1, April 1991, pp. 71-86.

Kim, C.J., Russell, B.D., "A Learning Method for Use in Intelligent Computer Relays for High Impedance Faults," IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery, Vol. 6, No. 1, January 1991, pp. 109-115.

Russell, B.D., "Computer Relaying and Expert Systems: New Tools for Detecting High Impedance Faults," Electric Power Systems Research, Vol. 20, No. 1, December 1990, pp. 31-37.

Kim, C.J., Russell, B.D., Watson, K., "A Parameter-Based Process for Selecting High Impedance Fault Detection Techniques using Decision Making Under Incomplete Knowledge," IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery, Vol. 5, No. 3, July 1990, pp. 1314-1320.

Benner, C., Carswell, P., Russell, B.D., "Improved Algorithm for Detecting Arcing Faults Using Random Fault Behavior," Electric Power Systems Research, Vol. 17, No. 1, July 1989, pp. 49-56.

Mehta, K., Russell, B.D., "Data Compression for Digital Data from Power Systems: Requirements and Technique Evaluation," IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery, Vol. 4, No. 3, July 1989, pp. 1683-1688.

Ingleston, J.W. Russell, B.D., et al., "Bibliography of Relay Literature, 1986 - 1987," IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery, Vol. 4, No. 3, July 1989, pp. 1649-1658.

Kim, C.J., Russell, B.D., "Classification of Faults and Switching Events by Inductive Reasoning and Expert System Methodology," IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery, Vol. 4, No. 3, July 1989, pp. 1631-1637.

Russell, B.D., Watson, K. "A Digital Protection System Incorporating Real Time Expert Systems Methodology," Proceedings, CIGRE, Bournemouth, England, June, 1989.

Russell, B.D., Doern, T.L., Martin, A., "Applications of Microcomputer-Based Systems in Power Substations," IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery, Vol. 4, No. 1, January 1989, pp. 201-207.

Russell, B.D., Chinchali, R.P., "A Digital Signal Processing Algorithm for Detecting Arcing Faults on Power Distribution Feeders," IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery, Vol. 4, No. 1, January 1989, pp. 132-140.

Russell, B.D., Mehta, K., Chinchali, R.P., "An Arcing Fault Detection Technique using Low Frequency Current Components-Performance Evaluation using Recorded Field Data," IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery, Vol. 3, No. 4, October 1988, pp. 1493-1500.

Russell, B.D., Chinchali, R.P., Kim, C.J. "Behaviour of Low Frequency Spectra During Arcing Faults and Switching Events," IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery, Vol. 3, No. 4, October 1988, pp. 1485-1492.

Kezunovic, M., Russell, B.D., "Microprocessor Applications to Substation Control and Protection," IEEE Computer Applications in Power, Vol. 1, No. 4, October 1988, pp. 16-20.

Kim, C.J., and Russell, B.D., "Harmonic Behavior during Arcing Faults on Power Distribution Feeders," Electric Power Systems Research, Vol. 14, No. 3, June 1988, pp. 219-225.

Russell, B.D., Watson, K., "Power Substation Automation Using a Knowledge Based System - Justification and Preliminary Field Experiments," IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery, Vol. PWRD-2, No. 4, October 1987, pp. 1090-1097.

Russell, B.D., Narendorf, M., Aucoin, M., "Microcomputer Based Feeder Protection and Monitoring System - Utility Experience," IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery, Vol. PWRD-2, No. 8, October 1987, pp. 1046-1052.

Aucoin, M., Russell, B.D., "Detection of Distribution High Impedance Faults Using Burst Noise Signals near 60Hz," IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery, 86T&D 546-6, Vol. 2, No. 2, April 1987, pp. 342-348.

Aucoin, M., Zeigler, J., Russell, B.D., "Feeder Protection and Monitoring System, Part I: Design, Implementation and Testing," IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems, Vol. PAS-104, No. 4, April 1985, pp. 873-880.

Aucoin, M., Zeigler, J., Russell, B.D., "Feeder Protection and Monitoring System, Part II: Staged Fault Test Demonstration," IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems, Vol. PAS-104, No. 6, June 1985, pp. 1456-1462.

Ingleson, J., Russell, B.D., et al., "Bibliography of Relay Literature, 1982-1983," IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems, Vol. PAS-104, No. 5, May 1985, pp. 1189-1197. (PSRC Committee Report)

Walker, L., Russell, B.D., et al., "Criteria for the Evaluation of Digital Impedance Methods of Transmission Line Protection," IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems, WM105-3, 1984.

Russell, B.D., Harvey, S., Nilsson, S. "Substation Electromagnetic Interference - Characterization & Description of the Transient EMI Problem," IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems, Vol. PAS-103, No. 7, July 1984, pp. 1863-1870.

Russell, B.D., Kotheimer B. Malewiski, R., "Substation Electromagnetic Interference - Susceptibility Testing and EMI Simulation High Voltage Laboratories," IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems, PAS-103, No. 7, July 1984, pp. 1871-1878.

Stephens, J., Russell, B.D., et al., "Bibliography of Relay Literature, 1980-1981," IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems, Vol. PAS-102, No. 4, April 1983, pp. 1014-1022. (PSRC Committee Report)

Russell, B.D., Herrick, D., "Electromagnetic Transients in High Voltage Power Substations," Proceedings of the 1982 IEEE International Symposium on Electromagnetic Compatibility, (IEEE/EMC), Santa Clara, CA, September, 1982.

Lau, K.P., Russell, B.D., et al., "SCADA's State-of-the-Art and Future U.S. Trends in Substation Control," Proceedings, 1982 CIGRE (International Conference on Large High Voltage Electric Systems), Paris, France.

Aucoin, B.M., Russell, B.D., "Distribution High Impedance Fault Detection Utilizing High Frequency Current Components," IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems, Vol. PAS-101, No. 6, June 1982, pp. 1596-1604.

Russell, B.D., "New Developments in Systems for Transmission and Distribution Substation Control and Protection," Electric Power Systems Research, Vol. 5, No. 1, March 1982, pp. 21-34.

Russell, B.D., "High Impedance Faults Can Now Be Detected," *Transmission and Distribution*, Vol. 34, No. 2, February 1982, pp. 32-34, 60.

Stephens, J.E., Russell, B.D., et al., "Bibliography of Relay Literature, 1978-1979," *IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems*, Vol. PAS-100, No. 5, May 1981. (IEEE/PSRC Committee Report)

Russell, B.D., "Distribution Automation Using Microcomputer Technology," *Electric Power Systems Research*, Vol. 1, No. 2, April 1978, pp. 131-137.

Conference, Professional Publications and Presentations

Benner, C. L., Wischkaemper, J. A., Manivannan, K., Russell, B. D., "On-line Monitoring of Substation Waveform Data for Improved Asset Management and Circuit Operations." 2015 CIGRE Canada Conference, Winnipeg, Canada, September 2015.

Russell, B.D., "Causes of Wildfire Ignition by Powerlines", 2015 Wildland Fire Litigation Conference, Monterey, California, May 2015.

Russell, B. D., "Detection of Incipient Faults Using Waveform Analytics", Proceedings PES General Meeting, July 2014, Washington DC, presentation and panel session organizer.

Wischkaemper, J. A., Benner, C. L., Russell, B. D., and Manivannan, K., "Application of Advanced Electrical Waveform Monitoring and Analytics for Reduction of Wildfire Risk." IEEE Innovative Smart Grid Technologies Conference, Washington DC, February 2014.

Russell, B.D., Benner, C.L., Wischkaemper, J.A., "Distribution Feeder Caused Wildfires: Mechanisms and Prevention," Proceedings of 65th Annual Conference for Protective Relay Engineers, College Station, Texas, April 2-5, 2012.

Russell, B. D., Benner, C. L., "A New Monitoring Architecture for Distribution Feeder Health Monitoring, Asset Management, and Real-Time Situational Awareness," Proceedings of the 2012 PES Innovative Smart Grid Technologies Conference, Washington, DC, January 16-18, 2012.

Benner C.L., Russell B.D., "Beyond Mid-Grid: Predicting Failures Before They Occur and Responding Intelligently When They Do," presented at EPRI PQ and Smart Distribution 2010 Conference and Exhibition, Quebec City, Canada, June 14-17, 2010.

Russell, B.D., "Wind Power – Grand Challenges and Opportunities Roundtable," Texas/European Union Wind Energy Symposium, October 27, 2009, (invited speaker).

Russell, B.D., Benner, C.L., Cheney, R.M., Wallis, C.F., Anthony, T.L., Muston, W.E., "Reliability Improvement of Distribution Feeders through Real-Time, Intelligent Monitoring," Proceedings of the IEEE Power and Energy Society General Meeting, Calgary, Alberta, Canada, July 26-30, 2009.

Russell, B.D., Benner, C.L., "Fault Anticipation and Feeder Diagnostics: Road to Reliability," Proceedings of 62nd Annual Conference for Protective Relay Engineers, College Station, Texas, March 30 – April 2, 2009.

Russell, B. D., Benner, C. L., Cheney, R. M., Wallis, C. F., Anthony, T. L., Muston, W. E., "Reliability Improvement of Distribution Feeders through Real-Time, Intelligent Monitoring," IEEE Power & Energy Society 2009 General Meeting, Calgary, Alberta, Canada, July 27, 2009

Benner, C. L., Russell, B. D., "Smart Diagnostics Prevents Conductor Burn-Down," presented at 62nd Annual Protective Relay Conference, College Station, Texas March 30-April 2, 2009

Benner, C. L., Russell, B. D., "Automated Fault Analysis Using an Intelligent Monitoring System," presented at 62nd Annual Protective Relay Conference, College Station, Texas March 30-April 2, 2009.

Babrauskas, V., Fleming, J.M., Russell, B.D., "RSET/ASET, a Flawed Concept for Fire Safety Assessment," Fire & Materials Conference, San Francisco, California, January 26-28, 2009.

Bowers, J. S., Sundaram, A., Benner, C.,L., Don Russell, B. D., "Outage Avoidance through Intelligent Detection of Incipient Equipment Failures on Distribution Feeders," Proceedings of 2008 PES General Meeting, Pittsburgh Pennsylvania, July 20-24, 2008.

Benner, C.L., Russell, B. D., Sundaram, A., "Feeder Interruptions Caused by Recurring Faults on Distribution Feeders: Faults You Don't Know About," Proceedings of 61st Annual Protective Relay Conference, College Station, Texas April 1-3, 2008.

Benner, C.L., Russell, B.D., "Distribution Feeder Reliability Enhancement through Real-Time Diagnostics and Monitoring," Proceedings of Distributech Conference and Exhibition, San Diego, CA, February 4-6, 2007.

Benner, C.L., Russell, B.D., "Distribution Fault Anticipation an Update," Proceedings of the EPRI Power Quality Applications (PQA) 2006 and Advanced Distribution Automation (ADA) Joint Conference, Atlanta, GA, July 24-26, 2006.

Depew, A.C., Parsick, J.M., Dempsey, R.W., Benner, C.L., Russell, B.D., Adamiak, M.G., "Field Experience with High-Impedance Fault Detection Relays," Proceedings of the 2006 IEEE Transmission and Distribution Conference and Exposition, Dallas, TX, May 21-24, 2006.

Depew, A.C., Parsick, J.M., Dempsey, R.W., Benner, C.L., Russell, B.D., Adamiak, M.G., "Field Experience with High-Impedance Fault Detection Relays," Proceedings of the 60th Annual Georgia Tech Protective Relaying Conference, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, May 3-5, 2006.

Benner, C.L., Russell, B.D., "Incipient Fault Detection Through On-line Monitoring," Proceedings of the 9th Annual Fault and Disturbance Analysis Conference, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, May 1-2, 2006.

Depew, A.C., Parsick, J.M., Dempsey, R.W., Benner, C.L., Russell, B.D., Adamiak, M.G., "Field Experience with High-Impedance Fault Detection Relays," Proceedings of the 59th Annual Conference for Protective Relay Engineers, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, April 4-6, 2006.

Depew, A.C., Parsick, J.M., Dempsey, R.W., Benner, C.L., Russell, B.D., Adamiak, M.G., "Field Experience with High-Impedance Fault Detection Relays," Proceedings of the 41st Annual Minnesota Power Systems Conference (MIPSYCON), St. Paul, MN, November 1-3, 2005.

Benner, C.L., Russell, B.D., "Automated Shipboard Diagnostics and Health Evaluation for Power Equipment and Systems: Advanced Techniques Developed for Terrestrial Power Systems," Proceedings of the First IEEE Electric Ship Technologies Symposium ESTS 2005, Philadelphia, PA, July 25-27, 2005, pp. 407-412.

Benner, C.L., Russell, B.D., "Investigation of Incipient Conditions Leading to the Failure of Distribution System Apparatus," Proceedings of the IEEE PES Power Systems Conference and Exposition, New York, NY, October 10-13, 2004, Vol. 2, pp. 703-708.

Li, J., Butler-Purry, K.L., Benner, C.L., Russell, B.D., Langari, R., "Selecting a Fuzzy Aggregation Operator for the Multi-Criteria Fault Location Problem," Proceedings of the IEEE PES Power Systems Conference and Exposition, New York, NY, October 10-13, 2004, Vol. 2, pp. 1134-1140.

Benner, C.L., Russell, B.D., "Distribution Fault Anticipation," Proceedings of the EPRI Power Quality Applications 2004 Conference and Exposition, Long Island, NY, May 17-19, 2004, pp. 365-370.

Benner, C.L., Russell, B.D., "Distribution Incipient Faults and Abnormal Events: Case Studies from Recorded Field Data," Proceedings of the 57th Annual Conference for Protective Relay Engineers, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, March 30-April 1, 2004.

Benner, C.L., Russell, B.D., "Variation in Performance of Residential Smoke Detectors – Safety Concerns Due to Unpredictable Behavior," Proceedings of the 56th Annual American Academy of Forensic Sciences Meeting, Dallas, TX, February 16-21, 2004.

Li, J., Butler-Purry, K.L., Benner, C., Russell, B.D., "Modeling of a Radial Distribution Feeder with TCC-based Protective Devices," Proceedings of the 35th Annual North American Power Symposium (NAPS 2003), Rolla, MO, October 20-21, 2003.

Richards, C., Benner, C., Butler, K., Russell, B.D., "Leakage Current Characteristics Caused by Contaminated Distribution Insulators," Proceedings of the 31st Annual North American Power Symposium, San Luis Obispo, CA, October 11-12, 1999.

Russell, B.D., "Response Characteristics of Residential Smoke Detectors under Varying Full-Scale Fire Scenarios," presented at the 51st Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, Orlando, FL, February 15-20, 1999.

Benner, C.L., Russell, B.D., "Characteristic Behavior of Downed Electrical Lines Including Evaluation of Various Electrocution Scenarios," presented at the 51st Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, Orlando, FL, February 15-20, 1999.

Benner, C.L., Russell, B.D., "Arcing Fault Detection - An Update on the Technology," Proceedings, IEEE PES Winter Power Meeting, Tampa, FL, February 2-5, 1998.

Tengdin, J.T., Baker, E.E., Burke, J.J., Russell, B.D., Jones, R.H., Wiedman, T.E., Johnson, N.J., "Application of High Impedance Fault Detectors: A Summary of the Panel Session Held at the 1995 IEEE PES Summer Meeting," Proceedings of the 1996 IEEE Transmission and Distribution Conference, Los Angeles, CA, September 15-20, 1996, pp. 116-122.

Aucoin, B.M., Russell, B.D., "Challenges in Technology Development and Commercialization: A Case Study of Fallen Power Line Detection," Proceedings of the International Conference on Engineering and Technology Management, Vancouver, BC, Canada, August 18-20, 1996, pp. 47-51.

Benner, C.L., Russell, B.D., "Practical High Impedance Fault Detection for Distribution Feeders," Papers, 39th Annual Rural Electric Power Conference, Fort Worth, TX, April 28-30, 1996, pp. B2-1.

Brzhezitsky, V.A., Il'enko, O.S., Mamishev, A.V., Russell, B.D., Sokolovsky, S.A., "Calculation of the Critical Distance between Power Line Conductors and Objects on the Ground," presented at the 7th International Conference on Transmission and Distribution Construction, Operation, and Live-Line Maintenance, Columbus, OH, October 29-November 3, 1995.

Khan, S., K.L. Butler, Russell, B.D., "A Predictive Maintenance Approach for Power Distribution Systems," Proceedings of the 27th Annual North American Power Symposium, Bozeman, MT, October 2-3, 1995.

Kim, C.J., Russell, B.D., "Identification of Distribution Disturbances by Crest Factor Analysis," submitted to the International Conference on Electrical Engineering, Taejon, Korea, July 19-21, 1995.

Mamishhev, A.V., Nevels, R.D., Russell, B.D., "Effects of Conductor Sag on Spatial Distribution of Power Line Magnetic Field," presented at the IEEE PES Summer Power Meeting, Portland, OR, July 1995.

Mamishhev, A.V., Russell, B.D., Benner, C.L., "Analysis of High Impedance Faults Using Fractal Techniques," Proceedings of the Power Industry Computer Application Conference, Salt Lake City, UT, May 7-12, 1995, pp. 401-406.

Mamishhev, A.V., Short, S.X., Kao, T.W., Russell, B.D., "Non-Intrusive Sensing Techniques for the Discrimination of Energized Electric Cables," Proceedings of the Instrumentation and Measurement Technology Conference, Waltham, MA, April 24-26, 1995, pp. 446-449.

Mamishhev, A.V., Russell, B.D., "Measurement of Magnetic Fields in the Direct Proximity of Power Line Conductors," Presentation, IEEE PES Winter Power Meeting, New York, NY, January 1995.

Mamishhev, A.V., Nevels, R.D., Russell, B.D., "Effects of the Sag of Power Line Conductors on Ambient Magnetic Fields," Presentation, IEEE PES Winter Power Meeting, New York, NY, January 1995.

Brzhezitsky, V.A., Il'enko, O.S., Mamishhev, A.V., Russell, B.D., Sokolovsky, S.A., "Partial Empirical Model of the Multifactor Aging of High Voltage Insulation," Proceedings of the Conference on Electrical Insulation and Dielectric Phenomena, Arlington, TX, October 23-26, 1994, pp. 367-372.

Mamishhev, A.V., Russell, B.D., "Influence of Catenary Shape of Power Line Conductors on Ambient Magnetic Fields," Proceedings of the 29th Universities Power Engineering Conference, Vol. 1, Galway, Ireland, September 1994, pp. 177-180.

Williams, S.E., Russell, B.D., "An Integrated Approach to Power System Control and Protection for Space Platforms," Proceedings of the 29th Intersociety Energy Conversion Engineering Conference, Monterey, CA, August 7-12, 1994.

Nevels, R.D., Mamishhev, A.V., Russell, B.D., "Power Line Magnetic Field Including the Catenary Effect and Electric Field Including Absorbing Boundary Conditions," Proceedings of the IEEE AP/S International Symposium and URSI Radio Science Meeting, Seattle, WA, June 1994.

Tyska, W.Z., Patterson, R.A., Russell, B.D., Aucoin, B.M., "A Microprocessor Based Digital Feeder Monitor with High Impedance Fault Detection," Proceedings of the Georgia Tech Protective Relay Conference, Atlanta, GA, May 1994.

Benner, C.L., Russell, B.D., Aucoin, B.M., "Case Histories of Distribution Feeder Faults: Field Experience with General Electric's Digital Feeder Monitor," Proceedings of the 47th Annual Conference for Protective Relay Engineers, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, March 21-23, 1994.

Tyska, W. Z., Patterson, R. A., Russell, B. D., Aucoin, B. M., "A Microprocessor Based Digital Feeder Monitor with High Impedance Fault Detection," Proceedings of the 47th Annual Conference for Protective Relay Engineers, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, March 21-23, 1994.

Kim, C.J., Russell, B. Don, "Entropy Minimization Analysis for Fuzzy Set Generation," Proceedings of the 1994 International Fuzzy Systems and Intelligent Control Conference, Louisville, KY, March, 14-16, 1994.

Kim, C J., Russell, B.D., "Automatic Generation of Membership Function and Fuzzy Rule using Inductive Reasoning," Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Industrial Fuzzy Control and Intelligent Systems, Houston, TX, December 1-3, 1993, pp. 93-96.

Aucoin, B.M., Russell, B.D., "A Microprocessor-Based Digital Feeder Monitor with High-Impedance Fault Detection," Proceedings of the EPRI Substation Equipment Diagnostics Conference, New Orleans, LA, November 3-5, 1993.

Tyska, W.Z., Patterson, R.A., Russell, B.D., Aucoin, B. M., "A Microprocessor-Based Digital Feeder Monitor with High-Impedance Fault Detection," Proceedings of the Western Protective Relay Conference, Spokane, WA, October 19 - 21, 1993.

Kim, C.J., Russell, B.D., "Application of a Fuzzy Expert Model for Power System Protection: Proposal for Synergetic Detection of Low Current Faults," Proceedings of the 5th International Fuzzy Systems Association (IFSA) World Congress, Seoul, Korea, July 4-9, 1993, pp. 1074-1077.

Russell, B.D., Aucoin, B.M., "Field Experience with High Impedance Fault Detection," Proceedings of the High Impedance Faults on Distribution Feeders Seminar, IEEE Vancouver Section, May 14, 1993.

Williams, S.W., Russell, B.D., "Ships Service Electric Power Enhanced Survivability via Early Detection of Incipient Cable Faults," Naval Engineers Journal, May 1993, pp. 78-84.

Benner, C.L., Russell, B.D., "Fuse Characteristics under Non-Ideal Fault Current Conditions," Proceedings of the 46th Annual Conference for Protective Relay Engineers, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, April 12-14, 1993.

Kim, C.J., Russell, B.D., "A Structure of Fuzzy Decision-Making System for Power System Protection," Proceedings of the 2nd IEEE International Conference on Fuzzy Systems, FUZZ-IEEE'93, San Francisco, CA, March 28-April 1, 1993, pp. 998-1003.

Russell, B.D., "Advanced Techniques and Tools for Substation Equipment Diagnostics," Proceedings of the EPRI Workshop on Advanced Substation Equipment Diagnostics, Palo Alto, CA, November 9-11, 1992.

Russell, B.D., Aucoin, B.M., Benner, C.L., "High Impedance Fault Detection in Distribution Systems," Proceedings of the Pacific Gas and Electric Technical Conference, Pleasanton, CA, August 20, 1992.

Russell, B.D., "Performance Evaluation of the TAMU High Impedance Fault Detection System," Proceedings of the 45th Annual Conference for Protective Relay Engineers, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, April 1992.

Aucoin, M., Russell, B.D., "Fallen Conductor Faults: The Challenge to Improve Safety," Public Utilities Fortnightly, Vol. 129, No. 3, February 1992, pp. 38-40.

Watson, K., Russell, B.D., Jagadish, U., "Single-Chip Microcontrollers for Switchgear Control," Proceedings of the Intersociety Energy Conversion Engineering Conference, Boston, MA, August 1991.

Aucoin, M., Russell, B.D., Benner, C.L., "Characteristics of Distribution Faults," Proceedings of the Utility Fault and Disturbance Analysis Conference, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, April 17-19, 1991.

Russell, B.D., Li, S., Watson, K., "Digital Methods for the Detection of Incipient Fault Conditions in Spaceborne Power Systems," Proceedings of the Intersociety Energy Conversion Engineering Conference, Reno, NV, August 1990.

Li, S., Russell, B.D., et al., "On-Line Fault Detection in Power Systems Using Adaptive DFT," Proceedings of the Conference on Information Sciences and Systems, Princeton, NJ, March 1990.

Aucoin, M., Russell, B.D., Benner, C.L., "High Impedance Fault Detection for Industrial Power Systems," Proceedings of the IEEE Industrial Applications Society Annual Meeting, San Diego, CA, October 1-5, 1989, pp. 1788-1792.

Russell, B.D., Aucoin, B.M., Benner, C., "Computer Relaying Techniques for the Detection of High Impedance Faults Using Signal Processing and Pattern Recognition Methods," Proceeding of the International Conference on Power System Protection, Singapore, September 1989.

Russell, B.D., Aucoin, M. "Detection of Incipient and Low Current Faults in Electrical Distribution Systems," Proceedings of the 24th Intersociety Energy Conversion Engineering Conference, Washington, D.C., August 6-11, 1989, pp. 153-158.

Watson, K., Russell, B.D., McCall, K. "A Digital Protection System Incorporating Knowledge Based Learning," Proceedings of the 24th Intersociety Energy Conversion Engineering Conference, Washington, D.C., August 6-11, 1989, pp. 239-244.

Benner, C.L., Carswell, P.W., Russell, B.D., "Improved Algorithm for Detecting Arcing Faults Using Random Fault Behavior," Proceedings of the Southern Electric Industry Application Symposium, New Orleans, LA, November 1988.

Russell, B.D., Watson, K., "Knowledge-Based Expert System for Improved Power System Protection and Diagnostics," Proceedings of the 1st Symposium on Expert Systems Applications to Power Systems, Stockholm, Sweden, August 1988.

Watson, K., Russell, B.D., Hackler, I., "Expert System Structures for Fault Detection Spaceborne Power Systems," Proceedings of the 23rd Intersociety Energy Conversion Engineering Conference, Denver, CO, July 31-August 4, 1988.

Kim, C.J. and Russell, B.D., "Analysis of High Impedance Fault Detection Parameters for Digital Relays," Proceedings of the Computer Relaying Conference, National Science Foundation and Virginia Tech, October 6, 1987.

Russell, B.D., Hackler, I., "Incipient Fault Detection and Power System Protection for Spaceborne Systems," Proceedings of the 22nd Intersociety Energy Conversion Engineering Conference, Philadelphia, PA, August 1987.

Russell, B.D., "Detection of High Impedance Faults on Distribution Feeders," Proceedings of the APPA Engineering and Operations Workshop, Invited Paper, March 1985.

Russell, B.D., Heller, P., Perry, P., "Demand Control Utilizing Energy Management Systems - Report of Field Tests," Proceedings of the Symposium on Efficient Utilization of Energy in Residential and Commercial Buildings, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, August 1984.

Russell, B.D., "High Impedance, Arcing Faults: Staged Fault Experience," Proceedings of the 1982 Power Distribution Conference, Austin, TX, October 1982.

Russell, B.D., "Characteristics of Low Current Faults on Distribution Feeders," Proceedings of the Southwest Electrical Exposition and Conference, Houston, TX, April 1982.

Russell, B.D., Perry, L. Heller, R., "Design of a Computerized Energy Management System for Marine Applications," Proceeding of the Industrial Energy Conservation Technology Conference and Exhibition, Houston, TX, April 1982.

Russell, B.D., Willis, G., Colburn, B., "Industrial Energy Audit Training for Engineers," Proceedings of the Industrial Energy Conservation Technology Conference and Exhibition, Houston, TX, April 1982.

Russell, B.D., "Turning On To Saving Energy," Chuckwagon, Texas Restaurant Association, October 1981, pp. 21-23.

Russell, B.D., "Power Systems Automation Laboratory: Investigation of Electromagnetic Effects on Substation Automation Equipment," Proceedings of the Texas Engineering Experiment Station Engineering Research Conference, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, September 1981.

Russell, B.D., Aucoin, M., "Development of a Low-Current Relay for High Impedance Faults on Distribution Feeders," Proceedings of the 34th Annual Conference Protective Relay Engineers, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, April 1981.

Russell, B.D., "Energy Conservation through the Use of a Microcomputer-Based Fuel Management System," 27th International Instrumentation Symposium, ISA, Indianapolis, IN, Invited Paper, April 1981.

Russell, B.D., "Energy - To Control or Not to Control - A Study in Commercial EMS Equipment," Chuckwagon, Texas Restaurant Association, Austin, TX, 1981.

Russell, B.D., Gerloff G., "Characteristics of the Electrical Environment in Transmission Substations," Workshop on Digital Techniques for Control and Protection of Transmission Class Substations, Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto, CA, Invited Paper, August 1980.

Russell, B.D., Goers, W.C., Heller, R.P., "Microprocessor Based Data Acquisition System for Use in Energy Audits," Proceedings of the 1979 Industrial Energy Conservation Technology Conference, Houston, TX, April 1979.

Russell, B.D., et al., "Test Techniques for SCADA and Automation Systems," Proceedings of the 1979 IEEE Power Engineering Society Summer Meeting, edited for PES Substations Committee.

Russell, B. D., et al., "Communication Alternatives for Distribution Metering and Load Management," 1979 IEEE Power Engineering Society Winter Meeting, edited for Application of New Technologies in Substation Control Working Group.

Russell, B.D., Heller, R., "Microprocessor Algorithm for Overcurrent Protection of Distribution Systems," Proceedings of the 1978 Control of Power Systems Conference, Oklahoma City, OK.

Russell, B.D., Aucoin, M., "Algorithm for the Detection of Noise Frequencies Generated by High Impedance Faults," Proceedings of the 1978 Control of Power Systems Conference, Oklahoma City, OK.

Russell, B.D., et al., "Recent Field Experiences with the Automation of Substation Control," Proceedings of the 1978 IEEE PES Winter Meeting.

Russell, B.D., "Microprocessor Applications and Distribution System Automation," Proceedings of the 1977 Power Distribution Conference, University of Texas, Austin, TX, October 1977.

Russell, B.D., "A Microcomputer Based Substation Control System," Proceedings of the Control of Power Systems Conference, Oklahoma City, OK, March 1976.

Russell, B.D., "Present and Future Applications of Microcomputers in Power System Control," Proceedings of the 1976 IEEE Microcomputer Conference, Oklahoma City, OK.

Russell, B.D., "Microprocessor Applications of Interest to Substation and Protection Engineers," 1976 IEEE Summer Power Meeting, Mexico City, Mexico, A 77 746-1.

Russell, B.D., "Use of Reliability Constraints in the Design of a Microcomputer Based Transmission Substation Control System," Proceedings of the Midwest Power Symposium, 1975.

Russell, B.D., "Application of Microcomputers to the Protection and Control of Power Systems Substations," Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Decision and Control and 14th Symposium on Adaptive Processes, Houston, TX, December 1975.

Russell, B.D., "Electronics Science Education for Non-Science Majors," Proceedings of the Texas Academy of Science, Science Education Section, March 1974.

Significant Technical Reports

Best Practices in Vegetation Management for Enhancing Electric Service in Texas, Public Utility Commission of Texas, project 38257, September 2011.

Arcing Fault Detection and Intelligent Monitoring and Diagnostics on ConEd's Low-Voltage Networks, Phase I report, TEES, December 2008.

"Distribution Fault Anticipation, Phase III: System Integration and Library Enhancement," Final Report, Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), Palo Alto, CA, EPRI Publication #1016036, July 2009.

"Distribution Fault Anticipation, Phase III: System Integration and Library Enhancement," Interim Report, Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), Palo Alto, CA, EPRI Publication #1013824, December 2007.

"Reliability Based Vegetation Management Through Intelligent System Monitoring," Final Project Report, Power Systems Engineering Research Center (PSERC), August 2007.

"Distribution Fault Anticipation, Phase III: System Integration," Technical Update, Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), Palo Alto, CA, EPRI Publication #1012435, December 2006.

"Distribution Fault Anticipator, Phase II: Field Data Collection and Algorithm Development," Final Report, Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), Palo Alto, CA, EPRI Publication #1010662, November 2005.

"Distribution Fault Anticipator, Phase I: Proof of Concept," Final Report, Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), Palo Alto, CA, EPRI Publication #1001879, December 2001.

"A Critical Assessment and Comparison of Three Proposed Designs for C-130 Critical Load Bus Transfer," Final Report, Chrysler Technologies, with P. Enjeti, April 1993.

"An Instrumentation & Data Analysis System for Monitoring Industrial and Commercial Energy Use," Final Report, Energy Research in Applications Program, March 1993.

"Methods of High Impedance Fault Detection - Comparative Evaluation and Recommendations," Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), Palo Alto, CA, 1990.

"Evaluation of Algorithms for Arcing Fault Detection," Final Report, Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), Palo Alto, CA, December 1989.

"The Effects of Vibration on High Pressure Sodium Lamps in Roadway Luminaires," Final Report, Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation, with W.E. Red, April 1984.

"Evaluation of the EPRI Real-Time Digital Data Acquisition System for Determining Load Characteristics," Final Report, Project 849-6, Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), Palo Alto, CA, March 1983.

"Measurement and Characterization of Substation Electromagnetic Transients," Final Report, Project 1359-2, Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), Palo Alto, CA, March 1983.

"Detection of Arcing Faults on Distribution Feeders," Final Report, Project 1285-3, Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), Palo Alto, CA, December 1982.

"Evaluation of Arcing Noise Propagation from 12.5 kV High Impedance Faults: Results of Staged Fault Tests," Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), Palo Alto, CA, with M. Aucoin and T. Talley, 1980.

"Design Criteria and Functional Specifications of an Electromagnetic Transient Capture System for Use in High Voltage Substations," Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), Palo Alto, CA, with G. Gerloff, 1979.

"Analysis of the National Energy Plan: The Effects on Electric Utilities," Center for Energy and Mineral Resources, with C.W. Brice, et al., October 1977.

"Techniques of Ion Implanting as Applied to the Production of Infrared Sensing Devices," Institute of Solid State Electronics, Texas A&M University, 1971 (Master's Project).

"The Influence of Ion Implantation on Both Thermally Induced Dislocations and Strain Generated Surface Patterns in Silicon," Institute for Solid State Electronics, Texas A&M University, with J.S. Linder and T.H. Bhar, 1971.

"Electrical and Physical Measurements of Boron Ion-Implanted Layers in Silicon," Institute for Solid State Electronics, Texas A&M University, with J.S. Linder and R. Heller, 1971.

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
WESTERN DIVISION**

**FURLANDARE SINGLETON, Individually and as
Administrator of the Estate of DEQUAN SINGLETON,
SYNDI SINGLETON, AND HAYLEE SINGLETON,
Decedents; and CLYDE HATCHETT, Individually,
and as Administrator of the Estate of EMILY
BEAVERS, Deceased**

PLAINTIFFS

V. NO. 4:15-cv-00205-KGB

**ARKANSAS HOUSING AUTHORITIES PROPERTY
& CASUALTY SELF-INSURED, Inc.(Specifically,
THE JACKSONVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY, a/k/a
THE MAX HOWELL PLACE HOUSING PROJECTS);
EVANSTON INSURANCE COMPANY, an Illinois
Corporation; PHIL NIX, in His Individual and Official
Capacity as Executive Director of The Jacksonville
Housing Authority; CITY OF JACKSONVILLE;
BRK BRANDS, INC.; JACKSONVILLE FIRE DEPT;
WAYNE TAYLOR; LARRY HAMSHER; CHRIS
McDONALD; TONY SUTHERLAND; DEWAN
LEWIS; JOHN DOES 1 - 50; and JANE DOES 1- 50**

DEFENDANTS

AND

**MARILYN LOUISE BEAVERS, Individually, and as
Administrator of the Estate of MARILYN BEAVERS,
DECEASED**

PLAINTIFFS

V.

**ARKANSAS HOUSING AUTHORITIES PROPERTY
& CASUALTY SELF-INSURED, INC. (Specifically,
THE JACKSONVILLE HOUSING AUTHORITY, a/k/a
THE MAX HOWELL PLACE HOUSING PROJECTS);
EVANSTON INSURANCE COMPANY, an Illinois
Corporation; PHIL NIX, in His Individual and Official**

**Capacity as Executive Director of THE JACKSONVILLE
HOUSING AUTHORITY; BRK BRANDS, INC.;
CITY OF JACKSONVILLE; BRK BRANDS, INC.;
JACKSONVILLE FIRE DEPT; WAYNE TAYLOR;
LARRY HAMSHER; CHRIS McDONALD; TONY
SUTHERLAND; DEWAN LEWIS; and
JOHN DOES 1 - 10**

DEFENDANTS

**BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO STRIKE AFFIDAVIT OF DANIEL
GOTTUK AND TO EXCLUDE HIS TESTIMONY IN THIS MATTER**

Plaintiff Marilyn Louise Beavers, Individually, and as Administrator of the Estate of Marilyn Beavers, deceased, moves the Court to strike the Affidavit of Daniel Gottuk and to exclude Mr. Gottuk from offering expert testimony in this matter.

The Affidavit of Daniel Gottuk (attached to Plaintiff's Motion as Exhibit A), was attached to the Housing Authority Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. Docket No. 56. That Motion describes Gottuk as an alleged expert in "fire detection and dynamics". Docket 56, p. 2. Defendants have continued to rely upon the statements in Mr. Gottuk's Affidavit in various subsequent motions and filings, included in BRK Brands, Inc.'s Motion for Summary Judgment. Docket No. 88.

Mr. Gottuk's opinions rely upon a method called "enhanced soot deposition" (hereinafter referred to as "ESD"). The ESD method is based upon the premise that certain soot patterns on a horn in a smoke detector serve as

evidence that the horn sounded in a fire. See Exhibit B at ¶ 8. Plaintiff contends that the methods used by Mr. Gottuk fail to meet the reliability requirements for expert testimony. Plaintiff attaches to her Motion as Exhibit B, the Affidavit of B. Don Russell, Ph.D., P.E. in support of her arguments that Mr. Gottuk's Affidavit should be excluded, and that he should not be allowed to give expert opinions or testimony in this matter.

I.
STANDARDS FOR ADMISSIBILITY OF EXPERT TESTIMONY

The admissibility of expert testimony is governed by Rule 702 of the Federal Rule of Evidence as well as Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 509 U.S. 579 (1993) and by subsequent case law. See Nichols v. American Nat. Ins. Co., 154 F.3d 875, 882-883 (8th Cir. 1998).

The Rule states:

A witness who is qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education may testify in the form of an opinion or otherwise if:

- (a) the expert's scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge will help the trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue;
- (b) the testimony is based on sufficient facts or data;
- (c) the testimony is the product of reliable principles and methods; and

- (d) the expert has reliably applied the principles and methods to the facts of the case.

Fed. R. Evid. 702 (emphasis added).

Rule 702 “imposes a special obligation upon a trial judge to ‘ensure that any and all scientific testimony ... is not only relevant, but reliable.’” Kumho Tire Co., Ltd. v. Carmichael, 526 U.S. 137, 147 (1999) (quoting Daubert, 509 U.S. at 589, 113 S.Ct. 2786). The Court also maintains an independent gatekeeping obligation to verify that proffered expert testimony meets the requirements of Rule 702 such that it is based on a reliable foundation and is relevant to the task at hand. *Daubert*, 509 U.S. at 589;

The proponent of the expert testimony must prove its admissibility by a preponderance of the evidence. Lauzon v. Senco Prods., Inc., 270 F.3d 681, 686 (8th Cir. 2001). To satisfy this burden, proposed expert testimony must meet three prerequisites. First, evidence based on scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge must be useful to the finder of fact in deciding the ultimate issue of fact. Id. This is the basic rule of relevancy. Second, the proposed witness must be qualified to assist the finder of fact. Id. Third, “the proposed evidence must be reliable or trustworthy in an evidentiary sense, so that, if the finder of fact accepts it as true, it provides the assistance the finder of fact requires” Id. citing 4 Jack B. Weinstein & Margaret A. Berger,

Weinstein's Federal Evidence § 702.02[3] (2001)(prerequisite order altered from case citation in consideration of order of argument below).

Without acknowledging at this point that Daniel Gottuk and his Affidavit and Testimony would meet the first two prerequisites above, Plaintiff contends that it is clear that Daniel Gottuk's Affidavit, opinions, and testimony cannot meet the third prong, and, therefore, his Affidavit should be struck and he should be precluded from offering expert opinions or testimony in this case.

Daubert emphasized the district court's gatekeeper role when screening expert testimony for relevance and reliability. Daubert, 509 U.S. at 591–93; see also Blue Dane Simmental Corp. v. Am. Simmental Ass'n, 178 F.3d 1035, 1040 (8th Cir.1999) (during the evaluation “of expert testimony under Federal Rule of Evidence 702, the district court must look to both the relevancy and the reliability of the testimony”). Daubert provides a number of nonexclusive factors a court can apply in performing this role: “(1) whether the theory or technique ‘can be (and has been) tested’; (2) ‘whether the theory or technique has been subjected to peer review and publication’; (3) ‘the known or potential rate of error’; and (4) whether the theory has been generally accepted.” Peitzmeier v. Hennessy Indus., Inc., 97 F.3d 293, 297 (8th Cir.1996) (citing Daubert, 509 U.S. at 593–94, 113 S.Ct. 2786).

Daubert's progeny provides additional factors such as: whether the expertise was developed for litigation or naturally flowed from the expert's research; whether the proposed expert ruled out other alternative explanations; and whether the proposed expert sufficiently connected the proposed testimony with the facts of the case. Bogosian v. Mercedes-Benz of N. Am., Inc., 104 F.3d 472, 479 (1st Cir.1997) (finding testimony of the expert and the plaintiff must be sufficiently related); Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharm., Inc., 43 F.3d 1311, 1317 (9th Cir.1995) (addressing whether opinion was developed naturally out of research or solely for litigation); Claar v. Burlington N.R. Co., 29 F.3d 499 (9th Cir.1994) (discussing whether the expert accounts for obvious alternative explanations).

Testimony which fails this test, whether due to speculation, exceeding an expert's area of expertise, or otherwise, is not competent proof, contributes nothing to a legally sufficient evidentiary basis, and should be excluded. Concord Boat Corp. v. Brunswick Corp., 207 F.3d 1039, 1057 (8th Cir. 2000) (moreover where a jury's verdict is based upon such insufficient testimony that verdict cannot stand).

II.
GOTTUK'S OPINIONS LACK A RELIABLE
FOUNDATION AND SHOULD BE EXCLUDED

The Affidavit of Dr. Russell demonstrates that the method upon which Mr. Gottuk bases his opinions face multiple reliability issues which warrant exclusion of Mr. Gottuk's opinions. Dr. Russell is a Distinguished Professor in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at Texas A & M University. Exhibit B, ¶ 3. He serves as the Director of the Texas A&M Engineering Experiment Station Smoke Detector Test Facility, and has conducted numerous experiments and tested hundreds of smoke detectors in full-scale fires over the past twenty five years. . Exhibit B, ¶ 4.

The ESD theory has not been proven scientifically and it cannot be known whether the soot patterns referenced by Mr. Gottuk are uniquely associated with the subject fire. Exhibit B at ¶ 14. Mr. Gottuk's opinions are unreliable, and helpful in understanding what occurred in the time sequence of the subject fire. Numerous factors, discussed below, support the assertion that Mr. Gottuk's methodology and opinions are not reliable.

A. Testing

The first relevant factor is whether the expert's theory can be (and has been) tested. Daubert, 509 U.S. at 593, 113 S.Ct. 2786. Dr. Russell's Affidavit notes that to be considered reliable, the ESD theory employed by Gottuk must have been tested using acceptable scientific protocols with a statistically significant number of experiments to validate the results. Exhibit

B at ¶ 9. Dr. Russell further notes that the researchers testing the theory must be independent and objective, without bias or conflicts. Dr. Russell also notes that the ESD method must be tested under the wide variety of fire conditions that can reasonably be anticipated to occur in a home. Id.

The ESD method used by Mr. Gottuk fails to meet the testing requirement, and, as explained in Dr. Russell's Affidavit, cannot be considered reliable. There has been little or no testing of the method by independent researchers. Exhibit B at ¶ 10. The number of scientific experiments and tests that have been conducted on this method is extremely limited and have been primarily performed by a small group of researchers with vested and specific interest in the outcome of the tests. Id. There has been no publication of the data from a statistically significant number of full scale fire experiments conducted under a wide range of fire conditions analyzed and evaluated by independent researchers. Id.

In light of the lack of sufficient testing of the method used by Mr. Gottuk, this factor weighs in favor of striking the Affidavit of Mr. Gottuk and precluding him from offering opinions or testifying.

B. Peer Review and Publication

Another applicable factor is whether the theory or technique has been subjected to peer review and publication. Daubert, 509 U.S. at 593. "The fact

of publication (or lack thereof) in a peer reviewed journal thus will be a relevant, though not dispositive, consideration” Id. at 594. Rather, the focus remains on reliability. Kannankeril v. Terminix Inter., Inc., 128 F.3d 802, 809 (3rd Cir.1997) (citing Daubert, 509 U.S. at 593).

In the present case, Dr. Russell’s Affidavit states as to the ESD method used by Gottuck, that the theory must be subjected to peer review.

By peer review I do not mean mere publication, but rather peer scientific evaluation. The theory has not received widespread acceptance or use in the broader scientific community and is not governed by any standards that establish a use protocol

.....

The ESD method must be demonstrated to be experimentally repeatable by independent peer experts.

Exhibit B at ¶ 9

Here, as noted above, Dr. Russell states that the number of scientific experiments and tests that have been conducted on the ESD method used by Mr. Gottuk is extremely limited and have been primarily performed by a small group of researchers with vested and specific interest in the outcome of the tests. This, in conjunction with the lack of publication of data from a statistically significant number of full scale fire experiments conducted under a wide range of fire conditions analyzed and evaluated by independent

researchers, demonstrates that this factor also weighs in favor of exclusion of Mr. Gottuk's Affidavit, opinions, and testimony.

C. General Acceptance

Plaintiff also contends that Mr. Gottuk's methods fail to meet the widespread acceptance factor. "Widespread acceptance can be an important factor in ruling particular evidence admissible, and 'a known technique which has been able to attract only minimal support within the community' may properly be viewed with skepticism." Daubert, 509 U.S. at 594 (citation omitted).

As discussed above, Dr. Russell's Affidavit demonstrates that the ESD method used by Mr. Gottuk has not received widespread acceptance or use in the broader scientific community and is not governed by any standards that establish a use protocol. Exhibit B at ¶ 9. The general acceptance factor also weighs in favor of excluding Mr. Gottuk's Affidavit, opinions, and testimony.

D. Opinion's Basis

The Eighth Circuit has also applied a factor which looks to the basis of an expert's opinion in regards to the importance from where the proffered expert opinion emanates. Lauzon v. Senco Products, Inc., 270 F.3d 681, 692 (8th Cir. 2001). "That an expert testifies based on research he has conducted independent of litigation provides important, objective proof that the research

comports with the dictates of good science.” *Id.* (citing Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharm., Inc., 43 F.3d 1311, 1317 (9th Cir. 1995)). An expert's finding that flows from research independent of litigation is less likely to be biased and the expert is limited to “the degree to which he can tailor his testimony to serve a party's interests.” *Id.*

Here, the development of the ESD method does not appear to be a result of Mr. Gottuk’s own research, independent of litigation. Instead, Mr. Gottuk indicates that “[m]any studies have demonstrated the utility of enhanced soot deposition around the openings of smoke alarm horns as an indication as to whether the device sounded during a fire.” Exhibit A at ¶ 9. From reading Mr. Gottuk’s Affidavit, it appears that he merely used the ESD theory developed by others, and attempts to apply it to the circumstances of the current case to provide an opinion that the smoke alarm sounded.

Because it appears that Mr. Gottuk has played no role in the development, experimentation, or research as to the ESD method, and instead he merely attempts to apply it to the facts of the present case in order to tailor his opinion, this factor also weighs in favor of excluding Gottuk’s Affidavit, opinions, or testimony.

E. Exclusion of Possible Causes

Another factor commonly applied to the determination of admissibility of an expert opinion is the ability to rule out other possibilities. Lauzon v. Senco Products, Inc., 270 F.3d 681, 693 (8th Cir. 2001). Here, the failure to rule out other possibilities in regards to Mr. Gottuk's ESD method-based conclusions is illustrative of the broader lack of reliability with this method.

As discussed in Dr. Russell's Affidavit, the soot deposits on a smoke detector horn cannot be uniquely linked to a specific fire. Exhibit B at ¶ 12.

It is not known and likely cannot be known whether a previous fire occurred before the subject incident, such as a kitchen fire, and created smoke that caused the detector to sound. A detector sounding in a previous fire could cause smoke deposition patterns on the horn. These smoke patterns would represent latent and pre-existing conditions which pre-dated the subject fire and therefore do not provide evidence of sounding in the subject fire. There has been no scientific analysis presented as to a means to distinguish which soot patterns relate to which of multiple fire events that may have occurred.

Exhibit B at ¶ 12.

As Dr. Russell notes, Mr. Gottuk states that the smoke deposition patterns indicate the detector sounded. However, Mr. Gottuk does not say and cannot say when the detector sounded in the subject fire. Furthermore, even if the smoke alarm did sound during the subject fire, there is no indication as to whether the detector sounded in a timely or adequate way as to warn the residents sufficiently. Exhibit B at ¶ 13. This factor demonstrates the lack of

reliability of Mr. Gottuk's opinions, and as such, his Affidavit, opinions, and testimony should be excluded.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, the matters set forth in the Affidavit of Daniel Gottuk are not reliable. Even if his opinions were relevant (which Plaintiff does not concede), the District Judge "must ensure that any and all scientific testimony or evidence admitted is not only relevant, but reliable." Daubert, 509 U.S. at 589. Defendants cannot meet their burden to demonstrate that the opinions in Mr. Gottuk's Affidavit are sufficiently supported or reliable. Accordingly, Plaintiff asks the Court to strike his Affidavit, and to exclude him from offering opinions and testimony in this matter.

**MARILYN LOUISE BEAVERS, Individually,
and as Administrator of the Estate of
MARILYN BEAVERS, Deceased, Plaintiff**

By: /s/ David Hodges
DAVID A. HODGES
Attorney at Law
212 Center Street, Fifth Floor
Little Rock, AR 72201-2429
Arkansas Bar No. 65021
Telephone: 501-374-2400
Facsimile: 501-374-8926
E-Mail: david@hodgeslaw.com

and

E. DION WILSON

**Attorney at Law
423 Rightor Street
Helena, AR 72342
Telephone: 870-338-6487
Facsimile: 870-338-8030**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on May 18, 2016, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system, which shall send notification of such filing to the following:

Mr. William M. Hatchett
Hatchett, DeWalt, Hatchett
485 Orchard Lake Road
Pontiac, MI 48341

Ms. Sheila Campbell
Attorney at Law
P.O. Box 939
North Little Rock, AR 72115

Mr. William Griffin
Friday, Eldredge Clark
400 W. Capitol Avenue, Suite 2000
Little Rock, AR 72201-3493

Mr. John Walker
Mr. Shawn Childs
Walker Law Firm
1723 Broadway
Little Rock, AR 72206

Ms. Teresa Wineland
Kutak Rock, LLP
124 W. Capitol Avenue, Suite 2000
Little Rock, AR 72201-3706

Mr. Baxter D. Drennon
Wright, Lindsey & Jennings
200 West Capitol Avenue, Suite
2300
Little Rock, AR 72201

Mr. John L. Wilkerson
Attorney at Law
301 W. 2nd Street
North Little Rock, AR 72115

Mr. E. Dion Wilson
Wilson & Associates
423 Rightor Street, Suite One
Helena, AR 72342-3219

Mr. James H. Heller
Cozen O'Conner
1900 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Ms. Kathryn A. Pryor
Wright, Lindsey & Jennings
200 W. Capitol Avenue, Suite 2300
Little Rock, AR 72201

/s/ David Hodges

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
WESTERN DIVISION

FURLANDARE SINGLETON, Individually
and as Administrator of the Estate of
Dequan Singleton, Syndi Singleton, and
Haylee Singleton, Decedents; and
CLYDE HATCHETT, Individually, and as
Administrator of the Estate of Emily
Beavers, Deceased

PLAINTIFFS

v. Case No.: 4:15-CV-205-KGB

ARKANSAS HOUSING AUTHORITIES PROPERTY
& CASUALTY SELF-INSURED FUND, INC., *et al.*

DEFENDANTS

MARILYN LOUISE BEAVERS, Individually
and as Administrator of the Estate of
MARILYN BEAVERS, DECEASED

PLAINTIFFS

v.

ARKANSAS HOUSING AUTHORITIES PROPERTY
& CASUALTY SELF-INSURED FUND, INC., *et al.*

DEFENDANTS

**HOUSING AUTHORITY DEFENDANTS MEMORANDUM
IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO STRIKE DAN GOTTUK**

Separate Defendants Arkansas Housing Authorities Property & Casualty Self-Insured Fund, Inc., Evanston Insurance Company, and Phil Nix (“Housing Authority Defendants”) oppose Plaintiff’s Motion to Strike Dan Gottuk as an expert witness, Dkt. No. 106. The Housing Authority Defendants adopt and incorporate by reference Separate Defendant BRK Brands, Inc.’s Memorandum Opposing Plaintiffs’ motion, filed earlier today and docketed as Dkt. No. 112 (hereafter, “BRK’s response”).

I. Overview

Plaintiffs' effort to strike defense expert Daniel Gottuk, Ph.D. lacks any merit and should be summarily denied. Plaintiffs have found a new proposed expert, B. Don Russell, Ph. D., willing to opine that the enhanced soot deposition ("ESD") methodology, also known as acoustic soot agglomeration ("ASA"), relied on by Gottuk to analyze the smoke alarm from the Beavers' residence is not scientifically reliable.

As described in detail in Gottuk's supplemental affidavit, attached hereto as Exhibit 1, and Lori Streit's affidavit, attached to BRK's response as Exhibit A, ESD (or ASA) is a scientifically validated, peer-reviewed, generally accepted method for assessing after-the-fact whether a smoke alarm sounded in a fire. Additionally, Gottuk applied the method properly. Gottuk considered relevant case facts to rule out any other reasonable explanation for the distinct soot pattern he observed on the smoke alarm other than the alarm sounding during this fire. The evidence overwhelmingly supports both ESD analysis in principle and its use by Gottuk (and Streit) in this case. Therefore, Plaintiffs' motion should be denied.

As a threshold matter, Plaintiffs, not Defendants, have the burden to prove their allegation that the smoke alarm failed "to sound an audible alarm," thereby causing the decedents' death. (Am. Complaint at ¶ 46). This should be considered in evaluating Plaintiffs' motion and Don Russell's apparent

inability to determine whether the smoke alarm actually sounded.¹ Plaintiffs cannot prevail on their negligence claim without presenting evidence that the smoke alarm failed to sound and that it made a difference – *i.e.* that Plaintiffs’ decedents would have survived if the smoke alarm had sounded. Since Marilyn Beavers allegedly was awake; “recognized the blaze”; and fought “to put out the fire”; whether the smoke alarm sounded should be irrelevant. (Am. Comp. at ¶ 17, ¶ 19). Although the defense does not have the burden to disprove Plaintiffs’ theory of negligence, Gottuk’s valid and admissible opinion testimony, unless excluded, completely undermines Plaintiffs’ claim that the Housing Authority Defendants were negligent in failing to have a working smoke alarm installed in the Beavers’ apartment and that such failure proximately caused the death of the decedents. These Defendants submit that it is Gottuk’s ultimate conclusion that Plaintiffs find objectionable and not the science he used to reach it. As this Court well knows, a party’s objection to a conclusion reached through a reliable scientific process is not a legitimate basis for excluding expert opinion testimony.

II. *Daubert* standard

The opinion of a qualified expert witness is admissible if: (1) it is based on sufficient facts or data, (2) it is the product of reliable principles and

¹ Plaintiffs have also tendered Don Russell as a proposed new expert witness and tendered his Affidavit as a basis for further delaying Plaintiffs’ response to the Housing Authority Defendants and BRK’s motions for summary judgment. The Housing Authority Defendants and BRK have opposed both motions. They specifically object to Russell’s identification as a new expert at this point in the case. (*See, e.g.*, Dkt. Nos. 109, 110, and 111).

methods, and (3) the expert has reliably applied the principles and methods to the facts of the case. Fed. R. Evid. 702. The expert's scientific, technical, or specialized knowledge must also "assist the trier of fact to understand the evidence or determine a fact in issue." *Id.* The district court is vested with a gatekeeping function to ensure that "any and all scientific testimony or evidence admitted is not only relevant, but reliable." *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharms., Inc.*, 509 U.S. 579, 589, 113 S. Ct. 2786, 125 L. Ed. 2d 469 (1993). The proper focus of a *Daubert* inquiry is on an expert's methods and not his conclusions. *Daubert*, 509 U.S. at 595; *Bonner v. ISP Techs., Inc.*, 259 F.3d 924, 929 (8th Cir. 2001).

Plaintiffs' sole challenge is to the reliability prong. That is, they contend that the method used by Dan Gottuck to formulate his opinion that the smoke alarm sounded is unreliable. As the proponent of Dan Gottuck's testimony, the Housing Authority Defendants embrace their burden to show that his proposed testimony satisfies the standard for admitting expert testimony.

Four non-exclusive factors are relevant to an analysis of the reliability of an expert's opinion: (1) "whether it can be (and has been) tested"; (2) "whether the theory or technique has been subjected to peer review and publication"; (3) "the known or potential rate of error"; and (4) "[the method's] 'general acceptance.'" *Daubert*, 509 U.S. at 593-94. These factors are not exhaustive or limiting. Instead, "the *Daubert* reliability factors should only be relied upon to the extent that they are relevant and the district court must customize its inquiry to fit the facts of each particular case." *Shuck v. CNH Am., LLC*, 498

F.3d 868, 874 (8th Cir. Neb. 2007) (omitting citation and internal quotes). All four *Daubert* factors are satisfied here.

The judge's role in analyzing Rule 702 and *Daubert* “is to prevent juries from being swayed by dubious scientific testimony.” *Russell v. Whirlpool Corp.*, 702 F.3d at 456; see also *In re Zurn Pex Plumbing Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 644 F.3d 604, 613 (8th Cir. 2011) (“The main purpose of *Daubert* exclusion is to prevent juries from being swayed by dubious scientific testimony”).

For the reasons explained below, it cannot be seriously argued that Gottuk has employed “dubious” scientific reasoning.

III. Discussion

As described further below, the ESD method relied upon by defense expert Dan Gottuk has been widely tested, subjected to peer review and publication, has an exceedingly narrow error rate, and has been generally accepted by the scientific community, as reflected by its inclusion in NFPA 21. Therefore, Plaintiffs’ *Daubert* challenge should be summarily denied.

A. Factual and Procedural Background

Because of Plaintiffs’ allegation that the smoke alarm failed to sound during the March 22, 2012 fire, the inspection of the subject smoke alarm was anticipated and recognized by all interested parties as a very important event in this litigation. On December 7, 2015, after much discussion, multiple pleadings regarding testing specifics, and a hearing in the state court action, the smoke alarm inspection took place. Dan Gottuk, Ph.D., attended for the

Housing Authority Defendants; Lori Streit, Ph.D., attended for Defendant BRK Brands, Inc. Plaintiffs had two experts attend on their behalf, Forest Smith, an electrical engineer, and Roger Tate, an alleged “mechanical and fire prevention expert.”²

As a result of the December 7, 2015 inspection and as evidenced by their affidavits filed in this matter, both Gottuk and Streit determined that the smoke alarm had sounded during the subject fire.³ Notably, neither of Plaintiffs’ original two experts has come forward with any expert opinions regarding the results of the inspection. Neither is able to offer an opinion to counter Gottuk’s (and Streit’s) reliance on ESD methodology to determine that the smoke alarm sounded. Instead, albeit belatedly, Plaintiffs have secured the services of a third expert. B. Don Russell, in an effort to exclude Gottuk as an expert witness. Russell’s own proposed opinions about the case are unclear as he has not provided an expert report and his affidavit focuses solely on critiquing Gottuk.

What is clear is that Russell is a hired gun who testifies almost exclusively for plaintiffs and whose opinion testimony has been excluded in the past. *See, e.g., Johnson v. Kidde, et al.*, No. 5:03-425- JMH, 2006 U.S. Dist.

² Plaintiffs disclosed Smith and Tate as experts in December of 2014. Roger Tate specifically stated in his December 2014 “supplemental opinion” that the ‘fire alarm did not function at the time of the fire.’ The silence from Mr. Tate following the December 2015 inspection is telling.

³ *See* Dan Gottuk’s original Affidavit filed in support of the Housing Authority Defendants’ and BRK’s Motions for Summary Judgment. (Doc. Nos. 56, and 88). *See* Streit’s Affidavit, filed June 1, 2016 (Doc. No. 112-1).

LEXIS 4218 (E.D. Ky. Feb. 2, 2006) (excluding Russell from testifying that an ionization smoke alarm was defective because it failed to sound in a timely manner); *Garcia v. BRK Brands, Inc.*, 266 F. Supp. 2d 566, 572-575 (2003) (excluding Russell's proposed expert testimony that a smoke alarm should have sounded before the decedent was incapacitated and granting summary judgment to defense based on lack of causation); *Werner v. Pittway Corp.*, 90 F. Supp. 2d 1018 (W.D. Wis. 2000) (striking as a "bare conclusion" Russell's proposed testimony concluding that a missing smoke detector was "most probably" an ionization smoke detector and granting summary judgment where plaintiffs "were awake in time to escape" and "cannot show that any failure of a detector caused the injuries they suffered."). In stark contrast, Gottuk has testified in fire-related and smoke alarm cases in state and federal courts, and his expert opinions have never been stricken or limited. (Supp. Aff. at ¶ 6).

While the present motion before the Court relates solely to whether Gottuk's testimony satisfies *Daubert* and should be permitted, and is not, at this point, a battle of the experts,⁴ the Court may consider Russell's history in evaluating the strength and validity of Russell's challenge to Gottuk's testimony. For the reasons stated below, Russell's criticisms of the methodology relied upon by Gottuk and Streit are unfounded and insufficient to justify striking Gottuk's opinion testimony.

⁴ Assuming Russell is not stricken because he was identified too late, Defendants specifically reserve the right to challenge Russell's "opinion" based on *Daubert* once Russell makes those opinions known.

B. Two experts, Gottuk and Streit, independently conducted an ESD analysis of the subject smoke alarm and concluded that it sounded in this fire.

Gottuk describes in his initial affidavit how, using the enhanced soot deposition (“ESD”) method, he determined that the horn sounded during the March 22, 2012 fire. (Doc. No. 56-2, Exh. 2, ¶¶ 7-10).⁵ In his Supplemental Affidavit, Gottuk describes how ESD methodology “is recognized as a reliable forensic protocol to evaluate the presence of soot particulate around various openings of a horn assembly for the purpose of evaluating whether the alarm sounded during a fire exposure.” (Supp. Aff., Exh. 1, ¶ 8). Gottuk also explains how he considered additional information, including case facts and the timeline of events, to conclude that the ESD patterns he observed were caused by this fire. (Id. at ¶ 17). Lori Streit describes how she also used ESD methodology to examine the subject smoke alarm, as a result of which she also concluded that the smoke alarm sounded in this fire. (Streit Aff. at ¶ 23).

Thus, here we have two experts, representing different parties, who separately used ESD methodology and independently concluded that the subject smoke alarm sounded in this fire.

⁵ Dan Gottuk’s original affidavit is already in the record as Exhibit 2 to the Housing Authority Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment, Docket # 56-2, and BRK’s Motion for Summary Judgment, Docket # 88-1. Rather than increase the already voluminous record, Dan Gottuk’s original affidavit is incorporated herein by reference.

C. ESD satisfies the *Daubert* criteria for assessing reliability.

(1) Prior Testing

Defense expert Dan Gottuk explains how in addition to the testing and work he has personally done, the ESD methodology “has been tested and validated by multiple scientists.” (Supp. Aff., Gottuk, Exh. 1 at ¶ 8). Gottuk goes on to describe how ESD has been “systematically studied and independently evaluated by multiple investigators” and recognized as a “repeatable phenomenon.” (*Id.* at ¶ 9). Additionally, Lori Streit in her affidavit goes into great detail regarding both the testing that she, and others, have done. (Streit Aff. at ¶ 10, 13, 15).

Russell’s assertion that there has been “little or no testing of the method by independent researchers” either discounts completely the extensive testifying that has occurred or Russell is unaware of it. (Russell Aff. at ¶ 10). Neither justifies the conclusion that ESD has not been adequately tested.

Assuming that Russell would conclude and be willing to opine that faculty members at leading science universities such as University of Maryland, Worcester Polytechnic Institute and University of Edinburgh are not sufficiently “independent,” that is an issue for cross-examination, at best, and not a basis for excluding Gottuk’s testimony.

(2) Peer review and publication

Gottuk describes the various peer-reviewed publications on the use of ESD analysis to assess whether a smoke alarm sounded. (*Id.* at ¶ 10; *see also* ¶ 18 (listing publications)). Lori Streit goes into considerable detail concerning

her research into ESD, her publications and peer-reviewed work, as well as publications and studies by other researchers. (*See, e.g.*, Streit Aff. at ¶¶ 8-13, 14-16; BRK's response, Doc. No. 112, at pp.4-6). Additionally, Streit has attached several published studies to her affidavit. In light of this production, Russell cannot seriously contend that ESD methodology has not been peer-reviewed and published.

Considered in light of Gottuk and Streit's presentation, Russell's assertion that there has been "no publication of the data from a statistically significant number" of experiments once again appears to be based on either ignorance or arrogance. (Russell at ¶ 10). Either way, Russell's assertion regarding lack of peer review and publication is simply wrong.

(3) Error rate

BRK's expert Streit, in a blind study, personally examined over 400 smoke alarms without knowing which alarms had activated and was able to identify, for those alarms in which there was sufficient soot to create a distinct pattern, the alarms that had activated with 100% accuracy. (Streit Aff. at ¶ 13; *see also* Gottuk Supp. Aff. at ¶ 15, discussing 100% accuracy in blind studies of alarms using ESD).

Gottuk conducted a statistical analysis to the available data regarding ESD methodology applied to smoke alarms. The resulting analysis, using a Bayesian method, shows that ESD can correctly identify whether a smoke detector activated with a 99.6% confidence level. Similarly, ESD can be used to

correctly determine that a smoke detector failed to activate with 99.5% accuracy. (Gottuk Supp. Aff. at ¶ 16).

Russell's conclusory affidavit is unsupported by any scientific evidence or testing. He simply asserts that ESD is not a reliable predictor of whether a given smoke alarm sounded during a fire. Russell's conclusion must yield to the extensive and compelling evidence showing that evidence of distinct soot deposition patterns, when present on a smoke alarm following a fire, is a very reliable indicator that a smoke alarm sounded. Indeed, it is Russell's "opinion" (if one can call it that) that seems suspect.

(4) General acceptance

It is undisputed that the National Fire Protection Association's Guide for Fire and Explosion Investigations ("NFPA 921") recognizes ESD as an approved forensic method for determining whether a smoke alarm sounded during a fire. This establishes general acceptance without need for further inquiry.

NFPA 921 is recognized as an authoritative reference for fire investigators. (Gottuk Aff. at ¶¶ 8-9, Supp. Aff. at ¶ 11; Streit Aff. at ¶¶ 17-20). Additionally, the Eighth Circuit has held that NFPA 921 "qualifies as a reliable method endorsed by a professional organization" for purposes of *Daubert*. *Fireman's Fund Ins. Co v. Canon U.S.A.*, 394 F.3d 1054, 1058-1059 (8th Cir. 2005); *Presley v. Lakewood Eng'g*, 553 F.3d 638, 645 (8th Cir. 2009).

Russell fails to provide any scientific basis for this Court to reject a forensic method approved by NFPA 921. Nor does Russell mention in his supporting affidavit NFPA 921's approval of ESD as a forensic method to

determine whether a given smoke alarm sounded during a fire. Moreover, NFPA specifically rejected Russell's effort to keep ESD from inclusion in NFPA 921. In 2010, Russell argued to the NFPA that EDS was still a hypothesis and could not be scientifically validated. The NFPA Committee rejected Russell's proposal and issued the following statement: "The use of acoustic soot agglomeration for the determination of smoke detector activation is supported in the scientific literature, as referenced in the original proposal." (Supp. Aff. of D. Gottuk, at ¶ 12 and Exh. 1-B; *see also* Streit Aff. at ¶ 19).

Should Russell persist, after reviewing all the evidence validating ESD as a forensic method, in refusing to recognize ESD as a valid and reliable method for determining whether a smoke alarm activated in a fire, Russell will be the one going against the grain of the scientific community.

The evidence overwhelmingly supports the use of ESD or ASA as an approved, reliable method for determining whether a given smoke alarm sounded in a particular fire.

D. Gottuk's application of ESD methodology in this case is sufficiently reliable to survive a *Daubert* challenge.

Of course, even when an expert applies a reliable, approved and validated method such as ESD, he must also apply it reliably to the facts of the case. As Dan Gottuk explains in his Supplemental Affidavit, his ultimate conclusion that the smoke alarm in this case sounded in this fire is informed

not only by his reliance on ESD analysis, but also by his consideration of case facts and the timeline of events.⁶ (Supp. Aff. of Dan Gottuk, at ¶ 17).

First, as a general proposition, Gottuk agrees with Russell that due to the persistence of ESD patterns, observing a distinct pattern alone may not suffice to support the conclusion that an alarm sounded during a particular fire. “However, with additional information regarding case facts and timeline of events, the occurrence of the ESD can be made with certainty and correlated to a specific fire.” (*Id.*) Gottuk goes on in this paragraph to explain how he relied on his general specialized knowledge and knowledge of the facts in this case to conclude that that alarm sounded in this fire. In Gottuk’s own words:

No evidence exists that this particular alarm had been in an earlier fire, period, much less an earlier fire resulting in smoke exposure significant enough to have caused the distinct ESD patterns I observed on the subject smoke alarm. Typical cooking and nuisance alarms have been shown to not produce ESD associated with a sounding alarm in response to a fire. (Phelan, 2004). Also, the tests cited above have shown that if a fire is not large enough or does not burn for a sufficient amount of time, distinct enhanced soot deposition will not occur. Thus, the technical literature demonstrates numerous cases in which smoke alarms have been exposed to fire, but the resulting smoke and soot was insufficient to leave a discernable pattern.

Based on the ESD testing combined with inquiry into relevant historical facts, it is my scientific opinion that the prominent ESD patterns I observed on the subject smoke alarm could not have been caused by a prior fire. I also learned in my investigation that the subject smoke alarm had been inspected and tested within months of the subject fire and determined to be in good working order. Finally, circumstantial evidence suggesting the subject alarm had been knocked from its ceiling mount at some point during the fire also is consistent with the alarm having sounded during this fire.

⁶ In stark contrast to Gottuk’s Affidavit, there is no evidence that Russell considered the case specific facts in any manner whatsoever.

In conclusion, in the absence of any evidence whatsoever that would suggest that the subject smoke alarm had been previously exposed to another fire or soot sufficient to create distinct soot deposition patterns, it is my opinion, to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, that the distinct soot deposition patterns I observed on the subject smoke alarm indicate that the alarm sounded in this fire.

(Gottuk Supp. Aff. at ¶ 17).

Gottuk's explanation of how he used ESD in this particular case to reach his particular conclusions is more than adequate to survive a *Daubert* challenge. Under Eighth Circuit precedent, experts' methods are deemed reliable when experts "observed the relevant evidence, applied their specialized knowledge, and systematically included or excluded possible theories of causation." *Shuck v. CNH America*, 498 F.3d 868, 875 (8th Cir. 2007). Gottuk's overall methodology is reliable because it was founded on a NFPA 921 approved scientific methodology and supplemented with an examination of relevant case evidence to exclude any other possible explanation for the distinct soot deposition patterns on the subject smoke alarm.

E. Don Russell's speculation about what *may* have happened is inadmissible and insufficient to justify striking Gottuk's testimony.

Russell also speculates that maybe the smoke alarm had sounded in a previous fire and therefore, that a previous fire *could* be the cause of the soot deposits Gottuk observed. (Russell Aff. at ¶ 12). As Gottuk explained, *supra*, because there was no case specific facts existing to suggest that the smoke alarm had been exposed to a previous fire, no basis existed for Gottuk to

attribute the ESD patterns he saw to a non-existent event. (Supp. Aff. of Gottuck, at ¶ 17). Russell's sworn testimony on this point is pure conjecture.

Russell theorizes that even if the "subject smoke detector sounded in the incident fire, the smoke detector *may* have sounded very late in the fire and therefore did not provide a timely or adequate warning." (Russell Aff. at ¶ 13) (emphasis added). Once again, this is speculation that has nothing to do with whether Gottuk's opinion that the alarm sounded should be excluded.

As one court has stated, "the function of expert testimony is to explain how something happened, not to speculate as to how something could possibly have happened." *Estate of Groff v. Aquila, Inc.*, No. 4:05-cv-0250, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 98729, 2007 WL 4644707, at *10 (S.D. Iowa Sept. 28, 2007); accord, e.g., *Glastetter v. Novartis Pharms. Corp.*, 252 F.3d 986, 989 (8th Cir. 2001) ("[T]he district court's gatekeeping role separates expert opinion evidence based on 'good grounds' from subjective speculation that masquerades as scientific knowledge."); *Concord Boat Corp. v. Brunswick Corp.*, 207 F.3d 1039, 1057 (8th Cir. 2000) ("Expert testimony that is speculative is not competent proof.") (internal quotation marks and citations omitted); *Johnson v. Avco Corp.*, 702 F. Supp. 2d 1093, 1108-09 (E.D. Mo. 2010) ("We do not allow witnesses to tell juries that in their expert opinion something happened simply because it is possible."). Thus, Russell should not be permitted to offer speculative testimony, either at trial (assuming he is permitted to testify and can survive a *Daubert* challenge) or in challenging Gottuk's testimony.

Finally, Russell's affidavit and Plaintiffs' argument evidences a fundamental misunderstanding of the burden of proof in this case. Gottuk is not purporting to offer an opinion as to the precise point in time the alarm began to sound. Nor is he required to do so. It is Plaintiffs, not Defendants, who have the burden to prove negligence and causation. To prevail, Plaintiffs must prove both that the alarm failed to sound and that its failure to sound proximately caused the death of decedents. Russell's affidavit, at ¶ 13, stating that even if the smoke detector sounded, it "*may* have sounded very late in the fire and therefore did not provide a timely or adequate warning to residents" -- is totally speculative and will not permit Plaintiffs to go to the jury on their theory of negligence against the Housing Authority Defendants. Plaintiffs' *Daubert* motion is so weak that it suggests an effort to obfuscate and to further delay the proceedings rather than a legitimate basis for attempting to exclude an expert witness.

IV. Conclusion

Defense expert Dan Gottuk has sufficiently explained both the ESD methodology and his application of it to the facts of this case. Gottuk's opinion may not be stricken simply because Don Russell disagrees with his opinion or because it undercuts Plaintiffs' negligence theory. A difference of opinion between experts, even assuming the Court permits Russell's late identification and Russell can survive a *Daubert* challenge, may be explored through cross-examination and, if permitted, the presentation of rebuttal expert opinion.

The Court should deny Plaintiff's Motion to Exclude Dan Gottuk's opinion testimony in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Teresa Wineland (#81168)
KUTAK ROCK LLP
124 West Capitol Avenue, Suite 2000
Little Rock, AR 72201-3706
(501) 975-3145
teresa.wineland@kutakrock.com

*Attorneys for Defendant Evanston
Insurance Company*

AND

/s/ EDIE R. ERVIN
William M. Griffin III (#82069)
Edie R. Ervin (#93198)
FRIDAY ELDREDGE & CLARK, LLP
400 West Capitol Avenue, Suite 2000
Little Rock, AR 72201-3522
(501) 376-2011
griffin@fridayfirm.com
eervin@fridayfirm.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Arkansas Housing
Authorities Property & Casualty Self-
Insured Fund, Inc.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Edie R. Ervin, hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing pleading has been filed using the CM/ECF Filing System on this 1st day of June, 2016, and the Clerk of Court shall serve a copy upon the following counsel of record:

David Hodges
david@hodgeslaw.com

Baxter Drennon
bdrennon@wlj.com

Dion Wilson
edionwilson@gmail.com

Sheila F. Campbell
campbl@sbcglobal.net

John W. Walker
johnwalkeratty@aol.com

John L. Wilkerson
jwilkerson@arml.org

Shawn G. Childs
schilds@gabrielmail.com

Teresa Wineland
Teresa.wineland@kutakrock.com

Kathryn Pryor
kpryor@wlj.com

James H. Heller
jimheller@cozen.com

A true and correct copy of the foregoing pleading has been served upon the following counsel of record via U.S. Mail on this same date:

William M. Hatchett
Hatchett, DeWalt & Hatchett, PLLC
485 Orchard Lake Road
Pontiac, MI 48341
w.hatchett@hatchettlawfirm.com

/s/ EDIE R. ERVIN
Edie R. Ervin (#93198)
FRIDAY ELDREDGE & CLARK
400 West Capitol, Suite 2000
Little Rock, AR 72201-3522

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
WESTERN DIVISION**

FURLANDARE SINGLETON, *et al.*

PLAINTIFFS

v.

Case No.: 4:15-CV-205-KGB

**ARKANSAS HOUSING AUTHORITIES PROPERTY
& CASUALTY SELF-INSURED FUND, INC., *et al.***

DEFENDANTS

SUPPLEMENTAL AFFIDAVIT OF DANIEL GOTTUK

I, Daniel Gottuk, of lawful age and having been duly sworn, upon my oath states as follows:

1. My name is Daniel T. Gottuk. I am employed by Jensen Hughes of Baltimore, Maryland.

2. I have been retained by the Defendants, Jacksonville Housing Authority, Evanston Insurance Company and Phil Nix, in this matter. I was specifically retained to review all information regarding the smoke alarm at issue in this case.

3. This Supplemental Affidavit is intended to supplement the Affidavit I gave earlier in this case. My updated Curriculum Vitae and a selected publications list is attached hereto as Exhibit **1-A**.

4. Since 1993, I have conducted thousands of fire detection tests in a wide range of structures and fire conditions (see selected publications list for examples). Analyses have included the investigation and analysis of novel detection technologies, performance of existing technologies and the



development of standardized test protocols. I have also conducted many experimental forensic programs for the National Institute of Justice (part of the Department of Justice). My research has included both basic and applied forensic studies to develop fundamental understanding of fire dynamics, pattern formation and damage assessment as well as to develop practical forensic tools for fire scene investigations and analyses.

5. Some of the relevant positions I have held in various organizations include: (1) chair, NFPA 72 Technical Committee on Single- and Multiple-Station Alarms and Household Fire Alarm Systems; (2) member, NFPA 921 Technical Committee on Fire and Explosion Investigation; (3) Chair, Fire Detection and Alarm Research Council; and (4) member, UL Standards Technical Panel 217 for Smoke Detectors and Alarms.

6. I have been qualified and given testimony in fire-related and smoke alarm cases in state and federal courts. My expert opinions have never been stricken or limited.

7. I understand that Plaintiffs, through B. Don Russell, Ph.D., have challenged my opinion in this case that the smoke alarm at issue in this case sounded during the fire. Dr. Russell in his Affidavit contends that the forensic method of enhanced soot deposition (“ESD”) is not reliable in that it does not use accepted scientific protocols, has not been peer reviewed, is not repeatable, and has not been tested “under the wide variety of fire conditions that can reasonably be anticipated to occur in a home.” Dr. Russell’s statements simply

are not true. The ESD method has been tested, peer-reviewed, and deemed scientifically reliable.

8. Among those who regularly work in this field, the method referred to as enhanced soot deposition (also known as acoustic soot agglomeration) is recognized as a reliable forensic protocol to analyze the presence of smoke particulate around various openings of a horn assembly for the purpose of evaluating whether the alarm sounded during a fire exposure. Besides the testing and work I have personally done, the methodology has been tested and validated by multiple scientists (Worrell 2001, Worrell 2003, Phelan 2004, Kennedy 2004, Mealy 2008, Mealy 2011, Woycheese 2006) and evaluated and accepted by the forensic community (NFPA 921). See paragraph 11 below re: NFPA 921's acceptance of ESD in its 2011 edition.

9. Enhanced soot deposition ("ESD") during sounding of an alarm has been systematically studied and independently evaluated by multiple investigators and has also been recognized as a repeatable phenomenon by those involved with smoke alarm testing. The studies cited in the literature have been performed by at least four independent organizations and have included multiple faculty members at leading fire science universities, that is, University of Maryland, Worcester Polytechnic Institute and University of Edinburgh.

10. Publications on ESD have appeared in at least three separate papers in a leading fire science peer-reviewed journal (Fire Technology) and presented in a range of venues, including Interflam, the International

Symposium on Fire Investigations, NFPA 921 Technical Committee, and as a master's thesis at Worcester Polytechnic Institute.

11. The National Fire Protection Association ("NFPA"), which was founded in 1896, is a global, nonprofit organization "devoted to eliminating death, injury, property and economic loss due to fire." (As viewed on NFPA's website, <http://www.nfpa.org/press-room>, on May 31, 2016). NFPA 921 is recognized as an authoritative reference for fire investigation.

Beginning with its 2011 edition, NFPA 921 specifically identified ESD as an appropriate method to determine if a smoke alarm sounded or did not sound during a given fire. Thus, ESD has been recognized as an approved forensic method.

12. Plaintiffs' proposed expert, Dr. Russell, objected to NFPA 921's inclusion of ESD as an approved forensic method in its 2011 edition. NFPA 921's Technical Committee reviewed and rejected Dr. Russell's proposal to exclude ESD from NFPA 921. The explanatory statement for rejecting Dr. Russell's proposal was: "The use of acoustic soot agglomeration for the determination of smoke detector activation is supported in the scientific literature. as referenced in the original proposal." See attached excerpt from NFPA 921's 2010 meeting, as Exhibit 1-B. Thus, it is Dr. Russell who is out of the mainstream with his views on ESD.

13. The various studies performed to evaluate and validate the forensic methodology of using enhanced soot deposition have included a range of fire and non-fire conditions, including cooking events and other nuisance sources,

fires in small test chambers, fires in multi-room structures, fires in full-scale apartment and house tests with and without flashover conditions. The wide variety of fire conditions resulted in smoke alarms that ranged from not being thermally affected to those that had charred plastic and some that were largely consumed by the fire. Fuel sources were varied from gas fires to flaming and smoldering polyurethane, wood, paper, cardboard, cables, cotton and upholstered furniture and kitchen cabinets. Besides smoldering and flaming, fires included slow growing to fast developing arson scenarios.

14. Amongst the various studies performed and presented in the literature, over 450 fire exposed smoke alarms (both powered and non-powered) were evaluated in assessing and validating the use of enhanced smoke deposition. The wide range of fire conditions, makes and models of smoke alarms, and different exposure conditions amongst these hundreds of trials has established a significant database to evaluate the use of enhanced soot deposition. (Worrell 2001, Worrell 2003, Phelan 2004, Mealy 2011).

15. ESD has been evaluated using blind studies so that the people evaluating the smoke alarms did not know which alarms had or had not sounded during a fire. The results demonstrate reliable conclusions of determining when a smoke alarm sounded. These results have been reported in the various studies cited above. For example, the work of Mealy et al (2011) validated the use of the heuristics developed by Phelan (2004) by exposing 78 smoke alarms to a range of full-scale apartment structure fire tests. Of the 47 smoke alarms that had sufficient evidence to evaluate (*i.e.*, some were

excessively burned and consumed and some not exposed to enough smoke), alarm activation was determined with 100% accuracy.

16. The data collected over the four main studies (Worrell 2001, Worrell 2003, Phelan 2004, Mealy 2011) that have examined the use of ESD to determine whether or not a smoke alarm activated in a fire demonstrates a statistically significant, strong correlation in the accuracy of the methodology that was used in the determinations. The future distribution of the “success” or “failure” of a determination made by using this methodology was considered to determine the confidence level of the testing. In this analysis, a Bayesian method was determined to be the most appropriate. A Bayesian method considers the weight of the generic data, can account for the statistical significance of the data, and is a consistent way to treat data when the data has no failures (EPRI, 2013). This method is used and supported within the Nuclear industry for probabilistic risk assessment (PRA) and is approved by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (PRA, 1983).

Based on the Bayesian method using a Jeffreys non-informative priors, the confidence level in the ability of the ESD methodology to correctly determine whether a smoke alarm activated was determined to be 99.6%. This represents almost a three sigma level of confidence in the reliability of the testing. Similarly, when analyzing the testing data for the ability of ESD methodology to correctly determine whether a smoke alarm failed to activate, the confidence level was calculated to be 99.5%.

17. ESD patterns are generally persistent and will remain over the course of time. As such, it is true that one cannot necessarily tell the time that the patterns occurred just by looking at the pattern. However, with additional information regarding case facts and timeline of events, the occurrence of the ESD can be made with certainty and correlated to a specific fire.

No evidence exists that this particular alarm had been in an earlier fire, period, much less an earlier fire resulting in smoke exposure significant enough to have caused the distinct ESD patterns I observed on the subject smoke alarm. Typical cooking and nuisance alarms have been shown to not produce ESD associated with a sounding alarm in response to a fire. (Phelan, 2004). Also, the tests cited above have shown that if a fire is not large enough or does not burn for a sufficient amount of time, distinct enhanced soot deposition will not occur. Thus, the technical literature demonstrates numerous cases in which smoke alarms have been exposed to fire, but the resulting smoke and soot was insufficient to leave a discernable pattern.

Based on the ESD testing combined with inquiry into relevant historical facts, it is my scientific opinion that the prominent ESD patterns I observed on the subject smoke alarm could not have been caused by a prior fire. I also learned in my investigation that the subject smoke alarm had been inspected and tested within months of the subject fire and determined to be in good working order. Finally, circumstantial evidence suggesting the subject alarm had been knocked from its ceiling mount at some point during the fire also is consistent with the alarm having sounded during this fire.

In conclusion, in the absence of any evidence whatsoever that would suggest that the subject smoke alarm had been previously exposed to another fire or soot sufficient to create distinct soot deposition patterns, it is my opinion, to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, that the distinct soot deposition patterns I observed on the subject smoke alarm indicate that the alarm sounded in this fire.

18. The following is a list of publications referenced herein:

EPRI Guidelines for PRA Data Analysis (2013), 3002000774, Technical Update, December 2013.

Kennedy, K.C., Gorbett, G.E., Kennedy, P.M (2004), "A Fire Analysis Tool – Revisited, Acoustic Soot Agglomeration in Residential Smoke Alarms," Poster presented at Interflam 2004 – 10th International Fire Science and Engineering Conference, Edinburgh, Scotland, July 6, 2004.

Mealy, C.L. and Gottuk, D.T. (2008), "Full-Scale Validation Tests of a Forensic Methodology to Determine Smoke Alarm Response," Proceedings – 2008 *International Symposium on Fire Investigation Science and Technology*, Cincinnati, OH, May 18–21, 2008, pp. 133–142.

Mealy, C.L. and Gottuk, D.T. (2011), "Full-Scale Validation Tests of a Forensic Methodology to Determine Smoke Alarm Response," *Fire Technology*, 47 (1), January 2011, pp. 275–289.

NFPA 921 (2011), "Guide for Fire & Explosion Investigations," National Fire Protection Association, Quincy, MA, 2011.

NFPA 921 (2014), "Guide for Fire & Explosion Investigations," National Fire Protection Association, Quincy, MA, 2014.

Phelan, P. (2004), "An Investigation of Enhanced Soot Deposition on Smoke Alarm Horns," Thesis, Master of Science, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, May 2004.

PRA Procedures Guide (1983): A Guide to the Performance of Probabilistic Risk Assessments for Nuclear Power Plants, NUREG/CR-2300, Vol. 1, Prepared under the auspices of the American Nuclear Society (ANS) and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) for the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC, January 1983.

Worrell, C.L., Roby, R.J., Streit, L., Torero, J.L. (2001), "Enhanced Deposition, Acoustic Agglomeration, and Chladni Figures in Smoke Detectors," *Fire Technology*, 37, 343-362, 2001.

Worrell, C.L., Lynch, J.A., Jomaas, G., Roby, R.J., Streit, L., Torero, J.L. (2003), "Effect of Smoke Source and Horn Configuration on Enhanced Deposition, Acoustic Agglomeration, and Chladni Figures in Smoke Detectors," Fire Technology, 39, 309-346, 2003.

Woycheese, J., Gottuk, D., and Phelan, P. (2006), "An Investigation of Enhanced Soot Deposition on Smoke Alarm Horns: Experiments and Observations," 2006 International Symposium on Fire Investigation Science and Technology, Cincinnati, Ohio, June 26-28, 2006, pp. 343-352.

FURTHER, AFFIANT SAYETH NOT.



Daniel T. Gottuk

DANIEL T. GOTTUK
VP of Specialty Services, Technical
Director

Dated: 5/31/2016

SUBSCRIBED and SWORN to before me this 31st day of May, 2016.

Elizabeth M. Pigott-Dubyoski
Notary Public

My Commission Expires:

03/19/2017



DANIEL T. GOTTUK, PE, PhD

VP of Specialty Services, Technical Director

Experience: 27 Years

Joined JENSEN HUGHES: 1992

Education

Ph.D., Mechanical Engineering,
Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1992

B.S., Mechanical Engineering,
Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1989

Registered PE

AL, No. 29227-E (2008)

RI, No. 7087 (1999)

MD, No. 23144 (1998)

Associations

- Member, National Fire Protection Association (NFPA)
- Member, The International Association for Fire Safety Science (IAFSS)
- Member, The Society of Fire Protection Engineers (SFPE)

Security Clearances

DoD, Secret

(410) 737-8677

dgottuk@jensenhughes.com

Daniel Gottuk, PE, PhD, is VP of Specialty Services and the Technical Director of Jensen Hughes. The Specialty Services group includes forensic, R&D and environmental services. With 27 years of experience, he is a recognized expert in fire detection and fire dynamics and is well published in the technical literature. He draws on his extensive experimental background and his long involvement in national codes and standards to provide clients practical and technically sound solutions to their problems. Dr. Gottuk has evaluated fire development and fire protection systems in shipboard, residential and industrial applications. He has forensically analyzed a wide range of consumer products and assisted clients in product development and litigation matters. His research includes both basic and applied forensic studies to develop fundamental understanding of fire dynamics, pattern formation and damage assessment as well as to develop practical forensic tools for fire scene investigations and analyses.

PROFESSIONAL HIGHLIGHTS

VP of Specialty Services, Technical Director, JENSEN HUGHES, Baltimore, MD, present. Responsible for the forensic, R&D and Environmental services. As Technical Director, Dr. Gottuk is responsible for establishing the overall technical direction and initiatives for the company and maintaining technical excellence. He provides oversight for the supervision and management of senior staff and is involved with strategic planning for the company. He manages Jensen Hughes' on-site engineering support for the ATF Fire Research Laboratory.

Director of Forensics and R&D, JENSEN HUGHES, Baltimore, MD, 2012–2014. Responsible for forensic and R&D services, including the supervision and management of senior and staff engineers. Project manager for a variety of fire related forensic, research, testing, and development programs.

Senior Engineer, JENSEN HUGHES, Baltimore, MD, 1992–2012. Project manager for a variety of fire related research, testing, and development programs. Responsible for the planning execution and analysis of experimental fire research and development studies in the areas of fire dynamics, fire detection and suppression, instrument development, and material performance. Work also includes the use of fire dynamics principles and models in applications of fire hazard analyses, fire investigations, and fire protection code equivalency assessments. Examples of projects include the evaluation and development of advanced fire detection systems; the evaluation of liquid fuel fires; and backdraft explosion environments. Work includes experimental and analytical work in support of litigation. Responsible for the determination of origin and cause, and the analysis of fire growth and the response of fire protection systems.



DANIEL T. GOTTUK, PE, PhD, VP of Specialty Services, Technical Director



PROFESSIONAL HIGHLIGHTS

Researcher, Mechanical Engineering Department, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, VA, 1989–1992.

Conducted experimental research and chemical kinetics modeling of the generation of carbon monoxide in compartment fires. Supervised undergraduate research assistants.

Systems/Integration and Test Engineer, General Electric Astro Space Division, Princeton, NJ, 1988–1989. Developed integration and testing procedures for satellite production.

Research Assistant, Mechanical Engineering Department, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, VA, 1988–1989. Conducted research and development in the study of flame detection. Examined the feasibility of using flame spectroscopy and chemiluminescence as a fast response method for flame detection.

PROFESSIONAL STANDING (CONTINUED):

Committees, Boards, and Panels

Member, Technical Committee on Single- and Multiple-Station Alarms and Household Fire Alarm Systems (SIG-HOU), NFPA 72

Member/Chair, Technical Committee on Carbon Monoxide Detection (SIG-CAR), NFPA 720

Member, Technical Committee on Fire Investigation (FIA-AAA), NFPA 921

Member, Technical Committee on Fire Investigator Professional Qualifications (PQU-FIV), NFPA 1033

Member/Chair, Fire Detection & Alarm Research Council

Member, UL Standards Technical Panel 217 for Smoke Detectors and Alarms

Member, UL Standards Technical Panel 2034 for Carbon Monoxide Alarms and Gas Detectors

Technical Journals and Books

Editor of the *8th Symposium of the International Association of Fire Safety Science*

Editorial Board, *Fire Technology*

Editorial Board, *Fire Science Reviews*

Reviewer, *International Symposium on Fire Safety Science*

Reviewer, *Fire and Materials*

Reviewer, *Journal of Fire Sciences*

Reviewer, *Fire Safety Journal*

Awards

Foundation Medal for the best and most noteworthy research project, "Development of Standardized Cooking Fires for Evaluation of Prevention Technologies: Data Analysis," 2015

Hats Off Award from the Society of Fire Protection Engineers, 2015

Ronald K. Mengel Award for the most outstanding detection presentation at *Suppression, Detection and Signaling Research and Application Symposium*, SUPDET 2010

Jack Bono Engineering Communications Award for the *Journal of Fire Protection Engineering* paper that most contributed to the achievement and application of professional fire protection in 2006, 2007

Harry C. Bigglestone Award, Excellence in Communication of Fire Protection Concepts, 2004

Royal Institute of Naval Architects/Lloyds Register, Safer Ship Award, Advanced Damage Control Technology, 2003

Alan Berman Research Publication Award, Naval Research Laboratory, 2003

Alan Berman Research Publication Award, Naval Research Laboratory, 2000

PATENTS

Roby, R.J., Gottuk, D.T., and Beyler, C.L., "Multi-signature Fire Detector," U.S. Patent No. 5,691,703, November 25, 1997

**SELECTED PUBLICATIONS LIST****DANIEL T. GOTTUK, PhD, PE**

- Gottuk, D.T. and Lattimer, B.Y., "Effect of Combustion Conditions on Species Production," Chapter 16, *The SFPE Handbook of Fire Protection Engineering*, Fifth Edition, Hurley, M.J. (ed.), 2016.
- Gottuk, D.T. and White, D.A., "Liquid Fuel Fires," Chapter 65, *The SFPE Handbook of Fire Protection Engineering*, Fifth Edition, Hurley, M.J. (ed.), 2016.
- Dinaburg, J. and Gottuk, D., "Smoke Alarm Nuisance Source Characterization: Review and Recommendations," *Fire Technology*, **51** (3), May 2015, pp. 479–748, DOI: 10.1007/s10694-015-0502-1.
- Dinaburg, J. and Gottuk, D., "Comparative Fire and Nuisance Performance of Beam Detectors," *15th International Conference on Automatic Fire Detection (AUBE 14)*, Duisburg, Germany, October 14–16, 2014, 8 p.
- Dinaburg, J., Gottuk, D., and Floyd, J., "Fire Source and Detection Response Characterization for High Airflow Applications," *15th International Conference on Automatic Fire Detection (AUBE 14)* Duisburg, Germany, October 14–16, 2014, 8 p.
- Dinaburg, J.B., Floyd, J., and Gottuk, D.T., "Validation of Modeling Tools for Detection Design in High Air flow Environments: Phase II – Task 2 and 3: Fire Source and Detection Response Characterization," prepared for the Fire Protection Research Foundation, Quincy, MA, Hughes Project #1DTG02049.010, July 31, 2014, 68 p.
- Floyd, J., Boehmer, H., and Gottuk, D.T., "Validation of Modeling Tools for Detection Design in High Air flow Environments: Phase II – Task 4b and 4c: Full Scale Model Verification and Validation," prepared for the Fire Protection Research Foundation, Quincy, MA, Hughes Project #1DTG02049.010, July 31, 2014, 72 p.
- Floyd, J. and Gottuk, D.T., "Validation of Modeling Tools for Detection Design in High Air flow Environments: Phase II – Task 5: Design Guidance," prepared for the Fire Protection Research Foundation, Quincy, MA, Hughes Project #1DTG02049.010, July 31, 2014, 27 p.
- Dinaburg, J.B. and Gottuk, D.T., "Development of Standardized Cooking Fires for Evaluation of Prevention Technologies: Data Analysis," prepared for the Fire Protection Research Foundation, Quincy, MA, Hughes Project #1DTG02049.009, July 18, 2014, 135 p.
- Dinaburg, J. and Gottuk, D., "Smoke Alarm Nuisance Source Characterization – Phase 1," prepared for the Fire Protection Research Foundation, Quincy, MA, March 2014, 59 p.
- Mealy, C., Benfer, M., and Gottuk, G., "Liquid Fuel Spill Fire Dynamics," *Fire Technology*, **50** (2), March 2014, pp. 419–436, DOI: 10.1007/s10694-012-0281-x.
- Dinaburg, J.B. and Gottuk, D.T., "Comparative Fire and Nuisance Performance of Beam Detectors," *Suppression, Detection and Signaling Research and Applications Symposium (SUPDET 2014)*, National Fire Protection Association, University of Central Florida Orlando, FL, March 4–7, 2014, 21 p.
- Gottuk, D.T. and Dinaburg, J.B., "Smoke Alarm Nuisance Source Characterization, Phase 1: Literature Review and Gap Analysis," *Suppression, Detection and Signaling Research and Applications Symposium (SUPDET 2014)*, National Fire Protection Association, University of Central Florida Orlando, FL, March 4–7, 2014, 20 p.
- Benfer, M. and Gottuk, D., "Electrical Receptacles - Overheating, Arcing, and Melting," *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Symposium*, International Association for Fire Safety Science (IAFSS), University of Canterbury, New Zealand, February 10–14, 2014, 14 p.
-

- Dinaburg, J.B. and Gottuk, D.T., "Development of Standardized Cooking Fires for Evaluation of Prevention Technologies: Phase One Data Analysis," prepared for the Fire Protection Research Foundation, Quincy, MA, Hughes Project #1DTG02049.009, October 14, 2013, 42 p.
- Benfer, M.E. and Gottuk, D.T., "Development and Analysis of Electrical Receptacle Fires," Grant No. 2010-DN-BX-K218, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, Department of Justice, September 12, 2013.
- Gottuk, D.T. and Dinaburg, J.B., "Video Image Fire Detection and Optical Flame Detection for Industrial Applications," *Fire Technology*, **49** (2), April 2013, pp. 213–251, DOI: 10.1007/s10694-012-0254-0.
- Mealy, C.L., Wolfe, A.J., and Gottuk, D.T., "Forensic Analysis of Ignitable Liquid Fuel Fires in Buildings," Grant No. 2009-DN-BX-K232, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, Department of Justice, February 15, 2013.
- Mealy, C.L. and Gottuk, D.T., "Ignitable Liquid Fuel Fires in Buildings – A Study of Fire Dynamics," Grant No. 2009-DN-BX-K232, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, Department of Justice, January 31, 2013.
- Benfer, M.E. and Gottuk, D.T., "Fire Effects on Receptacles," Proceedings – *2012 International Symposium on Fire Investigation Science and Technology*, University of Maryland University College, October 15–17, 2012.
- Mealy, C.L. and Gottuk, D.T., "A Study of Calcination of Gypsum Wallboard," Proceedings – *2012 International Symposium on Fire Investigation Science and Technology*, University of Maryland University College, October 15–17, 2012.
- Mealy, C.L. and Gottuk, D.T., "A Study of the Persistence of Ignitable Liquid Residue," Proceedings – *2012 International Symposium on Fire Investigation Science and Technology*, University of Maryland University College, October 15–17, 2012.
- Gottuk, D., Floyd, J., Dinaburg, J., and Williamson, J., "Validation of Modeling Tools for Detection Design in High Air Flow Environments – Final Phase I Report," prepared for the Fire Protection Research Foundation, Quincy, MA, August 2012, 50 p.
- Dinaburg, J. and Gottuk, D.T., "Fire Detection in Warehouse Facilities – Final Phase I Report," prepared for the Fire Protection Research Foundation, Quincy, MA, Hughes Project #1DTG02049.007, January 2012.
- Dinaburg, J. and Gottuk, D.T., "Home Cooking Fire Mitigation: Technology Assessment – Final Report," prepared for the Fire Protection Research Foundation, Quincy, MA, Hughes Project #1DTG02049.006, October 31, 2011.
- Mealy, C., Benfer, M., and Gottuk, D., "A Study of the Parameters Influencing Liquid Fuel Burning Rates," *Fire Safety Science – Proceedings of the 10th International Symposium*, International Association of Fire Safety Science, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, June 19–24, 2011.
- Mealy, C.L., Benfer, M., and Gottuk, D.T., "Fire Dynamics and Forensic Analysis of Liquid Fuel Fires," Grant No. 2008-DN-BX-K168, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, Department of Justice, February 18, 2011.
- Mealy, C.L. and Gottuk, D.T., "Full-Scale Validation Tests of a Forensic Methodology to Determine Smoke Alarm Response," *Fire Technology*, **47** (1), January 2011, pp. 275–289.
- Gottuk, D.T., "Single-and Multiple-Station Alarms and Household Fire Alarm Systems," Chapter 29, Sixth Edition, *NFPA 72–National Fire Alarm and Signaling Code Handbook*, National Fire Protection Association, Quincy, MA, 2010, pp. 669–718.

- Boehmer, H.R., Floyd, J.E., and Gottuk, D.T., "Evaluation of Calorimeter Heat Release Rate as Input to FDS Model for Simulation of Underventilated Compartment Fires," *Proceedings – 2010 International Symposium on Fire Investigation Science and Technology*, University of Maryland University College, September 28–29, 2010, pp. 93–104.
- Mealy, C.L., Benfer, M.E. and Gottuk, D.T., "Fire Dynamics and Forensic Analysis of Liquid Fuel Fires," *Proceedings – 2010 International Symposium on Fire Investigation Science and Technology*, University of Maryland University College, September 28–29, 2010, pp. 399–410.
- Wolfe, A.J., Mealy, C.L., and Gottuk, D.T., "Fire Dynamics of Limited Ventilation Compartment Fires," *Proceedings – 2010 International Symposium on Fire Investigation Science and Technology*, University of Maryland University College, September 28–29, 2010, pp. 603–614.
- Mealy, C.L. and Gottuk, D.T., "Experimental Validation of Smoke Detector Spacing Requirements and the Impact of these Requirements on Detector Performance," *Fire Technology*, **46** (3), July 2010, pp. 679–696.
- Gottuk, D.T. and Dinaburg, J.B., "Video Image Fire Detection and Optical Flame Detection for Industrial Applications," *Fire Suppression and Detection Research and Applications – A Technical Working Conference (SUPDET 2010)*, Orlando, FL, February 16–19, 2010, 32 p.
- Boehmer, H., Floyd, J., and Gottuk, D.T., "Fire Dynamics and Forensic Analysis of Limited Ventilation Compartment Fires – Volume 2: Modeling," Grant No. 2007-DN-BX-K240, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, Department of Justice, October 2009.
- Wolfe, A.J., Mealy, C.L., and Gottuk, D.T., "Fire Dynamics and Forensic Analysis of Limited Ventilation Compartment Fires – Volume 1: Experimental," Grant No. 2007-DN-BX-K240, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, Department of Justice, October 2009.
- Mealy, C.L., Wolfe, A.J., and Gottuk, D.T., "Smoke Alarm Response and Tenability," *AUBE '09 – Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Automatic Fire Detection*, Vol. 1, Duisburg, Germany, September 8–10, 2009, pp. 353–360.
- Mealy, C.L. and Gottuk, D.T., "Validation of Smoke Detection Response Methodologies," *AUBE '09 – Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Automatic Fire Detection*, Vol. 2, Duisburg, Germany, September 8–10, 2009, pp. 25–32.
- Minor, C.P., Steinhurst, D.A., Johnson, K.J., Rose-Pehrsson, S.L., Owrutsky, J.C., Wales, S.C., and Gottuk, D.T., "Multi-sensory Detection System For Damage Control And Situational Awareness," *AUBE '09 – Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Automatic Fire Detection*, Vol. 1, Duisburg, Germany, September 8–10, 2009, pp. 121–128.
- Kouchinsky, A.J., Gottuk, D.T., Dinaburg, J.B., Hill, S.A., Back, G.G., Farley, J.P., Rose-Pehrsson, S.L., Hunstad, M., Peter, A.J., and Callahan, B.M., "Advanced Magazine Fire Protection Program: Detection System Development," NRL/MR/6180--09-9199, Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, DC, July 27, 2009.
- Gottuk, D.T. and Lattimer, B.Y., "Effect of Combustion Conditions on Species Production," Section 2/Chapter 5, *The SFPE Handbook of Fire Protection Engineering*, Fourth Edition, DiNenno, P.J. (ed.), 2008.
- Gottuk, D.T. and White, D.A., "Liquid Fuel Fires," Section 2/Chapter 15, *The SFPE Handbook of Fire Protection Engineering*, Fourth Edition, DiNenno, P.J. (ed.), 2008.
- Mealy, C., Floyd, J., and Gottuk, D., "Smoke Detector Spacing Requirements Complex Beamed and Sloped Ceilings, Volume 1: Experimental Validation of Smoke Detector Spacing Requirements," prepared for the Fire Protection Research Foundation, Quincy, MA, April 2008.

- Floyd, J., Riahi, S., Mealy, C., and Gottuk, D., "Smoke Detector Spacing Requirements Complex Beamed and Sloped Ceilings, Volume 2: Modeling of and Requirements for Parallel Beamed, Flat Ceiling Corridors and Beamed, Sloped Ceilings," prepared for the Fire Protection Research Foundation, Quincy, MA, April 2008.
- Gottuk, D.T., "Household Fire Warning Equipment," Section 14.6, *NFPA Fire Protection Handbook*, Twentieth Edition, Cote, A.E. (Editor-in-Chief), National Fire Protection Association, Quincy, MA, 2008, pp. 14-79–14-88.
- Gottuk, D.T., "Video Image Detection Systems Installation Performance Criteria Research Project," prepared for the Fire Protection Research Foundation, Quincy, MA, October 2008.
- Gottuk, D., Mealy, C., and Floyd, J., "Smoke Transport and FDS Validation," *Fire Safety Science – Proceedings of the 9th International Symposium*, International Association of Fire Safety Science, Karlsruhe, Germany, September 21–26, 2008, pp. 129–140.
- Gottuk, D., Do, C., and Mawhinney, J., "International Road Tunnel Fire Detection Research Project – Tasks 5 and 6: Monitoring and Fire Demonstrations in the Lincoln Tunnel," prepared for the Fire Protection Research Foundation, Quincy, MA, June 11, 2008.
- Mealy, C.L. and Gottuk, D.T., "Full-Scale Validation Tests of a Forensic Methodology to Determine Smoke Alarm Response," *Proceedings – 2008 International Symposium on Fire Investigation Science and Technology*, Cincinnati, OH, May 18–21, 2008, pp. 133–142.
- Hammonda, M.H., Rose-Pehrsson, S.L., Gottuk, D.T., Lynch, J.A., Tilletc, D., and Streckertc, H., "Cement Microsensors for Fire Detection," *Sensor and Actuators B: Chemical*, **130** (1), March 2008, pp. 240–248.
- Gottuk, D.T., "Single- and Multiple-Station Alarms and Household Fire Alarm Systems," Chapter 11, *National Fire Alarm Code Handbook*, Fifth Edition, L.F. Richardson and W.D. Moore (eds.), National Fire Protection Association, 2007.
- Beyler, C.L. and Gottuk, D.T., "Development of a Technical Basis for Carbon Monoxide Detector Siting," prepared for the Fire Protection Research Foundation, Quincy, MA, October 2007.
- Mealy, C.L. and Gottuk, D.T., "Unventilated Compartment Fires," *Proceedings – 2006 International Symposium on Fire Investigation Science and Technology*, Cincinnati, Ohio, June 26–28, 2006, pp. 107–118.
- Woycheese, J., Gottuk, D., and Phelan, P., "An Investigation of Enhanced Soot Deposition on Smoke Alarm Horns: Experiments and Observations," *2006 International Symposium on Fire Investigation Science and Technology*, Cincinnati, Ohio, June 26–28, 2006, pp. 343–352.
- Mealy, C.L. and Gottuk, D.T., "A Study of Unventilated Fire Scenarios for the Advancement of Forensic Investigations of Arson Crimes," Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, Department of Justice, 981JCXK003, 2006.
- Gelman, J.P. and Gottuk, D.T., "Evaluation of Smoke Detector Response Estimation Methods: Part I – Optical Density, Temperature Rise and Velocity at Alarm," *Journal of Fire Protection Engineering*, **16** (4), November 2006, pp. 251–268.
- Gottuk, D.T., Lynch, J.A., Rose-Pehrsson, S.L., Owrutsky, J.C., and Williams, F.W., "Video Image Fire Detection for Shipboard Use," *Fire Safety Journal*, **41** (4), June 2006, pp. 321–326.
- Owrutsky, J.C., Steinhurst, D.A., Minor, C.P., Rose-Pehrsson, S.L., Williams, F.W., and Gottuk, D.T., "Long Wavelength Video Detection of Fire in Ship Compartments," *Fire Safety Journal*, **41** (4), June 2006, pp. 315–320.
- Rose-Pehrsson, S.L., Minor, C.P., Steinhurst, D.A., Owrutsky, J.C., Lynch, J.A., Gottuk, D.T., Wales, S.C., Farley, J. P., and Williams, F.W., "Volume Sensor for Damage Assessment and Situational Awareness," *Fire Safety Journal*, **41** (4), June 2006, pp. 301–310.

- Geiman, J.A. and Gottuk, D.T., "Reducing Fire Deaths in Older Adults: Optimizing the Smoke Alarm Signal Research Project. Summary Technical Report," prepared for the Fire Protection Research Foundation, Quincy, MA, May 2006.
- Gottuk, D.T., Lynch, J.A., Rose-Pehrsson, S.L., Owrutsky, J.C., and Williams, F.W., "Video Image Fire Detection for Shipboard Use," *AUBE '04 – Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Automatic Fire Detection*, Duisburg, Germany, September 14–16, 2004.
- Owrutsky, J.C., Steinhurst, D.A., Minor, C.P., Rose-Pehrsson, S.L., Gottuk, D.T., and F.W. Williams "Long Wavelength Video Detection of Fire in Ship Compartments," *AUBE '04 – Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Automatic Fire Detection*, Duisburg, Germany, September 14–16, 2004.
- Rose-Pehrsson, S.L., Owrutsky, J.C., Wales, S.C., Farley, J.P., Williams, F.W., Steinhurst, D.A., Minor, C.P., Gottuk, D.T., and Lynch, J.A., "Volume Sensor for Damage Assessment and Situation Awareness," *AUBE '04 – Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Automatic Fire Detection*, Duisburg, Germany, September 14–16, 2004.
- Gottuk, D.T. and Scheffey, J.L., "Fire Hazard Analysis," *Guidelines for Fire Protection for Chemical, Petrochemical, and Hydrocarbon Processing Facilities*, Chapter 5, Center for Chemical Process Safety, American Institute of Chemical Engineers, New York, NY, 2003, pp. 54–98.
- Milke, J.A., Hulcher, M. E., Worrell, C.L., Gottuk, D.T., and Williams, F.W., "Investigation of Multi-Sensor Algorithms for Fire Detection," *Fire Technology*, **39**, 2003, pp. 363–382.
- Rose-Pehrsson, S.L., Hart, S.J., Street, T.T., Williams, F.W., Hammond, M.H., Gottuk, D.T., Wright, M.T., and Wong, J.T., "Early Warning Fire Detection System Using a Probabilistic Neural Network," *Fire Technology*, **39**, 2003, pp. 147–171.
- Gottuk, D.T. and Lattimer, B.Y., "Effect of Combustion Conditions on Species Production," Section 2/Chapter 5, *The SFPE Handbook of Fire Protection Engineering*, Third Edition, P.J. DiNenno (ed.), 2002.
- Gottuk, D.T. and McKenna, L.A., "Spot and Aspirated Laser Smoke Detection in Telecommunication Facilities," *Fire Technology*, **38**, 2002, pp. 147–178.
- Gottuk, D.T., and White, D.A., "Liquid Fuel Fires," Section 2/Chapter 15, *The SFPE Handbook of Fire Protection Engineering*, Third Edition, P.J. DiNenno (ed.), 2002.
- Gottuk, D.T., Peatross, M.J., Roby, R.J., and Beyler, C.L., "Advanced Fire Detection Using Multi-Signature Alarm Algorithms," *Fire Safety Journal*, **37**, 2002, pp. 381–394.
- Geiman, J.A. and Gottuk, D.T., "Alarm Thresholds for Smoke Detector Modeling," *Fire Safety Science—Proceedings of the Seventh International Symposium*, Evans, D.D. (ed.), International Association for Fire Safety Science, Worcester, MA, June 16–21, 2002, pp. 197–208.
- Strege, S. and Gottuk, D.T., "An Evaluation of Magazine/Ordnance Cargo Hold Fire Detectors," HAI Project No. 1185-002, December 31, 2001.
- Gottuk, D.T. and McKenna, L.A., "Spot and Aspirated Laser Smoke Detection in Telecommunication Facilities," *AUBE '01 – Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Automatic Fire Detection*, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD, March 26–28, 2001, pp. 151–162.
- Rose-Pehrsson, S.L., Shaffer, R.E., Hart, S.J., Williams, F.W., Gottuk, D.T., Strehlen, B.D., and Hill, S.A., "Multi-Criteria Fire Detection Systems Using a Probabilistic Neural Network," *Sensors and Actuators*, B 69, 2000, pp. 325–335.

- Gottuk, D.T., Scheffey, J.L., Williams, F.W., Gott, J.E., and Tabet, R.J., "Optical Fire Detection (OFD) for Military Aircraft Hangars: Final Report on OFD Performance to Fuel Spill Fires and Optical Stresses," NRL/MR/6180--00-8457, Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, DC, May 22, 2000.
- Gottuk, D.T., Beitel, J.J., and Williams, F.W., "Final Report for Flammability Evaluation of Chairs," NRL Ltr Rpt Ser 6180/0001, Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, DC, February 18, 2000.
- Gottuk, D.T. and McKenna, L.A., "Final Report Response Time Comparison of Spot and Aspirated Laser Smoke Detection Technologies in a Telecommunications Facility," prepared for Notifier/Fire Lite Alarms, Northford, CT, November 10, 1999.
- Gottuk, D.T., Peatross, M.J., Farley, J.P., and Williams, F.W., "The Development and Mitigation of Backdraft: A Real-Scale Shipboard Study," *Fire Safety Journal*, **33** (4), November 1999, pp. 261–282.
- Gottuk, D.T., Hill, S.A., Schemel, C.F., Strehlen, B.D., Rose-Phersson, S.L., Shaffer, R.E., Tatem, P.A., and Williams, F.W., "Identification of Fire Signatures for Shipboard Multi-criteria Fire Detection Systems," NRL/MR/6180--99-8386, Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, DC, June 18, 1999.
- Gottuk, D.T., Peatross, M.J., Roby, R.J., and Beyler, C.L., "Advanced Fire Detection Using Multi-signature Alarm Algorithms," *AUBE '99 – Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Automatic Fire Detection*, Duisburg, Germany, March 16–18, 1999, pp. 237–250.
- Gottuk, D.T. and Williams, F.W., "Multi-criteria Fire Detection: A Review of the State-of-the-Art," NRL Ltr Rpt Ser 6180/0472, Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, DC, September 10, 1998.
- Williams, F.W., Peatross, M.J., Gottuk, D.T., and Roby, R.J., "Evaluation of Hydrocarbon Measurement Techniques in Class B Fire Environments," NRL/MR/6180--97-7913, Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, DC, January 13, 1997.
- Gottuk, D.T., Williams, F.W., and Farley, J.P., "The Development and Mitigation of Backdrafts: A Full-scale Experimental Study," *Fire Safety Science – Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium*, International Association of Fire Safety Science, 1997, pp. 935–946.
- Gottuk, D.T. and Roby, R.J., "Effect of Combustion Conditions on Species Production," Section 2/Chapter 7, *The SFPE Handbook of Fire Protection Engineering*, P.J. DiNenno (ed.), Second Edition, June 1995.
- Gottuk, D.T., Roby, R.J., and Beyler, C.L., "The Role of Temperature on Carbon Monoxide Production in Compartment Fires," *Fire Safety Journal*, **24**, June 1995, pp. 315–331.
- Rhodes, B.T., Beitel, J.J., Gottuk, D.T., Beyler, C.L., Rosenbaum, E.R., and Haecker, C.F., "Analytical and Experimental Evaluation of Solid Waste Drum Fire Performance," WHC-SD-WM-TRP-233, Rev 0, 1995.
- Beitel, J.J., Gottuk, D.T., Rhodes, B.T., Beyler, C.L., and Haecker, C.F., "Solid Waste Drum Array Fire Performance," WHC-SD-WM-TRP-246 Rev 0, 1995.
- Gottuk, D.T., "Generation of Carbon Monoxide in Compartment Fires," NIST-GCR-92-619, National Institute of Standards and Technology, 1992.
- Gottuk, D.T., Roby, R.J., and Beyler, C.L., "A Study of Carbon Monoxide and Smoke Yields from Compartment Fires with External Burning," *Twenty-Fourth Symposium (International) on Combustion*, The Combustion Institute, Pittsburgh, PA, 1992, pp. 1729–1735.
- Gottuk, D.T., Roby, R.J., Beyler, C.L., and Peatross, M.J., "Carbon Monoxide Production in Compartment Fires," *The Journal of Fire Protection Engineering*, **4** (4), October/November/December 1992, pp. 133–150.

Report on Comments – November 2010**NFPA 921**921-20 Log #84
(6.2.10.3)**Final Action: Reject****Submitter:** B. Don Russell, Texas A&M University**Comment on Proposal No:** 921-79**Recommendation:** For the reasons set forth in Section 5 below, the entire proposed methodology on soot deposition should be eliminated and not included in this edition of NFPA 921.**Substantiation:** NFPA 921 should only include accepted scientific theories and methods derived therefrom. As a practical document, NFPA 921 should not include any hypotheses that are not broadly proven and practiced. The basic scientific question is how much testing and validation must a hypothesis receive before it can be elevated to a theory. In practical terms, the proof of a hypothesis should not be based on a small handful of researchers running a limited number of experiments, under limited protocols and conditions. I am not questioning the reporting accuracy for the data collected by the researchers cited. However, the hypothesis that soot deposition analysis can generally be used to prove the sounding, or not, of smoke alarms under a broad range of conditions with acceptable levels of false positives and false negatives has not yet been proven by the cited researchers or by broader, independent testing and experiments conducted by researchers outside the current small community.

The theory set forth in 6.2.10.3 "Enhanced Soot Deposition on Smoke Alarms" does not have broad scientific basis and validation and therefore should not be included. It is still a hypothesis. The number of researchers who have conducted statistically valid experiments and the total body of results that have been presented for scientific review is inadequate to prove this concept and create a theory for practical use. With no criticism of the work of any individual researcher, the total number of independent researchers and their peer reviewed papers that have been published on this subject is miniscule. Without respect to the quality of the individual work of any individual researcher, the total body of work is insufficient to prove the theory reliable under the wide range of fire conditions-that must be addressed by NFPA 921.

There are specific scientific concerns that have not been addressed in the test protocols of researchers. All causes of false positives and false negatives are not yet scientifically established nor is the rate of false indications established using statistically accepted methods. The peer reviewed papers that are cited in substantiation for this modification to NFPA 921 show multiple repetition of authors or dependent connections between authors. One must ask what significant group of informed scientists provided the peer review for this relatively small community of individuals who have acquired data or analyzed data on smoke alarm soot deposition. In truth, the number of practitioners of smoke alarm soot deposition analysis is an exceptionally small community and the peer reviewed literature from this community, to date, is insufficient to support this theory for broad practical application.

While a review of the papers cited in the substantiation cannot be completed here, there are certain obvious questions. The wording leaves the reader with the impression that the presence of soot deposition on a smoke alarm indicates that the alarm has just sounded in the fire under investigation. It must be noted that prior smoky conditions, including specifically previous kitchen fires, may establish various levels of soot patterns that persist over time or are enhanced over time, unrelated to the last fire that occurred or the current fire under investigation. Furthermore, no scientific work has been performed to create a formula or a method where researchers or investigators can determine (a) when the smoke detector first sounded in the subject fire, or (b) how long the smoke alarm sounded in the fire.

Based on the above, investigators using this technique are left with significant scientific uncertainty even with the presence of soot deposition on smoke alarms. If they reach a positive conclusion of soot deposition patterns on a specific smoke alarm, they must also conclude that (1) they do not know when the smoke alarm sounded in the fire, (2) they do not know how long the smoke alarm sounded in the fire, and (3) they do not know if the smoke alarm sounded in this fire or in some previous smoky condition or fire that occurred at an unknown time. Investigators analyzing soot deposition patterns on smoke alarms after a specific fire do not know the condition of the smoke detector prior to the fire with respect to previous soundings to smoke conditions. Therefore, no conclusion can be reached that the mere presence of soot deposition patterns on or inside a given smoke detector originate from the subject fire of investigation as opposed to previous soundings of the detector in previous smoky conditions and/or fires (e.g. kitchen fires). Given these uncertainties that are obvious limitations to the proposed technique as set forth in the cited literature, the technique becomes virtually useless for drawing practical conclusions related to a specific fire under investigation.

I have conducted hundreds of smoke alarm fire tests under a wide range of fire conditions. Figures 6.2.10.3(c),(d) showing soot deposition around the exterior of the horn face are not at all representative of the post fire condition of the vast majority of smoke detectors that I have reviewed from my own experiments of staged fires or in the case of naturally occurring fires I have investigated. In fact, the condition represented in these figures is very rare even after exposure of smoke detectors to multiple fires. Therefore, the inclusion of these figures without qualification as to its



Report on Comments – November 2010**NFPA 921**

representation of an extreme condition is misleading and inappropriate. Based on experiments that are documented with data available from the Smoke Detector Test Facility of the Texas Engineering Experiment Station, deposition of significant patterns at the face of smoke detectors exposed to one significant fire, or multiple significant fires, or multiple low smoke fires do not show the patterns indicated in Figure 6.2.10.3(c),(d) for smoke alarms that sounded. (Data records, Smoke Detector Test Facility, Dr. B. Don Russell, Texas Engineering Experiment Station, Texas A&M University System, College Station, Texas, 77843.)

It should also be qualified in the text of the document that the presence of soot deposition on or inside a smoke alarm provides no indication as to when the smoke alarm sounded in the subject fire under investigation. A smoke alarm sounding late in a fire after victims are deceased may develop smoke deposition patterns (or not!). The levels, and quantity, and characteristics of the smoke and the location of the detector with respect to the fire source will all affect levels of soot deposition, if any, and the time progression of soot deposition in a given fire. There has been no scientific research relating the specific patterns of soot deposition on specific smoke detectors to a timeline of sounding in a given fire under given fire development conditions. Since no such formula exists, an analysis of these factors is speculative based on unknown conditions of a given fire; therefore, no conclusions can be reached based on analysis of soot deposition patterns as to how long a smoke detector sounded and/or when a smoke detector sounded in a given fire.

The language of the proposed additions to NFPA 921 with respect to soot deposition leave the incorrect impression to those not skilled in this specific art that the mere presence of accumulated soot on the outside, inside, or on the horn area of a smoke alarm is an indication that the alarm worked as designed, and is intended, and provided a timely warning, etc. None of these conclusions can be scientifically reached. An investigator seeing soot deposition patterns on a smoke detector following a given fire can only conclude that it is possible that the smoke alarm sounded, with an unknown probability, in one or more fires, not necessarily the subject fire under investigation. Once again, the investigator can conclude nothing as to when the smoke alarm sounded in the fire or the duration of it sounding in the fire, early or late. It should be noted that the design of certain smoke alarm horns allow for the partial failure of the horn resulting in vibration at a low sound level (non resonant condition) without the required volume to awaken residents. Soot deposition patterns could theoretically form around the horn even though the alarm sound level is far too low to be effective. This failure mode of smoke alarms has not been adequately addressed in the proposed method.

Unless the proposed language of soot deposition analysis is highly qualified in this document, many investigators attempting to use this section of NFPA 921 will reach erroneous or misleading conclusions and/or will not understand, the limits of the methodology with respect to conclusions in their specific fire investigation.

In conclusion, soot deposition analysis of smoke alarms is not yet broadly proven nor its limitations fully established by broad experimentation and repetition of experiments by a significant number of independent researchers and practitioners. Without respect to the issue of overall validity, the uncertainties of specific conclusions that can be reached by fire investigators make the technique of little practical use and frequently misleading as to its support for findings in any specific fire investigation.

Even if this technique ultimately is proven reliable, which will require much greater definition of error rates and extensive independent testing under carefully designed protocols, it should not be included in this document at this time because it remains a hypothesis that does not yet meet the requirements of the scientific method to be elevated to a theory. To include the method at this stage will violate basic principles of the scientific method.

While it is my preference that the proposed analytical method of soot deposition analysis be struck and not included in this revision of NFPA 921, the newness of this proposed technique and the lack of broad, independent testing and validation, coupled with the technical limitations and unknown error rates, demand that the technique be at least qualified significantly with adequate warnings as to the limitations of the technique if it is to be used by fire investigators. Hence, I have proposed 6.2.10.3.4 and 6.2.10.3.5 to provide clarity as to the limitations of the technique under the best of conditions.

My qualifications to offer these opinions as to the scientific validity of the proposed hypothesis (alleged theory) include 35 years of scientific research and experimentation. I am a Regents Professor and Distinguished Professor of the Texas A&M University System. I am a fellow of five societies, hold the Bovay Chair at Texas A&M, and am a member of The National Academy of Engineering. I teach the scientific method and its application to electrical design engineers.

Committee Meeting Action: Reject

Committee Statement: The use of acoustic soot agglomeration for the determination of smoke detector activation is supported in the scientific literature, as referenced in the original proposal.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
WESTERN DIVISION

FURLANDARE SINGLETON, Individually and :
as Administrator of the Estate of Dequan :
Singleton, Syndi Singleton, and Haylee Singleton, : Case No.: 4:15-CV-205-KGB
Decedents; and CLYDE HATCHETT, :
Individually, and as Administrator of the Estate of :
Emily Beavers, Deceased :

v. :

ARKANSAS HOUSING AUTHORITIES :
PROPERTY & CASUALTY SELF-INSURED :
FUND, INC., *et al.* :

MARILYN LOUISE BEAVERS, Individually, :
and as Administrator of the Estate of MARILYN :
BEAVERS, DECEASED :

v. :

ARKANSAS HOUSING AUTHORITIES :
PROPERTY & CASUALTY SELF-INSURED :
FUND, INC., *et al.* :

**DEFENDANT, BRK BRANDS, INC.’S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF’S MOTION
TO STRIKE THE AFFIDAVIT OF DANIEL GOTTUK AND
TO EXCLUDE HIS TESTIMONY IN THIS MATTER**

Defendant, BRK Brands, Inc. (“BRK”), by and through its attorneys, Wright, Lindsey & Jennings, LLP, and Cozen O’Connor, oppose Plaintiff’s Motion to strike the affidavit of Daniel Gottuk and to exclude his testimony because Plaintiff’s contention that the methodology was flawed is misinformed and without basis. The enhanced soot deposition (“ESD”) methodology Gottuk followed to conclude that “there was a working smoke alarm that did sound at the time of the fire in this case” is scientifically valid, peer-reviewed, generally accepted and incorporated into the industry standard that governs fire investigations.

Plaintiff's position is supported only by the affidavit of a (previously undisclosed and entirely new) expert¹, who is not a fire scientist or fire protection engineer. B. Don Russell ("Russell") is an *electrical* engineer. Russell does not know and has never attempted to conduct an ESD or acoustic agglomeration analysis and does not know and has never attempted to come up with an alternative way of determining whether or when a smoke alarm sounded in response to a fire. His criticism that ESD analysis is unscientific and not generally accepted is misinformed and wrong.

ESD is not only the subject of several peer-reviewed scientifically valid and statistically significant studies, the National Fire Protection Agency ("NFPA"), comprised of industry experts, recognized its reliability and industry-wide acceptance by incorporating it into the national standard which governs fire investigations, NFPA 921. The NFPA is a global non-profit organization devoted to eliminating death, injury, property and economic loss due to fire and related hazards through the promulgation of consensus-based codes and standards. (Affidavit of Lori A. Streit, Ph.D. ("Streit Aff."), submitted in support hereof and attached as Exhibit A hereto at ¶ 22.) In fact, in 2010, the NFPA rejected similar contentions by Russell, concluding that ESD was accepted science. (Streit Aff. at ¶¶ 21-23.)

Unlike Russell, Dr. Gottuk is a fire protection engineer and fire scientist. Unlike Russell, Dr. Gottuk has conducted scientific and statistically significant research into ESD as a method for determining whether a smoke alarm sounded during a fire. Unlike Russell, Dr. Gottuk wrote and published a peer-reviewed article on the topic. Several other fire protection engineers and scientists similarly researched ESD and concur that it is a valid methodology for determining whether a smoke alarm sounded during a fire.

¹ BRK opposes Plaintiff's Motion to extend the expert deadlines to permit the untimely disclosure of Dr. Russell. To the extent Plaintiff's motion is denied, as it should be, Plaintiff has positively no evidentiary support for moving to strike Dr. Gottuk.

Dr. Gottuk is not alone in his opinion that the smoke alarm sounded here. BRK's independent expert, Lori A. Streit, Ph.D., (the scientist and author of published and peer reviewed ESD scientific analyses) also inspected the smoke alarm at issue macroscopically and microscopically pursuant to the developed and generally accepted ESD methodology and agreed-upon inspection protocol using specialized instruments. Based on her training, extensive experience and observations, Dr. Streit concurs with Dr. Gottuk that the smoke alarm sounded during this fire. (Streit Aff. ¶ 23.)

The Plaintiff cannot exclude evidence just because it does not support her case. This is especially true when that evidence comports with Plaintiff's admission that the decedents were awake and aware of the fire, tried to extinguish it, and at some point, knocked the smoke alarm down off the ceiling (likely to get it to stop sounding). It is undisputed that a smoke alarm's job is to notify occupants of a fire. The decedents here were undisputedly aware of this fire. While no one knows (nor can know) what alerted them to the fire nor when, nor why they did not escape, a jury should at least be able to hear what we do know - that this smoke alarm sounded. Where there is no reasonable basis to exclude Dr. Gottuk's opinions as unreliable, Plaintiff's motion to strike should be denied.

ARGUMENT

I. ESD Is A Scientific, Peer-Reviewed, Reliable And Industry Accepted Methodology For Determining Whether A Smoke Alarm Sounded During A Fire

In support of her motion to strike, the Plaintiff asserts that the scientific analysis known as "acoustic agglomeration" or "ESD" is not reliable because the work "has been statistically [in]significant". (See Affidavit of B. Don Russell ("Russell Aff.") at ¶ 10.) Dr. Russell is clearly unfamiliar with the body of scientific literature on acoustic agglomeration and appears to only be aware of the first publication as it relates to smoke alarm.

Scientific research and analysis of the phenomenon of what is known as “acoustic agglomeration” or the study of enhanced soot deposition patterns, is well documented throughout the literature and dates back to the scientist, Kundt’s findings in 1866. (*See* Streit Aff. at ¶ 9 and Exhibit B thereto.) It is well established that an acoustic field can greatly enhance the rate of particle agglomeration. (*See id.*, references 2, 5-9). It is also been shown by Tiwary et. al (*id.*, ref. 8) and Mendiknow (*id.*, ref. 2) that the conditions optimum for acoustic agglomeration are substantially similar to those exhibited by a sounding smoke alarm.

Contrary to Russell’s complaint that only a select group with vested interests (Russell Aff. ¶ 10) have researched this area, many scientists independently contributed to the body of research on ESD and acoustic agglomeration as a means to scientifically assess whether a smoke alarm sounded during a fire. (Streit Aff. ¶ 8.) This research is the subject of several peer-reviewed and published journal articles. (*Id.*)

The first study to apply the science of acoustic agglomeration to smoke alarm was published in January 2001 by several eminent fire scientists, including Dr. Streit. (Streit Aff. Ex. B.) In that study, numerous smoke alarms were mounted for testing in an actual full-scale house fire. The results of that research was presented and published in the Proceedings of the Fire Suppression and Detection Research Application Symposium at The Fire Protection Research Foundation Annual Meeting in January of 2001. (Streit Aff. ¶ 10.) This paper was the winner of the William M. Carey Award in recognition of the best paper presented at the meeting. (*Id.*) Subsequently, that paper passed a rigorous peer review process and was published in Fire Technology, volume 37, pages 343-362 in 2001. (*Id.* at ¶ 11.) Fire Technology is the foremost refereed journal in the Fire Science field. (*Id.*)

In order to further the understanding of acoustic agglomeration, a second study was published the following year using 389 smoke alarms with different horn configurations exposed

to an array of controlled UL fire test configurations. (*Id.* at ¶ 12.) That work resulted in a paper presented and published in the Proceedings of the Fire Suppression and Research Application Symposium at The Fire Protection Research Foundation Annual Meeting, Jan. 2002. (*See* C. Worrell, J. Lynch, G. Jomaas, R. Roby, L. Streit and J. Torero, “*Effect of Smoke Source and Horn Configuration on Enhanced Deposition Acoustic Agglomeration, and Chladni Figures in Smoke Alarms*”, Streit Aff., Exhibit C.) This paper was also subjected to and passed the peer review process and was published in *Fire Technology*, volume 39, pages 309-346 in 2003. (Streit Aff. at ¶ 12.)

Dr. Russell’s concern that ESD research is not statistically significant or the result of full-scale fire tests is just as misplaced. Dr. Streit personally examined over 400 smoke alarms for these studies. (Streit Aff. at ¶ 13.) Any scientist would consider that to be a statically valid number of tests. (*Id.*) Not only are the results statistically significant, the smoke alarms tested were examined and evaluated as part of a double blind study, and the first set of tests were conducted in an actual full-scale house fire. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 10, 13.) In other words, Dr. Streit and others examined over 400 smoke alarms for acoustic agglomeration without knowing which alarms had activated and which had not. (*Id.* at ¶ 13.) In regards to the smoke alarms in the study that possessed sufficient soot to evaluate an acoustic agglomeration, there was one hundred percent correct determination of activation. (*Id.*) Therefore, the technique is clearly reliable, even under Russell’s standards. (*Id.*)

Subsequent to those publications, the technique used to determine the presence of acoustic agglomeration was substantiated and verified by research that was authored by P. Kennedy, K. Kennedy and G. Gorbett entitled “*A Fire Analysis Tool Revisited: Acoustic Soot Agglomeration in Residential Smoke Alarms*” and was published by the Investigative Institute in

August, 2003. (Streit Aff. at ¶ 14 and Ex. D thereto.) In fact, those authors combined the first two studies' data with theirs to create a larger database of tests. (*Id.*)

Yet another confirmation study of the acoustic agglomeration technique was performed as part of a Masters' Thesis concerning the validity of the ESD method for ascertaining whether a smoke alarm sounded during a fire. (Streit Aff. at ¶ 15 and Ex. E thereto, P. Phelan, "*An Investigation of Enhanced Soot Deposition on Smoke Alarm Horns*", Master of Science Thesis, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, MA, 250 p., 2005.) Additional research followed to ensure the validity of the ESD method was not limited to "controlled" fire scenarios as Russell complains herein. (Streit Aff. at 16 and Ex. F thereto, Mealy, C.L. and D. Gottuk, *Full-Scale Validation Tests of a Forensic Methodology to Determine Smoke Alarm Response*, ISFI 2008 Proceedings, International Symposium on Fire Investigation Science and Technology, NAFI, Sarasota, FL, 2008.) That study found that following the ESD methodology resulted in "a total of forty-seven alarms accurately identified as having either sounded or not sounded during exposures to enclosure fire conditions". (*Id.* at Conclusions.) The conclusion was that "based upon these results and those of the previous studies, it is apparent that [ESD] provides a valid methodology for evaluating soot deposition around smoke alarm horn openings as an indication as to whether or not the device sounded during a fire." (*Id.*)

Each and all of these research efforts satisfy Dr. Russell's own stated criteria for verification of the reliability of the experimental data. It appears Russell has simply failed to attend fire science meetings, conveniently ignored or otherwise failed to keep current with the fire science technical literature and therefore was unaware of all the additional work in the field of acoustic agglomeration science since the initial publication in 2001.

In fact, everyone other than Russell recognizes ESD as a reliable methodology. It is so widely accepted that beginning in 2011, the National Fire Protection Agency ("NFPA")

incorporated ESD into the national industry standard for fire investigations, known as NFPA 921. (NFPA 921, §6.2.10.3 (2011 ed.), *see* relevant portions at Streit Aff., Ex. G.) ESD remains a standard methodology for use in NFPA fire investigations today. (Streit Aff. at ¶ 17 and NFPA 921, §6.2.10.3 (2014 ed.), relevant portions at Streit Aff. Ex. H.) Interestingly, prior to NFPA's adoption of ESD as a standard methodology for use in 921 fire investigations, in 2010, Dr. Russell attempted to dissuade the NFPA from incorporating it with the same reasoning and arguments included in his affidavit here. (*See* Streit Aff. at ¶ 19 and NFPA 921 Report on Comments, November 2010, Log # 84, a copy of which is at Streit Aff. Ex. I.) The NFPA considered and rejected this initiative, stating "the use of acoustic soot agglomeration for the determination of smoke detector activation is **supported in the scientific literature**". (*Id.* at Committee Statement, p. 13.) (emphasis added) The "scientific literature" the NFPA was referring to is included in the reference section for 6.2.10.3. Note that all of the studies discussed herein are listed there. (*See* Streit Aff. Ex. G, NFPA 921 (2011 ed.) at references for 6.2.10.3.)

Notwithstanding Russell's personal unfounded opinions, it is well established that ESD, or acoustic agglomeration analysis, is a scientifically valid, industry proscribed and reliable methodology for determining whether a smoke alarm sounded during a fire. Plaintiff's motion to strike Dr. Gottuk's opinion that the smoke alarm sounded solely on the basis that this methodology is flawed should be denied.


II. BRK's Expert Concurs With, And Thereby Validates, Dr. Gottuk's Opinion That The Smoke Alarm Sounded In This Case

Dr. Streit personally attended the inspection of the smoke alarm at issue in this case on behalf of BRK. (Streit Aff. at ¶ 22.) She conducted an independent examination of the horn of the involved smoke alarm in accordance with the industry standard and accepted ESD methodology and the parties' agreed-upon protocol. (*Id.*) She personally viewed the soot agglomeration patterns on the horn - first macroscopically and then microscopically - using a

Nikon stereomicroscope. (*Id.*) She took photographs of what she saw during that inspection.


(*Id.*)

Below are photos from the first Worrell (2001) paper (Streit Aff. Ex. B) following full-scale fire testing showing ESD patterns on the horns of alarms which were confirmed to have sounded during that fire:



(Streit Aff. Ex. B at Figure 13.)

By way of comparison, here is a photo of the ESD patterns on the horn of the smoke alarm involved in this fire displaying similar ESD evidence:



(Streit Aff. Ex. J.) Based on her ESD analysis, her extensive experience and expertise, Dr. Streit concurs with Dr. Gottuk's findings and opinion that this smoke alarm sounded during this fire.

(Streit Aff. at ¶ 23.) All experts other than Russell therefore agree that the ESD pattern on this horn is conclusive evidence that this smoke alarm sounded at some point during this fire. (*Id.*)

In addition to being supported by this empirical evidence, Dr. Gottuk's determination that the smoke alarm sounded during this fire is consistent with evidence presented in this case, including Plaintiff's admission in her Complaint that the decedent was aware of the fire and attempted to extinguish it and that the alarm appears to have been knocked from its ceiling mount at some point during this fire. (Streit Aff. at ¶ 24.) There is no evidence of a prior fire in Plaintiffs' apartment and no evidence to support Russell's baseless speculation that the ESD pattern is the result of a prior fire. In fact, witnesses, including the named Plaintiff, testified that they never heard the smoke alarm go off in response to prior "kitchen smoke", as Russell suggests. (Deposition of Furlandare Singleton at 109:6-110:18, relevant portions of which are attached hereto as Exhibit B; Deposition of Tamara Braxton at 49:7-50:2, relevant portions of which are attached hereto at Exhibit C.) Dr. Gottuk's opinion is conversely reasonable, reliable and is consistent with the evidence.

CONCLUSION

Plaintiff's attack on the methodology employed by Dr. Gottuk is entirely unsubstantiated. ESD as a scientifically valid and reliable method to determine whether a smoke alarm sounded. The NFPA has incorporated ESD into its universally accepted standard for fire investigations over Russell's baseless objections. While ESD cannot independently tell you when a smoke alarm sounded, it can tell you is that the smoke alarm sounded. Plaintiffs' motion should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

WRIGHT, LINDSEY & JENNINGS, LLP

By: /s/ Kathryn A. Pryor

Kathryn Pryor (89206)
200 W. Capitol Avenue, Suite 2300
Little Rock, AR 72201-3699
501-371-0808
kpryor@wlj.com

And

James H. Heller, Esquire
COZEN O'CONNOR
1650 Market Street, Suite 2800
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-665-2189
jimheller@cozen.com

Attorneys for BRK Brands, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on June 1, 2016, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system, which shall send notification of such filing to the following:

David A. Hodges – david@hodgeslaw.com
E. Dion Wilson – edionwilson@gmail.com
Sheila Campbell – campbl@sbcglobal.net
Teresa Wineland – Teresa.wineland@kutakrock.com
John Walker – johnwalkeratty@aol.com
Shawn Childs – schilds@gabrielmail.com
William M. Hatchett – w.hatchett@hatchettlawfirm.com
William Griffin – griffin@fridayfirm.com
Eddie Ervin – Ervin@fridayfirm.com
John Wilkerson – jwilkerson@arml.org

/s/ Kathryn A. Pryor


Kathryn A. Pryor

AFFIDAVIT OF LORI STREIT, PH.D.

STATE OF ILLINOIS :
COUNTY OF DUPAGE :

Lori A. Streit, being duly sworn deposes and says:

1. I hold a Ph.D. degree in Analytical Chemistry/Surface Analysis from Arizona State University.
2. I am a Principal of Unified Engineering, Inc. of Lombard, Illinois, where I am employed as a chemist and materials analyst. My qualifications are as set forth in my curriculum vitae, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
3. My education and experience is in the areas of, among other things, surface analysis, microanalysis, material characterization, chemistry, chemical analysis and acoustic agglomeration or enhanced soot deposition (“ESD”) analysis.
4. I have been extensively involved with the examination, analysis and testing of smoke alarms. More specifically, I have extensive experience in the examination, analysis and testing of smoke alarms that have been involved in fires and exposed to products of combustion.
5. As part of my duties and responsibilities as a chemist and materials analyst, I routinely examine, analyze and test smoke alarms, to determine the manner in which the product operated when exposed to combustion products. I have specific knowledge, training and experience in fire investigation. Over the course of the last 20 years, I have conducted hundreds of investigations on smoke alarms that were exposed to fire and heat. With regard to smoke alarms, I have created analytical tools, which have been peer reviewed and accepted by the scientific community, which assists me in the examination of particular aspects of smoke alarms exposed to a fire.
6. These peer reviewed analytical tools permit the analysis of smoke alarm physical damage and contamination, thermal deformation, soot patterns, smoke, soot and other evidentiary patterns on the battery, acoustic agglomeration (enhanced soot deposition)



patterns, wires, etc. to determine, among other things, how the alarm was mounted, whether the alarm was properly powered, and whether the it alarmed during the fire. I have also constructed specific measurement and reflective tools, which have been peer reviewed and accepted by the scientific community which aid in the analysis of battery soot protected area patterns and acoustic agglomeration pattern evaluation.

7. In support of her motion to strike, the Plaintiff has asserted that the scientific analysis known as “acoustic agglomeration” or “ESD” is not reliable because the work “has been statistically [in]significant”. (*See* Affidavit of B. Don Russell (“Russell Aff.”) at 10.)

8. I have independently researched ESD and acoustic agglomeration as a means to scientifically assess whether a smoke alarm sounded during a fire. My research in this regard is the subject of several peer-reviewed and published journal articles.

9. As a brief overview and as further described in our initial paper that applied the science of acoustic agglomeration to smoke alarms, acoustic agglomeration is well documented throughout the literature and dates back to Kundt’s findings in 1866. (*See* C.L. Worrell, L. Streit, et al., Enhanced Deposition, Acoustic Agglomeration, and Chladni Figures in Smoke Alarms, *Fire Technology*, 37, 343-362 (2001) at ref. 5, a copy of which is attached hereto at Exhibit B.) It is well established that an acoustic field can greatly enhance the rate of particle agglomeration. (*See id.*, references 2, 5-9). It is also been shown by Tiwary et. al (*id.*, ref. 8) and Mendiknow (*id.*, ref. 2) that the conditions optimum for acoustic agglomeration are substantially similar to those exhibited by a sounding smoke alarm.

10. In January of 2001, my scientific analyses applying the science of acoustic agglomeration to smoke alarms, alarms which were mounted for testing in an actual full-scale house fire, was presented and published in the Proceedings of the Fire Suppression and Detection Research Application Symposium at The Fire Protection Research

Foundation Annual Meeting, Jan. 2001. (*Id.*) This paper was the winner of the William M. Carey Award in recognition of the best paper presented at the meeting.

11. Subsequently, the paper passed a rigorous peer review process and was published in *Fire Technology*, volume 37, pages 343-362 in 2001. (*Id.*) *Fire Technology* is the foremost refereed journal in the Fire Science field.

12. In order to further our understanding of acoustic agglomeration, a second study was published using 389 smoke alarms with different horn configurations exposed to an array of controlled UL fire test configurations. That work constituted a 2nd paper presented and published in the Proceedings of the Fire Suppression and Research Application Symposium at The Fire Protection Research Foundation Annual Meeting, Jan. 2002. (*See* C. Worrell, J. Lynch, G. Jomaas, R. Roby, L. Streit and J. Torero, “*Effect of Smoke Source and Horn Configuration on Enhanced Deposition Acoustic Agglomeration, and Chladni Figures in Smoke Alarms*”, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit C. This paper was also subjected to and passed the peer review process and was published in *Fire Technology*, volume 39, pages 309-346 in 2003.

13. I personally examined over 400 smoke alarms for these studies. Any scientist would consider that to be a statistically valid number of tests. As a further note, all of the smoke alarms tested were examined and evaluated as part of a double-blind study. In other words, I examined over 400 smoke alarms for acoustic agglomeration without knowing which alarms had activated and which had not. In the smoke alarms where there was sufficient soot to evaluate an acoustic agglomeration, I had one hundred percent correct determination of activation. Therefore, the technique is clearly reliable.

14. Subsequent to those publications, the technique used to determine the presence of acoustic agglomeration has been substantiated and verified by research that was authored by P. Kennedy, K. Kennedy and G. Gorbett entitled “*A Fire Analysis Tool Revisited: Acoustic Soot Agglomeration in Residential Smoke Alarms*” and was published by the

Investigative Institute in August, 2003. A copy of this study is attached hereto as Exhibit D. In fact, the authors combined our data with theirs to create a larger database of tests.

15. A second confirmation study of the acoustic agglomeration technique was performed as part of a Masters' Thesis. This study further confirmed the validity of the ESD method for ascertaining whether a smoke alarm sounded during a fire. (P. Phelan, "*An Investigation of Enhanced Soot Deposition on Smoke Alarm Horns*", Master of Science Thesis, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, MA, 250 p., 2005, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit E.)

16. Additional research on this subject followed to ensure the validity of the ESD method was not limited to "controlled" fire scenarios. (Mealy, C.L. and D. Gottuk, *Full-Scale Validation Tests of a Forensic Methodology to Determine Smoke Alarm Response*, ISFI 2008 Proceedings, International Symposium on Fire Investigation Science and Technology, NAFI, Sarasota, FL, 2008, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit F.) That study found that ESD methodology resulted in "a total of forty-seven alarms accurately identified as having either sounded or not sounded during exposures to enclosure fire conditions". (*Id.* at Conclusions.) The conclusion was that "based upon these results and those of the previous studies, it is apparent that [ESD] provides a valid methodology for evaluating soot deposition around smoke alarm horn openings as an indication as to whether or not the device sounded during a fire." (*Id.*)

17. In recognition of all of the scientific research and in further support of the reliability of ESD as a means to determine whether a smoke alarm sounded during a fire, beginning in 2011, the National Fire Protection Agency ("NFPA") incorporated ESD into the national industry standard for fire investigations, known as NFPA 921. (NFPA 921, §6.2.10.3 (2011 ed.), relevant portions of which are attached hereto as Exhibit G.) ESD remains a standard methodology for use in NFPA fire investigations today. (*See* NFPA 921, §6.2.10.3 (2014 ed.), relevant portions of which are attached hereto as Exhibit H.)

18. The NFPA is a global non-profit organization devoted to eliminating death, injury, property and economic loss due to fire and related hazards through the promulgation of consensus-based codes and standards.

19. Prior to NFPA's adoption of ESD as a standard methodology for use in 921 fire investigations, in 2010, Dr. Russell attempted to dissuade the NFPA from incorporating it with the same reasoning and arguments included in his affidavit here. (*See* NFPA 921 Report on Comments, November 2010, Log # 84, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit I.) The NFPA considered and rejected his initiative, stating "the use of acoustic soot agglomeration for the determination of smoke detector activation is supported in the scientific literature". (*Id.* at p. 13.)

20. The "scientific literature" upon which the NFPA relied to incorporate ESD into NFPA 921 is included in the reference section for 6.2.10.3. All of the studies discussed in this affidavit are listed there. (*See* Ex. G, NFPA 921 (2011 ed.) at references for 6.2.10.3.)

21. ESD, or acoustic agglomeration analysis, is a scientifically valid, industry proscribed and reliable methodology for determining whether a smoke alarm sounded during a fire.

22. I personally attended the inspection of the smoke alarm at issue in this case on behalf of BRK Brands, Inc. I conducted an independent examination of the horn of the involved smoke alarm in accordance with the industry standard and accepted ESD methodology and the parties' agreed-upon protocol. I viewed the soot agglomeration patterns on the horn first macroscopically and then microscopically, using a Nikon stereomicroscope. I took photographs of what I saw during that inspection. A true and correct copy of a photo (Image DSCN0121) depicting the ESD patterns on the subject alarm's horn which I took at the smoke alarm inspection in this matter is attached hereto as Exhibit J.

23. I concur with Dr. Gottuk, to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, based on all my years of research, training and experience and my own independent ESD analysis that the smoke alarm at issue in this case sounded during this fire.

24. In addition to being supported by empirical evidence, Dr. Gottuk's determination that the smoke alarm sounded conforms with the other circumstantial evidence presented in this case, including Plaintiff's admission in her Complaint that the decedent was aware of the fire and attempted to extinguish it, and that the alarm appears to have been knocked from its ceiling mount at some point during this fire.


25. Each and all of these research efforts satisfy Dr. Russell's own stated criteria for verification of the reliability of the experimental data and must therefore be deemed "reliable".

26. By Dr. Russell's standards, the technique of "Enhanced Soot Deposition" has been validated by his peer review criteria and independent scientific experimental verification requirements.

27. I have been admitted to testify as an expert in numerous state and federal courts around the country as to whether a smoke alarm sounded during a fire based on the results of my ESD and acoustic agglomeration analysis. My opinions and testimony in this regard has never been stricken or limited.

28. This affidavit is offered in opposition to Plaintiff's motion to strike the affidavit and testimony of Dan Gottuk related to his opinion, based on the presence of enhanced soot deposition ("ESD") patterns observed on the subject smoke alarm's horn, that it sounded during this fire.

Further affiant sayeth not.


Lori A. Streit, Ph.D.

Sworn and subscribed before me
on this the 7th day of MAY, 2016.


NOTARY PUBLIC
My Commission Expires 03/03/2020



EXHIBIT C



Fire Technology, 39, 309-346, 2003
© 2003 Kluwer Academic Publishers. Manufactured in The United States.

Effect of Smoke Source and Horn Configuration on Enhanced Deposition, Acoustic Agglomeration, and Chladni Figures in Smoke Detectors*

C.L. Worrell, J.A. Lynch, G. Jomaas, and R.J. Roby, Combustion Science & Engineering, Inc., Columbia, MD

L. Streit, Unified Engineering, Inc.

J.L. Torero, School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

Abstract. A series of UL/EN based test fires was conducted in a two room/corridor enclosure to investigate the viability of methods for determining whether a smoke detector sounded under a variety of smoke conditions and to see if this methodology could be applied to a detector with a different horn configuration. The presence of enhanced deposition in the form of a black or orange-brown ring and agglomerates around the central opening of a smoke detector horn was found to be a reliable indicator that the horn sounded when it was exposed to smoke from eight standardized, single-substrate fuel sources including hydrocarbon pool, flaming polyurethane foam, and smoldering polyurethane foam fires. Determinations could generally not be made for detectors exposed to white or gray smoke generated by flaming paper, smoldering paper, flaming wood, smoldering wood, and smoldering cotton wick due to a general lack of visible soot deposition within the detector. Therefore, it is not recommended to use the absence of a black or orange-brown ring of enhanced deposition, in and of itself, as an indicator that the horn did not sound. Nevertheless, this conclusion can be reached when the absence of enhanced deposition is combined with evidence supporting the presence of flaming fuels that produce black, sooty smoke. Test series were conducted using two different smoke detector brands, each having a different horn configuration. Findings suggest that the same type of methodology for determining whether the detector sounded is applicable to both models. Chladni figures were not found on any of the smoke detectors, whether they sounded or not; hence, the absence of a Chladni figure was not an indicator that the detector did not sound. A smoke flow visualization technique was used to determine the mechanism that caused the observed enhanced deposition and agglomerates on horns that sounded during a smoke exposure. Additionally, a smoke box test series showed that the extent of observed soot deposition increased with increasing smoke exposure.

Key words: smoke detector, deposition, agglomeration, Chladni figures, soot pattern, acoustic

* An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 2002 Fire Protection Research Foundation *Fire Suppression and Detection Research Application Symposium*. Many figures that could not be included here due to length considerations will be presented in the proceedings of the symposium.



Background

In fire reconstruction, knowledge of whether a particular smoke detector sounded during the fire can be valuable. It may be of special interest if there were fatalities involved. Knowing whether a detector sounded can provide information as to when, or if, an occupant may have been alerted to a developing fire. Before the observation of soot deposition patterns made by Worrell et al. [1] and Munger [2], smoke detector forensics was limited to determining whether the detector was operable. Such a determination might include checking whether the battery was properly in place and charged if it was a battery-powered device, checking whether the power was properly connected if it was an AC-powered device, or conducting a "canned smoke" test to check if the smoke-sensing system was operational. In addition, smoke detector horns can be so thermally damaged prior to the arrival of fire/rescue personnel that the horn may not be operable when the personnel arrive.

Recently, Worrell et al. [1] investigated the presence of enhanced soot deposition, agglomerates, and Chladni figures as post-fire indicators of smoke detector activation. In this study, a full-scale house fire test was conducted in which thirty smoke and CO detectors were mounted throughout the house. Half of the detectors had their batteries properly inserted and were operational. The other half had their batteries intentionally disconnected and were thus prevented from sounding during the fire. This study focused on the accumulation of soot on the piezoelectric horn case and disk of the detector. The horn style studied in this previous research is shown in the left photo of Figure 1, which is a photo of an




Figure 1. Open detector with "Horn Configuration #1" on left and "Horn Configuration #2" on right. Central circular opening of plastic horn case serves as primary horn opening for Configuration #1 (left). Three moon-shaped slotted openings on detector lid serve as primary horn openings for Configuration #2 (right).

ionization type smoke detector with its lid open. The authors observed enhanced deposition and sometimes very large soot agglomerates (of order 200–500 micrometers in length) on many detector horns that sounded during the test. The enhanced deposition was observed macroscopically, with the naked eye, in the form of a “black ring” around the central horn opening. Microscopically, it was apparent that the individual soot particles deposited on the edge of the horn opening were spaced closer together and were often much larger in size than particles deposited adjacent to the edge of the opening. This study theorized that various acoustic mechanisms, occurring when the alarms sounded, caused an increased rate of soot deposition onto the central horn opening. One effect of this enhanced rate of deposition was hypothesized to be a soot layering or stacking effect that resulted in the presence of very large soot agglomerates on the edge of the central horn opening. In addition, many studies reported in the aerosol and combustion literature support the hypothesis that smoke particles within the acoustic field of an alarming detector may experience greatly enhanced agglomeration or particle growth rates [3–7]. This study concluded that the presence of an increased number density and increased size of particles deposited locally about the central opening of the horn case was a reliable indicator that the alarm sounded. However, it was also concluded that the absence of such enhanced deposition and agglomerates did not necessarily exclude the possibility that the alarm sounded.

A Chladni figure is a pattern formed by particulates settling into the nodes of a vibrating surface [8]. The pattern formed is a mirror image of the nodal pattern of that surface. Nodal patterns can theoretically take the shape of concentric rings, a wagon wheel, or variations of the two [9, 10]. Some have proposed that Chladni figures of soot may form on the surface of the vibrating disc of a smoke detectors piezoelectric horn. If this were the case, the presence of a Chladni figure would be an indication that the alarm sounded. Although this theory has been proposed in litigation [11], no supporting studies have been performed. Munger [11] conducted a brief investigation in which he exposed six smoke detectors to smoke from a sample of flaming polyurethane foam. Half of the detectors were set up so that they could sound during the test, and the other half were disabled from sounding. Munger found that “. . . there was no discernable difference in the smoke patterns on the disks in the horns regardless of whether the device was operational or not” [11]. Similarly, Chladni figures were not observed macroscopically or microscopically on any of the piezoelectric discs in detectors from the full-scale house fire test of Worrell et al. [1].

The study described by Worrell et al. [1] was a preliminary investigation of enhanced deposition, acoustic agglomeration, and Chladni figures limited to one scenario: a flaming couch fire that was extinguished shortly after flashover. Worrell et al. [1] studied the phenomena in ionization, photoelectric, and carbon monoxide detectors; however, all of these detectors had the same horn configuration. This paper is intended to be a continuation of the earlier work [1] that focuses on the applicability of the methodology for determining activation under a variety of well-defined standardized smoke conditions and with different horn configurations.

This study attempted generalization of the methodology to a comprehensive set of fire scenarios. Pairs of ionization type smoke detectors mounted in a two-room/corridor test facility were exposed to various levels and types of smoke generated from eight different Underwriters Laboratories, Inc. (UL) and European Committee for Standardization (EN) based test fires. One detector in each pair was set up so that it could alarm, and the other was disabled from alarming during the test. This test configuration was also utilized with

detectors of a different brand, which had a different horn configuration than the previously tested detectors. This detector and horn configuration, referred to as "horn configuration #2", is shown in photo to the right in Figure 1. A total of 270 configuration #1 detectors and 119 configuration #2 detectors were tested. All detectors were inspected both macroscopically and microscopically for enhanced deposition, agglomerates, and Chladni figures. In addition, ultraviolet irradiation (UV) was used as an illumination source in an attempt to see deposits undetectable with visible light.

An effort was also made to better understand the mechanism that causes enhanced deposition and presence of agglomerates. Acoustic fields, such as those created by the detector horn, induce a flow field in the air. For this particular case, the air is seeded with smoke particles, which are then transported by the flow field. Depending on its structure, the flow field may create specific areas of preferential soot deposition. Additionally, this process may have a significant effect on the agglomeration rate of soot, especially if recirculation eddies are present. It is therefore of importance to better understand the flow field induced by the detector horn. This was accomplished by using a particle flow visualization technique similar to that described by Hoffmann and Koopmann [4, 5], which involves projecting a vertical laser light sheet across the horn opening of the smoke detector, which was ceiling-mounted in a small smoke box. The technique was applied to detectors with both horn configuration #1 and #2. This technique illuminated soot particles in a single plane, permitting the visualization of particle movement and interaction with the acoustic field generated by an alarming smoke detector.

Additionally, it was established that the extent of observed soot deposition depended on the extent of smoke exposure. This was accomplished by permitting a smoke detector to alarm to a steady smoke source for an incrementally increasing length of time. Photographs of the soot deposition on the detector horn were taken after each incremental smoke exposure.

Experimental Setup

Full-Scale Test Facility

Figure 2 is a schematic of the test facility. The facility consisted of two 2.3 m (7.5 ft.) by 2.6 m (8.5 ft.) rooms connected by a 1.1 m (3.5 ft.) by 4.6 m (15 ft.) corridor. The facility had standard 5.1 cm (2") by 10.2 cm (4") wood studs with 0.9 cm (3/8") gypsum wall construction and an acoustic tile drop-down ceiling, creating a ceiling height of 2.4 m (8 ft.) Pairs of ionization type smoke detectors were mounted in the fire room, corridor, and in the second room. In the fire room and the hallway, both ceiling and sidewall detectors were installed. During the testing, one detector from each pair was intentionally disabled from alarming. This was accomplished by disconnecting its nine-volt battery. The other detector in each pair had its battery properly inserted.

Detectors within each pair were spaced about 14.0 cm (5.5") apart. A voltage output was recorded from detectors that had their battery properly inserted. This measurement was used to determine when the detector began sounding and when the detector stopped sounding. A laser beam and photodiode assembly was mounted 5.1 cm (2") in front of each pair of detectors to measure the obscuration of the smoke just before it entered the detector. The path length of each laser/photodiode assembly was 45.7 cm (18"). In addition, temperature




Figure 2. Schematic of test facility.

was measured with a type-K bare bead thermocouple that was mounted between each pair of detectors. A thermal convection mass flow meter was mounted with its 5.1 cm (2") probe tip just below the ceiling of the fire room. This instrument was included as an attempt to measure ceiling jet velocities for each test fire. Finally, fuel mass was continuously recorded using a 11.3 kg (25 lb.) capacity scale with an analogue voltage output. A data acquisition system recorded the measurements. All of the above measurements were collected for testing of detectors with horn configuration #1, while only light absorption and analogue detector output were recorded for detectors with horn configuration #2.

The measurements described above are important since quantitative determination of the relative intensity of the fire and characteristics of smoke at the detector location is of importance when comparing different experiments. Furthermore, they allow establishing the detector response to different qualities and quantities of smoke. Within the context of this study, the measurements described above were used to determine the relative intensity of the different fires as well as to establish the smoke density at the detector location. These measurements ensured that the detectors were tested for a wide range of conditions. This data is not presented in detail here since the focus of this paper is not on the characterization of the detector response to the fire. Instead, emphasis is given to the characteristics of soot deposition patterns generated by the acoustic field. All data presented and proposed explanations are limited to this aspect of the tests.

Eight different UL/EN style test fires were conducted in the two room/corridor facility using detectors with horn configuration #1 (Figure 1). These standard test fires are used in the certification of smoke detectors. They included a flaming liquid hydrocarbon pool fire [12],

TABLE 1
Representative, Average Maximum Temperatures and Optical
Densities Created at the Room 1 and Room 2 Ceiling Detector
Locations During the Test Series for Horn Configuration #1

Fire Type	Maximum Temperature (°C)		Maximum Optical Density (m ⁻¹)	
	Room 1, Ceiling	Room 2, Ceiling	Room 1, Ceiling	Room 2, Ceiling
Heptane/toluene pool—400 mL	168	72	2.8*	0.4
Heptane/toluene pool—100 mL	99	45	0.6	0.2
Flaming polyurethane	42	32	0.05	0.08
Smoldering polyurethane	31	31	0.18	0.09
Flaming wood	51	38	0.22	0.10
Smoldering wood	33	32	0.19	0.03
Flaming paper	39	32	0.07	0.03
Smoldering paper	39	34	0.05	0.09
Smoldering cotton wick	35	33	0.09	0.11

*Optical density measuring system was saturated at this value.

a flaming wood crib fire [12], a flaming polyurethane foam fire, a flaming paper fire [12], a smoldering wood fire [12], a smoldering polyurethane foam fire, a smoldering paper fire, and a smoldering cotton wick fire [13]. For tests involving detectors with horn configuration #2 (Figure 1), only the flaming hydrocarbon pool fire, flaming polyurethane foam fire, smoldering polyurethane foam fire, and smoldering wood fire tests were conducted. The fire tests were set up to represent the corresponding standardized test in fuel configuration, but only for the purpose of generating several types of smoke. No substantial effort was made to adhere to the light obscuration, measuring ionization chamber output, and other criteria specified by the UL and EN standards. Each fire was set up 30.5 cm (1 foot) from the floor near the center of the far wall of the fire room. The doors leading from each room to the corridor remained open during the testing. Each fire type was carried out three times with new detectors for each test. Table 1 includes some representative, average temperatures and optical densities created by each of the fire types, and is indicative of the range of conditions that was generated during the test series.

For the hydrocarbon pool fires, a mixture of 25% toluene and 75% heptane (by volume) was burned in a 15.2 cm (6") diameter, 3.8 cm (1.5") deep circular metal pan. For the first test, 400 mL of the mixture was burned. For the second and third tests, 100 mL was burned because the longer duration fire was too hazardous to be repeated in the available test facility. Apparent in Table 1, which shows the average maximum temperatures and optical densities observed at the Room 1 and Room 2 ceiling detector locations, these two fire durations created a range of conditions that might be encountered during a residential fire. The mixture was ignited manually at the beginning of each test using a butane lighter.

For the flaming wood fires, a wood crib was constructed of 18 pieces of fir, each measuring 15.2 cm (6") by 1.9 cm (0.75") by 1.9 cm (0.75"). The crib consisted of three layers of six wood pieces each, and the overall dimensions of each crib were approximately 15.2 cm (6") by 15.2 cm (6") by 5.7 cm (2.25"). The crib was placed on a coarse wire mesh supported by a 15.2 cm (6") diameter ring stand. The crib was ignited by burning a small amount of

denatured alcohol in a 3.8 cm (1.5") diameter container placed 8.9 cm (3.5") below the crib per UL 217 [12].

The flaming polyurethane fires had a fuel configuration of a triangular prism shaped piece of polyurethane foam. The polyurethane was ignited at the top crest of the prism with a butane lighter. The prism had a base width of 34.3 cm (13.5"), a height of 17.8 cm (7"), and a depth of 6.0 cm (2 3/8"). This fuel configuration was used due to the repeatable nature of the fire.

The flaming paper fires consisted of shredded newspaper lightly tamped into a 10.2 cm (4") diameter sheet metal cylinder that was 30.5 cm (1 ft.) tall. The bottom end of the cylinder was placed on a coarse wire mesh, which was supported by a ring stand. The top end of the cylinder was open. The shredded newspaper consisted of 0.6 cm (1/4") to 1.0 cm (3/8") wide strips varying from 2.5 cm (1") to 10.2 cm (4") in length. Before the newspaper was poured into the receptacle, a 2.5 cm (1") diameter rod was temporarily placed in the center of the receptacle. The newspaper was then poured and tamped around the rod, forming a 2.5 cm (1") hole in the center of the newsprint from the base of the receptacle to the top. The newspaper was tamped until the paper was approximately 10.2 cm (4") below the top of the metal receptacle. Flaming ignition was initiated with a butane lighter at the base of the receptacle.

The smoldering wood fire consisted of 10 sticks of white pine placed in a spoke pattern on a 1.1 kW hotplate. Each stick was 7.6 cm (3") by 2.5 cm (1") by 1.9 cm (3/4"), and the 7.6 cm (3") by 1.9 cm (3/4") side was in contact with the hotplate during each test. For the tests involving horn configuration #1, a surface mount type K thermocouple was thermally pasted to the surface of the hotplate to ensure that its temperature profile roughly matched that specified by UL 217 [12] during the test. Because it was questioned as to whether pure smoldering was achieved during the first test series, the setting on the hotplate was significantly increased in the following tests.

For the smoldering polyurethane foam tests, two 20.3 cm (8") by 20.3 cm (8") by 10.2 cm (4") slabs of foam were fastened together on the 20.3 cm (8") by 20.3 cm (8") side using metal tie wire. The entire 12.1 cm (4.75") metal tip of a 30-watt pen style soldering iron was inserted between the two slabs as an ignition source. This configuration was intended to represent the initiation of smoldering between two foam cushions.

The smoldering paper tests consisted of shredded newspaper in the same configuration as the flaming paper fires. The paper was ignited with a butane lighter at the base of the receptacle and then quickly extinguished. This process was repeated until sustained smoldering of the paper was initiated.

Finally, for the smoldering cotton wick tests, 90 pieces of 80.0 cm (31.5") long cotton wick were hung from a 10.2 cm (4") diameter circular ring. Each cotton wick was approximately 1.0 cm (3/8") in diameter. The bottom edge of the cotton wicks was positioned so that it was 2.1 m (7 ft.) below the ceiling. The wicks were ignited at the base with a butane lighter and quickly extinguished. This process was repeated until sustained smoldering of the wick was achieved.

Small-Scale Smoke Visualization Tests

Figure 3 is a schematic of the smoke flow visualization apparatus. A 5 mW helium-neon laser and two cylindrical lenses were used to create a vertical light sheet. The beam was




Figure 3. Schematic of smoke flow visualization apparatus.

first passed through a cylindrical lens oriented to expand the beam in the vertical plane. This expanding sheet was passed through another cylindrical lens to collimate the sheet to a constant width of about 3.2 cm ($1\frac{1}{4}$ "). The vertical light sheet was passed through a plexiglass smoke box, in which an ionization smoke detector was mounted on the ceiling. The smoke box walls and tabletop on which the assembly was mounted were located far enough away from the detector horn as not to influence any flow patterns acoustically induced when the detector alarmed. The detector's battery was wired to a switch outside the smoke box that permitted control of the detector's alarm. Detectors with horn configuration #1 were mounted with their lids removed to permit the visualization of smoke flow directly below the horn. The laser sheet passed directly underneath the central horn opening. Detectors with horn configuration #2 were mounted with their lids in place since the three moon-shaped slotted openings on the lid actually served as the primary horn opening for this detector. The laser sheet was thus passed directly underneath these slotted openings on the detector lid. A digital video camera was mounted perpendicularly to the light sheet and focused on the area directly underneath the horn opening.

For each test, a small amount of smoke generated by small-scale versions of the UL and EN style test fires was introduced into the smoke box. In addition, a few tests were conducted with smoke from a toluene pool fire. The smoke particles were illuminated as they passed through the vertical light sheet. This setup thus permitted the visualization of a vertical cross section of smoke particles directly underneath the detector horn. When the detector alarmed, the setup enabled the visualization of smoke particle interaction with the acoustic field generated by the sounding horn.

Smoke Box Tests

This test was conducted within the same smoke box used for the flow visualization test series. A smoke detector with horn configuration #1 was mounted at the center of the smoke box and wired so that power could be supplied to the detector via a switch external to the box. A 6.4 cm (2.5") diameter cup of a mixture containing 75% heptane and 25% toluene was ignited approximately 0.9 m (3 feet) below the open-bottomed box. After 30 seconds of burning, the power supply circuit to the smoke detector was closed. The lag time ensured that the detector would sound immediately after the circuit was closed and that the pool fire had reached steady state burning. The detector was allowed to alarm for two minutes before the power supply circuit was opened. The detector was removed from the box and a photograph of the soot deposition on the central horn opening was taken. The detector was then remounted inside the box. Using the same detector, this process was repeated for two-minute intervals up to 16 minutes, then four-minute intervals up to 28 minutes, and one final two-minute interval up to 30 minutes. For each interval, the same 6.4 cm (2.5") diameter fire source was used to ensure an approximately equivalent smoke evolution for each interval. This test series established that the extent of observed soot deposition is related to the extent of smoke exposure.

Observations

After all test burns were complete, each detector was first inspected macroscopically with the naked eye. Then, without prior knowledge of which detectors sounded and which did not, a "blind" microscopic inspection was performed on each detector to determine whether or not it sounded during the test. This microscopic inspection was performed using a Nikon stereo-optical microscope with magnification levels between 8x and 80x. The magnification level was chosen depending on the extent of soot deposition. Some of the detectors that did not have visible soot deposition were also inspected under an intense UV light source using a BLAK-RAY long wave (580 nm) ultraviolet lamp Model B. A summary of the microscopic determinations for each detector is included in Tables 2 and 3. These results are discussed in more detail later.

Direct observation of different areas of the detector allowed establishing repeatable patterns that distinguished detectors that sounded from those that did not. These patterns corresponded to enhanced deposition and the presence of large agglomerates around the perimeter of the primary horn opening. This deposition pattern was observed on both horn configuration #1 and #2. The enhanced deposition and presence of large agglomerates can easily be contrasted from regular soot deposition throughout the rest of the detector.

TABLE 2
Summary of Microscopic Determination for Detectors with Horn Configuration #1

Fire Type	Correct "Positive"	Correct "Negative"	Undetermined	Incorrect
Heptane/toluene pool	15/15	15/15	0	0
Flaming polyurethane	17/17	11/11	22	0
Smoldering polyurethane	8/8 "possible"	0/0	22	0
Flaming wood	0/0	0/0	30	0
Smoldering wood	0/0	0/0	30	0
Flaming paper	0/0	0/0	30	0
Smoldering paper	1/1 "possible"	0/0	39	0
Smoldering cotton wick	2/2 "possible"	0/0	28	0

TABLE 3
Summary of Microscopic Determination for Detectors with Horn Configuration #2

Fire Type	Correct "Positive"	Correct "Negative"	Undetermined	Incorrect
Heptane/toluene pool	15/15	15/15	1**	0
Flaming polyurethane	13/13*	13/13	6	0
Smoldering polyurethane	4/4	1/1	19	0
Smoldering wood	1/1	1/1	30	0

*Includes one marked as "possibly" sounding due to faint soot.

**Detector MC78 included as "undetermined" because there was a missing observation as to whether or not a battery was installed in this detector.

For horn configuration #1, the microscopic determination of whether the detector sounded during the test was based on a comparison of soot deposits primarily on the central horn opening to deposits adjacent to the rim. If soot deposition on the rim was denser than deposition adjacent to the rim, the detector was determined to have sounded. In addition, an abundance of soot particles on the rim that were clearly larger compared to those adjacent to the rim was taken as indication that the horn sounded. Determination that the detector sounded required that enhanced deposition and agglomerates were distributed uniformly around the entire circumference of the circular horn opening. On the other hand, if the density of soot deposition on the rim of the horn opening was similar to deposition adjacent to the rim, the detector was determined not to have sounded. If the detector did not have sufficient soot deposition on the horn to facilitate such a comparison, the detector was declared "undetermined." That is, it was unknown whether the detector sounded or not. The inspection also included examining the piezoelectric disc of the horn for Chladni figures.

For horn configuration #2, the microscopic determination as to whether the detector sounded was based on a comparison of soot deposits on the inside surfaces of the three moon-shaped slotted openings of the detector lid. To determine whether the horn sounded or did not sound, the methodology described above for horn configuration #1 was followed.


Macroscopic Observations

The flaming hydrocarbon pool and flaming polyurethane foam fires resulted in black, carbonaceous soot deposition. The smoldering polyurethane foam generated tarry, orange-brown deposition. Such deposition is consistent with observations described in the literature [14–16]. For horn configuration #1, enhanced soot deposition was observed around the perimeter of the central horn opening and sometimes on the inside edges of the slotted lid opening in detectors that sounded. For horn configuration #2, enhanced soot deposition was observed around the inside perimeter of the three moon-shaped slotted openings on the detector lid. Enhanced soot deposition was not observed on detectors that did not sound.

All 15 detectors with horn configuration #1 that sounded due to exposure to hydrocarbon pool fire smoke had black enhanced soot deposition visible to the naked eye. As can be seen from Figure 4(a), configuration #1 horns that sounded during the hydrocarbon pool fires displayed soot deposition that was more concentrated around the perimeter of the central horn opening. This concentrated deposition was clearly observed on both the inside and outside edges of the horn opening. Deposition across the rest of the horn surface was lighter and more uniform. Also evident, soot traces just outside the concentrated deposition on the horn edge often appeared to be directed radially outward. Figure 4(b) shows a detector horn that was mounted adjacent to the detector in 4(a), but that did not alarm during the smoke exposure. As is apparent, there is no increased concentration of soot on the edges of the central opening in 4(b). This observation of black enhanced soot deposition in alarming detectors is consistent with observations of detectors from the full-scale house fire test described by Worrell et al. [1].

Of the 24 detectors with horn configuration #1 that sounded during the flaming polyurethane foam fire tests, 13 had black enhanced soot deposition visible to the naked eye. The same enhanced concentration of soot was observed around the perimeter of the inside and outside opening edges of horn configuration #1, except to a lesser extent than observed from the heptane/toluene tests. Soot deposition throughout the detector was generally light for the flaming polyurethane foam fires, which was thought to be a result of less smoke being generated during these tests. Soot deposition on the horns that did not sound was uniform across the edges of the horn opening and the top surface of the horn enclosure.

Regarding the smoldering polyurethane fires, 8 of the 12 configuration #1 detectors that sounded during the pure smoldering tests displayed a tarry orange/brown residue deposited around the perimeter of the inside edge of the central horn opening and to a lesser extent around the wall of the horn opening. This tarry residue is also mentioned in the literature [14–16]. The deposition on the horn opening was in clear contrast with the deposition on across the surface of the horn enclosure. The top surface of the horn and other areas throughout the detector were stained a light orange color. Similarly, many detectors from the smoldering wood and cotton wick tests were stained light orange throughout. However, of all 30 sounding detectors from the smoldering wood and cotton tests, only two from one particular smoldering cotton test produced enhanced deposition of the tarry residue. It was also noted that the enhanced deposition of the tarry residue only occurred on the inside edge of the horn opening, whereas it was observed on both the inside and outside edges of sounding detectors from the hydrocarbon pool and flaming polyurethane fires (Figure 4 for example). Non-alarming detectors had the light orange deposition throughout the detector, but no increased concentration of the residue on the horn opening. The absence



(a)



(b)


Figure 4. Macroscopic photos of two adjacent detectors exposed to smoke from a heptane/toluene pool fire. The horn in the top photo sounded and the horn in the bottom photo did not sound.

of the concentrated deposition was characteristic of the non-sounding detectors for all of the smoldering fire sources.

Finally, Figure 5 shows a configuration #1 horn that sounded during a flaming paper test and the adjacent detector that did not sound. There was no observable difference in soot deposition around the perimeter of the central horn opening compared to the adjacent



(a)



(b)

Figure 5. Macroscopic photos of two adjacent detectors exposed to smoke from a flaming paper fire. The horn in the top photo sounded and the horn in the bottom photo did not sound. The absence of observable soot deposition is generally representative of detectors from the flaming paper, smoldering paper, flaming wood, smoldering wood (configuration #1 series only), and smoldering cotton wick tests.

area on the top surface of the horn enclosure. This was true for both the outside and inside edge of the horn opening. In fact, very little visible soot was observed throughout either detector. These observations were generally representative of detectors from the flaming paper, smoldering paper, and flaming wood tests.

As also observed by Worrell et al. [1], enhanced deposition occurred for the hydrocarbon pool, flaming polyurethane, and smoldering polyurethane tests around the edges of the smaller configuration #1 horn openings in many detectors that sounded. Enhanced soot deposition around the smaller horn openings can be seen in Figure 4(a). This deposition was similar to that around the central horn opening in that it occurred uniformly around the entire circumference and on both inside and outside edges of the opening. However, the magnitude of deposition around the smaller openings was much less than deposition around the central opening.

In addition, on some of the configuration #1 detectors where a black ring of enhanced soot deposition was evident, enhanced deposition was also observed on the edges of the slotted openings located on the smoke detector lid. This deposition was most notable on the inside edges of the slotted openings. Figure 6 shows an example of this type of deposition. Consistent with findings from Worrell et al. [1] and Munger [11], no Chladni figures were observed on any of the piezoelectric horn discs on any of the 270 configuration #1 detectors, whether they sounded or not.

Several configuration #1 detectors that sounded during one particular polyurethane test contained both an orange ring of enhanced soot deposition and a black ring of enhanced deposition on the same horn. Figure 7 shows an example of such a deposition. Previous observations indicated that a tarry orange deposition occurred during smoldering combustion while the sooty black deposition occurred during flaming combustion of the polyurethane




Figure 6. Example of enhanced soot deposition on the inside edges of the slotted openings on a configuration #1 detector lid.




Figure 7. Example of the horn of a detector exposed to smoke from polyurethane foam that initially smoldered and then transitioned to flaming combustion. The horn has both an orange-brown ring, characteristic on horns sounding during smoldering combustion of polyurethane foam, and also a black ring, characteristic on horns sounding during flaming combustion of polyurethane foam.

foam. Indeed, during the progression of this particular test, the polyurethane foam initially smoldered for some time and then transitioned to flaming.

Whether or not enhanced deposition actually formed did not appear to be dependent on the extent of smoke exposure. Figure 8 shows representative values of the smoke concentration, integrated with time, in front of each ceiling mounted detector pair for each test type. This integral was only calculated while the detector was alarming, as this is when the enhanced deposition mechanism occurs. The integral is a measure of the magnitude of smoke the detector was exposed to during alarm. High values of this integral can result from short exposures to high concentration smoke or long exposures to low concentration smoke. Using the smoke obscuration measurements recorded during each test, smoke mass concentration was determined from the following expression:

$$m = \frac{K}{K_m}$$

where m is the smoke mass concentration in g/m^3 , K is the extinction coefficient in m^{-1} , and K_m is the specific extinction coefficient in m^2/g . Values for K_m of $7.6 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$ for flaming combustion and $4.4 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$ for smoldering combustion were taken from Mulholland [17].




Figure 8. Representative values of the time-integral of smoke concentration in front of each ceiling mounted detector pair for each test type. This integral was only calculated while the detector was alarming.

The extinction coefficient, K , is defined from

$$\frac{I}{I_0} = e^{-KL}$$

Figure 8 shows that the highest time-integrated smoke concentrations occurred during the smoldering wood tests. However, no pattern of enhanced soot deposition was observed in detectors from these tests. On the other hand, the chart shows that flaming polyurethane produced one of the lightest smoke exposures. Although the smoke exposures during the flaming polyurethane tests were one order of magnitude lower than those during the smoldering wood tests, enhanced soot deposition was clearly observed on detectors from the flaming polyurethane tests. This suggests that the formation of visible enhanced soot deposition pattern is not a result of the magnitude of smoke exposure, but rather a result of the type of smoke the detector is exposed to.

Regarding horn configuration #2, Figures 9 and 10 show examples of the macroscopic observation of one detector that sounded and one that did not for a flaming heptane/toluene and a smoldering wood test. Enhanced soot deposition was observed on detectors that sounded during the flaming hydrocarbon pool, flaming polyurethane foam, and smoldering polyurethane foam tests. This deposition was most notable around the perimeter of the inside edges of the three moon-shaped openings on the detector lid. This location in detectors with horn configuration #2 was similar to the location of deposition observed on the inside edges of the slotted opening of horn configuration #1, however deposition was much heavier on the slotted openings of horn configuration #2. In some detectors, enhanced






Figure 9. Macroscopic photos of the inside of the moon-shaped slotted openings of two detectors with horn configuration #2. These detectors were exposed to smoke from a heptane/toluene pool fire. The horn in the top photo sounded and the horn in the bottom photo did not sound.

deposition was observed to a lesser extent around the perimeter of the outside edges of the three slotted openings on the detector lid. The enhanced deposition for the hydrocarbon pool and flaming polyurethane foam tests was black and sooty while the enhanced deposition for the smoldering polyurethane foam tests was orange and tarry. Also, the orange



(a)



(b)

Figure 10. Macroscopic photos of the inside of the moon-shaped slotted openings of two detectors with horn configuration #2. These detectors were exposed to smoke from a smoldering wood fire. The horn in the top photo sounded and the horn in the bottom photo did not sound.

enhanced deposition tended to be most notable at the corners of the grated openings. Unlike observations from horn configuration #1, trace amounts of enhanced soot deposition were observed in some of the detectors that sounded during exposure to smoke from the smoldering wood tests. This deposition was minute and found on the inside edges of the moon-shaped slotted openings on the detector lid. Although difficult to see macroscopically, this deposition occurred in the detector in Figure 10(a). Enhanced soot deposition

around the inside edges of the grated opening was not observed on any detectors that did not sound.

One detector displayed an obvious ring of black soot deposition on the very edge or far perimeter of the piezoelectric disc in addition to enhanced soot deposition observed on the moon-shaped slotted openings of the detector lid. Such deposition on the perimeter of the horn disc was not observed in any detectors that did not sound.

“Blind” Microscopic Determinations

The microscopic determinations were consistent with the macroscopic observations; however, on some detectors the microscopic inspection revealed enhanced deposition and agglomerates that were not macroscopically apparent. This occurred in particular with detectors from the flaming polyurethane foam tests, which generally had very light soot deposition due to the small fire source and resulting small smoke exposure (see Figure 8).

Figures 11–14 show examples of the microscopic observations of the central horn opening of pairs of configuration #1 detectors from a flaming polyurethane, smoldering polyurethane, and flaming paper test. Figure 11 shows the outside edge of a sounding and non-sounding detector exposed to flaming polyurethane smoke. A band of fine carbon soot particles, spaced closely together, is apparent around the perimeter of the horn opening. Some larger agglomerate structures are also present at the very edge of the horn opening. On the other hand, very little visible deposition is present on the non-sounding detector despite being exposed to the same smoke exposure as the sounding detector. Figure 12 shows the inside edges of a sounding and non-sounding detector exposed to smoke from flaming polyurethane. A small mirror carefully inserted through the central horn opening was used to take these photographs. Again, a band of closely spaced soot particles is observed around the perimeter of the opening edge. In addition, this view also shows that enhanced deposition also occurred on the wall, close to the edge of the opening. Again, the non-sounding detector displays very little visible soot deposition. Finally, Figure 13 shows the inside edges of a sounding and non-sounding detector exposed to smoke from smoldering polyurethane. The sounding detector displays a very obvious band of liquid-like, tarry orange deposition near the inside edge of the opening. This band of deposition also extended onto the wall of the horn opening. The orange band is in clear contrast with the adjacent horn surface, which displays very little evidence of soot deposition. For these three fire types, many of the sounding horns that had significant soot deposition also displayed enhanced deposition on the edges of the smaller horn openings. On detectors that did not sound, but had enough soot deposition to be classified, soot deposition was uniform across the edges of the horn openings and the area adjacent to these edges. In other words, there were no observable rings of enhanced soot deposition on either the central horn opening or the smaller horn openings of detectors that did not sound during the testing.

For configuration #1 detectors that had enough soot deposition to be classified, determinations were made with a success rate of 100%; however, many of the horns did not have enough soot deposition to make a determination either way. In other words, many horns did not have enough soot deposition to compare deposits between the edge of the horn opening and the adjacent areas. Table 2 shows that this was especially true for the flaming wood, smoldering wood, flaming paper, smoldering paper, and smoldering cotton wick tests. 98% of detectors were marked as “undetermined” for these tests. In general,




Figure 11. Microscopic photos of the outside edge of the central horn opening of two adjacent detectors exposed to smoke from a flaming polyurethane fire. The horn in the top photo sounded and the horn in the bottom photo did not sound.




Figure 12. Microscopic photos of the inside edge of the central horn opening of two adjacent detectors exposed to smoke from a flaming polyurethane fire. The horn in the top photo sounded and the horn in the bottom photo did not sound.




Figure 13. Microscopic photos of the inside edge of the central horn opening of two adjacent detectors exposed to smoke from a smoldering polyurethane fire. The horn in the top photo sounded and the horn in the bottom photo did not sound.





Figure 14. Microscopic photos of the outside edge of the central horn opening of two adjacent detectors exposed to smoke from a flaming paper fire. The horn in the top photo sounded and the horn in the bottom photo did not sound. These detectors were representative of the detectors that did not display observable soot deposition.

very little soot deposition was visible on these detectors. Figure 14 shows an example of a sounding and non-sounding detector that, after exposure to smoke from flaming paper, that did not have enough visible soot deposition to make a determination. For these "undetermined" detectors, use of a UV light source did not illuminate any soot deposits that were not visible to the naked eye. Additionally, a ring of a clear, crystalline substance was noticed on the inside edges of some of the horn openings. The presence of this crystalline ring did not have any correlation with whether the detector sounded or not and is believed to be a natural occurrence in the manufacturing of these horns.


Regarding horn configuration #2, Figures 15–18 each show examples of soot deposition observed on some detectors that sounded and some that did not for tests with flaming heptane/toluene, smoldering polyurethane, and smoldering wood, and a smoldering polyurethane test that transitioned to flaming. Each photo depicts the inside surface of the detector lid, with focus on a corner of one of the three slotted openings. As with configuration #1, microscopic examination revealed enhanced soot deposits and agglomerates that were not visible to the naked eye in several cases. Again, this occurred in particular for the flaming polyurethane fires, which generated a very light smoke exposure (see Figure 8). The enhanced soot deposition was most visible around the perimeter of the inside edges of the three moon-shaped slotted openings for the horns that had enough soot to be classified.

The qualitative nature of the deposits in horn configuration #2 for each fire type was generally consistent with observations from the test series with configuration #1. Figure 15(a) shows the inside edge of one of the moon-shaped openings in a detector that sounded to a flaming heptane/toluene pool fire. Soot deposits are clearly much larger and more densely packed near the edge of the opening. On the other hand, Figure 15(b) is a non-sounding horn from a heptane/toluene pool fire test. Soot particles are evenly spaced and sized across the edge of the horn opening and the surrounding areas. Figures 16(a) and (b) show this inside edge for a sounding and non-sounding detector exposed to smoke from smoldering polyurethane. Figure 16(a) shows that the tarry orange deposition was concentrated at the corners of the inside edge in the sounding detector and absent in the non-sounding detector. On the other hand, Figure 17 shows that the tarry orange deposition occurred uniformly around the horn openings of sounding horns for the smoldering wood tests. Figure 18 shows the inside edge in a horn exposed to smoke from polyurethane that initially smoldered and then transitioned to flaming combustion. Again, both tarry orange deposits characteristic of smoldering combustion and black sooty deposits characteristic of flaming combustion were present. Inconsistent with observations from the horn configuration #1 test series, enhanced deposition of the tarry orange substance was also observed in detectors alarming while exposed to smoke from smoldering wood.

Determinations were made with a success rate of 100% for detectors with horn configuration #2 that had enough soot deposition to be classified. The presence or absence of enhanced deposition and agglomerates on the *inside* edges of the three moon-shaped slotted openings proved to be the most reliable determination source. Although about 88% of detectors from the smoldering tests were marked as "undetermined" due to lack of soot particles, the presence of increased deposition of the tarry, orange substance at the corners of the inside edges of the three moon-shaped slotted openings did appear to be a reliable indicator that the detector activated.




(a)




(b)

Figure 15. Microscopic photos (20×) of two detectors exposed to smoke from a heptane/toluene pool fire. The horn in the top photo sounded and the horn in the bottom photo did not sound.



(a)



(b)

Figure 16. Microscopic photos (40 \times) of two detectors exposed to smoke from smoldering polyurethane. The horn in the top photo sounded and the horn in the bottom photo did not sound.




Figure 17. Example of enhanced deposition of a tarry orange substance observed on a horn that sounded during a smoldering wood test.

Small-Scale Visualization Tests

Tests conducted with both horn configurations showed clearly that the presence of enhanced soot deposition and agglomerates in alarming detectors could be explained by an acoustically induced flow field that fostered particle growth and deposition. The following includes observations from the small-scale smoke flow visualization tests.

The visualization tests for horn configuration #1 showed that the alarming piezoelectric horn created a flow field that drew smoke particles toward and through the horn opening. The alarm signal consisted of a three-pulse temporal pattern, which is required by NFPA 72 [18] and specified by ANSI S3.41 [19]. With each sounding of the horn, a strong pulse of smoke was forced out of the horn case through the center of the horn opening. Simultaneously, a pulse of smoke was drawn into the horn around the perimeter of the opening. As with any flow passing through an orifice, a recirculation zone was induced at the edge of the horn opening. Although the setup could not visualize smoke flow inside the horn case, it is expected, based on fluid mechanic principles, that a similar recirculation zone would form near the inside edge of the horn opening.

The pulsing flow field was most easily observed when the horn opening was exposed to smoke generated by burning a small amount of pure toluene since this produced a thick field of soot particles. Figure 19 shows a photo series of the smoke flow field generated over the course of a single pulse of the detector horn. Frame-by-frame processing of the digital video recorded during the visualization tests provided these photos. Each photo shows a side view of a configuration #1 smoke detector horn and the smoke, illuminated by the laser




Figure 18. Example of a detector exposed to smoke from polyurethane foam that initially smoldered and then transitioned to flaming combustion. The horn has both tarry orange deposits, characteristic on horns sounding during smoldering combustion of polyurethane foam, and also black soot deposits, characteristic on horns sounding during flaming combustion of polyurethane foam.

light sheet, passing beneath it. The two marks on the side of the horn indicate the location of the central opening located on the bottom face of the horn. Figure 19(a) shows smoke passing underneath the horn just before it sounds. Figure 19(b), (c), and (d) show the smoke flow through the duration of the “beep.” These three photos clearly show the jet outflow of smoke from the center of the horn opening and the simultaneous smoke inflow around the perimeter of the opening. The recirculation zone at the outside edge of the horn opening is also visible in Photos 19(c) and (d). Photos 19(e) and (f) show the flow after the “beep” terminates. These photos were extracted from the digital video at a frequency of six frames per second. The same pulsing flow field, which drew smoke toward and through the horn opening, was observed for smoke generated by all eight of the UL and EN style test fires. Figure 20 shows the same flow field for a smoldering wood test, which, in contrast to the pool fire tests, generally did not produce observable deposition on the detector during the configuration #1 test series. This observation seems to indicate that a particular qualitative nature of the smoke coupled with the flow field leads to the enhanced deposition patterns. The absence of one of the two elements would result in no enhanced deposition patterns.

The visualization tests for horn configuration #2 showed that smoke near the moon-shaped slotted openings of the detector lid was clearly influenced by the alarming horn. Figure 21 shows that an acoustically induced smoke flow occurred when the horn sounded. Each pulse of the alarming horn formed eddies near the edges of the slotted openings,




Figure 19. Smoke flow field created by single "beep" of a configuration #1 detector horn visualized using smoke from burning a small amount of pure toluene.




Figure 20. Smoke flow field created by single "beep" of a configuration #1 detector horn visualized using smoke from "smoldering" a small amount wood.




Figure 21. Photo shows acoustically induced flow field established with each pulse of an alarming detector with horn configuration #2. The white diagonal line is the surface of the detector lid. Everything below the lid is smoke. The area above the line is the detector lid. The three lighter areas of the white line are the three grated openings.

and smoke was drawn in through the slots. Due to the geometric complexity of the slotted openings and the small scale of the observed flow structures, a precise flow field could not be established. That is, the exact path of smoke inflow and outflow is unclear. However, it is certain that smoke inflow and recirculation eddies were induced by the alarming horn. The acoustically induced flow was observed for all of the different test fires that detectors with horn configuration #2 were exposed to.

Smoke Box Tests

Figure 22 shows the central horn opening of a smoke detector (horn configuration #1) after alarming for 4, 12, and 30 minutes while exposed to smoke from the 6.4 cm (2.5") heptane/toluene pool fire described in the experimental setup section. The photo series shows clearly that soot deposition around the perimeter of the horn opening increases with increasing duration of the smoke exposure. Firstly, the soot deposition increases in darkness with increasing exposure time. This corresponds to an increased surface density of soot particles. That is, more particles deposit onto the horn as exposure time increases. Secondly, the boundary between the enhanced soot deposition and the unaffected horn surface appears to move radially away from the center of the horn opening as the exposure




Figure 22. Central horn opening of a smoke detector (horn configuration #1) after alarming for 4, 12, and 30 minutes to smoke from the 2.5 inch heptane/toluene pool fire described in experimental setup section.

time increases. In other words, the ring of enhanced deposition increases its surface area with increased exposure time. Finally, it was also observed that the soot deposition increased in height above the horn surface with longer exposure times. That is, soot particles were visibly piled and raised above the horn surface for longer exposure times.

Discussion

Enhanced black soot deposition was clearly observed on detector horns that sounded during the flaming hydrocarbon pool and flaming polyurethane foam tests. Tarry, orange deposition was observed on most of the sounding horns from the smoldering polyurethane tests and on some of the sounding horns from the smoldering wood and smoldering cotton tests. This enhanced deposition was found to occur regardless of detector orientation or placement (i.e. ceiling or sidewall). Such depositions were not observed on horns from tests with flaming paper, smoldering paper, and flaming wood tests. However, the flow visualization study clearly demonstrated that the acoustic flow field causing the enhanced deposition occurred for all types of smoke investigated, including those that did not cause visible enhanced deposition.

The observation that the acoustic flow field causing enhanced deposition occurred with all smokes suggested that some form of enhanced deposition did occur on the horns that sounded during the flaming paper, smoldering paper, and flaming wood tests, but that this deposition was invisible with the macroscopic and microscopic inspection techniques utilized. UV illumination did not reveal such deposition either. The smoke generated by the flaming hydrocarbon pool and flaming polyurethane foam tests was black in color, indicating high carbon content. Composition of the remaining types of smoke is less clear based on qualitative observations of the smoke during testing alone.

Based on a series of smoke particle characterization studies, Bankston [20] described smoke particles generated by smoldering combustion as droplets composed of "a complex mixture of liquid and/or solid organic materials". In the present study, the enhanced deposition of smoke droplets from smoldering polyurethane in sounding horns created a visible tarry orange-brown residue. The qualitative nature of this deposition has been observed in previous studies [14–16].

Regarding the smoldering wood tests, visible deposition was not observed in the test series for horn configuration #1; however a tarry orange deposition, similar to that observed for the smoldering polyurethane tests, was observed in detectors from the smoldering wood tests for horn configuration #2. One possible explanation is that pure smoldering was achieved in the second test series, whereas pyrolysis was the major smoke source in the first test series. Responding to such suspicions, a much higher heat flux setting was used on the hotplate for the second test series.

At this point, it is unclear why smoke from smoldering paper and smoldering cotton wick generally did not lead to visible soot deposition. As an exception, the tarry deposition was observed on two (2) of the 15 sounding detectors from the smoldering cotton tests. Bankston and Powell's studies [14, 20–23] did document a high liquid content for smolder smoke particles in general. One possible explanation for the lack of visible deposition of smoke from smoldering paper and cotton wick is that the liquid smoke droplets contained a larger fraction of water, whereas the droplets from the smoke produced by smoldering polyurethane

had higher "large hydrocarbon" content. The presence of water is also suggested by the white color of the smoke for these two fuels. After such particles deposit onto the detector horn, the water content may evaporate leaving behind only a small nucleation particle and/or a light residue. Such deposits could not be detected with the inspection techniques utilized in this study. Investigation of much higher magnification techniques such as scanning electron microscopy or even fluorescence of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) may prove useful for visualizing such deposits.

A similar phenomenon may be responsible for the lack of visible soot deposition from smoke produced by flaming wood and flaming paper. Although it was generalized that flaming fires produce predominantly carbonaceous smoke, Bankston found evidence of a significant liquid or tar fraction in smoke from flaming wood [22]. He suggested that this might be attributed to the formation of a char layer causing the flame to be "more unstable and less efficient. . . causing pyrolysis products to escape without passing through the flame reaction zone" [22]. A similar effect might occur for the flaming paper scenario if the fire were ventilation restricted. A degree of ventilation-restricted combustion is not inconceivable with the UL217 flaming paper test since the shredded paper is tamped together into a 30.5 cm (1 foot) tall metal cylinder with a 10.2 cm (4") diameter.

In practice, the current inability to visualize deposits of smoke from flaming paper, smoldering paper, flaming wood, and in many cases, smoldering wood, and smoldering cotton wicks is not likely to be significant. The standardized UL/EN style tests were designed to provide a very light smoke exposure intended to challenge the sensitivity of a detector to respond early in a fire. It is believed that the light smoke exposure during the flaming polyurethane tests resulted in the large number of detectors that did not have enough soot deposition to make determinations. Such a light exposure is not comparable to the heavy smoke exposure a detector would be exposed to throughout the course of an unwanted fire. A heavier, sooty smoke exposure is expected during unwanted fires for two reasons: (1) The standard test fires generally reach steady state relatively quickly and then decay. On the other hand, an unwanted fire generally continues to grow until it becomes ventilation limited, at which point very sooty smoke is produced; and (2) unwanted fires generally involve a mixture of fuels including polyurethane foam, upholstery, wood, and many others, while the UL/EN fires generally involve single-substrate fuels. Indeed, during the full-scale house fire test [1], only one of the *smoke* detectors had too little soot to make a determination, and this was a detector located the farthest from the fire origin.

At this point, it should be emphasized that the current methodology for determining *whether* a detector sounded does not give information as to *when* the detector sounded during a smoke exposure. At present, if enhanced deposition and soot agglomerates are observed on a detector horn recovered from a fire scene, it can only be concluded that the detector sounded at some point during the smoke exposure. The smoke box study in which a detector was permitted to alarm for an incrementally increasing duration did show clearly that the extent of observed soot deposition increased with increasing alarm duration. So, with additional research, it may be possible to estimate the duration of alarm if the extent of enhanced soot deposition can somehow be quantified. Such quantification might include measuring the surface density of particles deposited onto the horn (i.e. how closely spaced the particles are), a mass measurement of the deposition, or perhaps the radial thickness of the deposit with respect to the center of the horn opening. A practical limitation of estimating alarm duration is the uncertainty in the smoke concentration

profile that occurred during the fire. Another potential limitation is the possible formation of a critical mass of soot deposition above which soot would no longer accumulate despite continued alarming. If the alarm duration could be estimated and the time at which the detector stopped alarming was known (e.g. time at which power to residence was shut down), the time at which the detector began alarming may be estimated. These potential applications require the development of a repeatable relationship between the smoke concentration profile and a quantitative measurement of the enhanced soot deposition.

The visualization study clearly demonstrated that the acoustic field of an alarming horn strongly affects the flow of local smoke with both horn configurations. This suggests that areas of enhanced soot deposition may form in many devices that create a strong acoustic field during a smoke exposure. Provided that they are sounding during the smoke exposure, areas of enhanced deposition may occur in other models of smoke detectors, audible notification appliances, or even infrared motion detectors used as burglar alarms. Flow visualization studies similar to the one described in this paper can be performed to determine locations within a given unit where enhanced deposition will occur. In addition, numerical modeling could establish the precise structure of the flow fields.

Some of the detectors used in the flaming polyurethane foam tests showed that microscopic inspection can visualize enhanced soot deposition that is not seen macroscopically. In these cases, the macroscopic invisibility of the enhanced deposition was often the result of very light soot deposition. On the other hand, in the full-scale house fire test [1], soot deposition was generally heavy and dark throughout the detectors. Such heavy deposition is expected in full-scale fires. Because deposition may be heavy throughout the detector, enhanced soot deposition may be difficult to discern without microscopic inspection, especially inside the horn housing. In addition, some of the horns in the full-scale study [1] were severely deformed due to heat exposure. These horns tended to collapse in on themselves when exposed to heat, making simple exterior macroscopic inspection more difficult. In these cases, the use of a small mirror or removal of the horn and disc from the circuit board to look at the underside of the horn openings proved helpful. In addition, only microscopic inspection can detect the presence of large soot agglomerates, which is an indicator that the horn sounded. These findings indicate the importance of microscopic inspection when determining whether a detector sounded during a fire.

The formation of large soot agglomerates is acoustically induced and a result of the horn sounding. Agglomeration refers to the growth of soot particles when they collide and adhere together. It has been well established that exposure of soot particles to an acoustic field greatly increases the rate of agglomeration or particle growth [3-7]. A second mechanism resulting in particle growth may be the formation of recirculation eddies at the inside and outside edges of the horn opening. These recirculation eddies can lead to long soot particle residence times, allowing for more particle collisions and agglomeration to take place. The recirculation eddy near the outside edge of the horn opening is most visible in the photo series shown in Figure 20. From fluid mechanic principles, a similar recirculation eddy is expected to form near the inside edge of the horn opening; however, this could not be visualized due to the opacity of the horn. Finally, the smoke flow visualization study showed that the alarming horn drew smoke in through the horn opening, resulting in soot deposition around the perimeter of the opening. This acoustically induced flow may be an additional mechanism resulting in particle growth on the horn surface due to a stacking of smaller soot

particles on top of each other. For these reasons, microscopic inspection for the presence of soot agglomerates on the central horn opening of horn configuration #1 and the inside edges of the slotted opening of horn configuration #2 should be performed and taken as an indication that the horn sounded.

The presence of enhanced soot deposition around the central horn opening of horn configuration #1 and slotted opening of horn configuration #2 was found to be a reliable indicator that the horn sounded. Results from this and the previous study [1] suggest that if enough soot is present, the lack of enhanced soot deposition on the horn openings is a good indicator that the detector did not alarm. In fact, all of the detectors in these studies that were microscopically determined not to have sounded did indeed fail to sound. This observation should however be noted with caution because there may exist situations in which the alarm sounded but enhanced deposition is difficult to detect. Examples of situations that make enhanced deposition difficult to notice include extreme heat deformation and melting of the horn or excessive jarring/scraping/smearing that might occur during overhaul operations. Another conceivable scenario is that during a real fire, the detector may initially alarm but become so thermally damaged later in the fire that the horn stops sounding. If the fire were to continue, soot deposition would continue to accumulate on the detector after it had ceased sounding. Such an additional soot buildup could make the enhanced ring of soot deposition that formed while the horn was sounding difficult to detect. On the other hand, given that the flow visualization study clearly showed an acoustically induced smoke flow during alarm, it is difficult to imagine a scenario that could create a uniform ring of enhanced soot deposition on the central horn opening in configuration #1 or around the perimeters of the slotted openings in configuration #2 without the alarm having sounded.

Regarding handling practices, experience from the present study and the full-scale house fire test [1] indicated that the enhanced soot deposition was resistant to damage from normal evidence handling practices, such as those described in NFPA 921 [24]. Care should be taken to avoid direct contact with the horn as this may cause smearing of any soot deposition present. Preferably, the detector should be handled with its lid closed to reduce the risk of an object contacting the horn surface. Consideration should also be given to the state in which the detector is found in the field. For example, if the detector is found underneath a pile of drywall with its lid broken off, the investigator should be aware of the possibility of damage to soot deposition on the horn.

Chladni figures were not observed on any of the piezoelectric discs or horn case in any of the 270 detectors with horn configuration #1 from this study. This is consistent with Munger's investigation [11]. No Chladni figures were observed on any of the piezoelectric discs in any of the detectors from the previous full-scale study [1]. As previously noted, an obvious circular soot deposition around the perimeter edge of the piezoelectric disc was observed in one of the 119 detectors that alarmed with horn configuration #2. Whether this deposition is related to a nodal pattern of the disc or some other phenomenon is not known. A type of Chladni figure was observed on the top surface of one of horn cases from the full-scale test. The fact that this particular form of a Chladni figure was observed on only one of 294 total configuration #1 detectors tested in this and the previous study [1] reinforces the idea that these patterns form under a very narrow set of conditions. So, it is strongly recommended that the absence of a wagon wheel or circular Chladni figure on the piezoelectric disc not be taken as indication of non-activation of the detector.

Enhanced deposition observed on the edges of the slotted opening above the horn can provide additional support that a configuration #1 horn sounded. It is not recommended to use deposition on this grating as the sole indicator of activation or non-activation. Instead, enhanced deposition or the lack of enhanced deposition around the central opening of the configuration #1 horn case should be used as the primary indicator of activation or non-activation since the acoustically induced smoke flow is strongest at this part of the detector. As a result, any enhanced soot deposition will be most apparent at this location. Following the same logic, the presence or absence of enhanced deposition around the three smaller horn openings can provide additional support as to whether the horn sounded. Regarding horn configuration #2, deposition on the inside edges of the slotted openings proved the most reliable indicator of activation. Deposition on the outside edges of the slotted openings was generally lighter, and its presence should only be taken as additional support of the conclusion based on the inside edges.

Qualitative observation of the soot deposited on smoke detectors may provide information about the development of the fire. Black carbonaceous soot deposition was observed in detectors exposed to smoke from flaming polyurethane foam. Orange tarry deposition was observed in detectors exposed to smoke from smoldering polyurethane foam. The presence of both orange enhanced deposition and black enhanced deposition on the sounding horns shown in Figures 7 and 18 reflected the fact that the polyurethane fuel underwent both smoldering and flaming combustion. Further, the presence of the both orange and black enhanced deposition indicated that the detector was alarming during both smoldering and flaming phases. This may apply not only to smoke detectors but also to soot deposition throughout the fire scene. Due to the limited nature of this study, it is not known whether this orange liquid-like deposition would survive in detectors with a significant heat exposure, as may be expected during a real fire. As a result, it is only suggested that the observation of such deposition yields information about the fire source, but it cannot yet be stated that such deposition would be observed in all detectors from actual fires that smoldered and transitioned to flaming.

Conclusions

Enhanced soot deposition and the presence of agglomerates on the edge of the central horn opening in a smoke detector with horn configuration #1 was found to be a reliable indicator that the detector sounded during an exposure to smoke from flaming hydrocarbon pool, flaming polyurethane foam, and smoldering polyurethane foam fires. The presence of enhanced deposition and agglomerates around the perimeter of the inside edges of the slotted openings in horn configuration #2 was also a reliable indicator of activation. If enough soot deposition was present within the detector, the absence of an increased density of soot deposited around the edges of the primary horn openings was an indicator that the horn did not sound. However, for reasons discussed in this paper, a determination of non-activation is inherently more subjective than determination of activation and should thus be noted with caution. Detector orientation and location (sidewall versus ceiling mounted) did not affect enhanced soot deposition and agglomeration. It is hypothesized that any device creating a strong acoustic field during a smoke exposure could create areas of enhanced soot deposition indicative that the device sounded. Chladni figures were not observed on any of the 270 detectors with horn configuration #1 in this study. The absence of Chladni

figures on the horn of a smoke detector was thus found not to be a reliable indicator that the detector did not sound.

Acknowledgments

This research was funded completely by Combustion Science & Engineering, Inc. (CSE). Dr. Lori Streit and Dr. José Torero volunteered their time and effort to this project. The authors of this paper would like to sincerely thank Maclain Holton of CSE for his assistance in setting up and conducting the fire tests; Dr. Michael Klassen of CSE for his useful discussions and assistance at every step of the project; and Kenneth Venzant of First Alert for providing useful information about smoke alarm electronics.

References


- [1] C.L. Worrell, R.J. Roby, L.A. Streit, and J.L. Torero, "Enhanced Deposition, Acoustic Agglomeration, and Chladni Figures in Smoke Detectors," *Fire Technology*, vol. 37, no. 4, 2001, pp. 343-362.
- [2] J.G. Munger, Private Communication, February 2000.
- [3] E.P. Mednikov, *Acoustic Coagulation and Precipitation of Aerosols*, New York: Consultants Bureau Enterprises, Inc., 1965.
- [4] T.L. Hoffmann and G.H. Koopmann, "Visualization of Acoustic Particle Interaction and Agglomeration: Theory and Experiments," *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, vol. 99, no. 4, 1996, pp. 2130-2141.
- [5] T.L. Hoffmann and G.H. Koopmann, "Visualization of Acoustic Particle Interaction and Agglomeration: Theory and Evaluation," *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, vol. 101, no. 6, 1997, pp. 3421-3429.
- [6] R. Tiwary and G. Reethof, "Numerical Simulation of Acoustic Agglomeration and Experimental Verification," *Journal of Vibration, Acoustics, Stress, and Reliability in Design*, vol. 109, April, 1987, pp. 185-191.
- [7] R. Tiwary, G. Reethof, and O.H. McDaniel, "Acoustically Generated Turbulence and its Effect on Acoustic Agglomeration," *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, vol. 76, no. 3, 1984, pp. 841-849.
- [8] R.B. Lindsay, *Acoustics: Historical and Philosophical Development*, Stroudsburg, PA: Dowden, Hutchinson & Ross, Inc., 1973.
- [9] L.L. Beranek, *Acoustics*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.
- [10] E. Kreyszig, "Partial Differential Equations", Chapter 11 in *Advanced Engineering Mathematics*, 8th ed., New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1999.
- [11] J.G. Munger, "Residential Smoke Alarms: Their Effects on the Reduction of America's Fire Death and Injury Rate," Ph.D. dissertation, Columbian Southern University, 1999.
- [12] UL, *UL Standard for Safety Single and Multiple Station Smoke Alarms Fifth Edition; Reprint with Revisions Through and Including 01/04/1999*, UL217, Underwriters Laboratories Inc., Northbrook, IL, 1997.
- [13] CEN, *Components of Automatic Fire Detection Systems Part 9 Fire Sensitivity Test*, EN 54, European Committee for Standardization, 1982.
- [14] C.P. Bankston, R.A. Cassanova, E.A. Powell, and B.T. Zinn, "Review of Smoke Particulate Properties Data for Burning Natural and Synthetic Materials," NBS-GCR-78-147, School of Aerospace Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, May 1978.

- [15] F.D. Hileman, K.J. Voorhees, and I.N. Einhorn, "Pyrolysis of a Flexible-Urethane Foam," in *Proceedings from the Physiological and Toxicological Aspects of Combustion Products: International Symposium*, Salt Lake City, UT, 1974, pp. 226-244.
- [16] J.L. Torero and A.C. Fernandez-Pello, "Forward Smoldering of Polyurethane Foam in a Forced Air Flow," *Combustion and Flame*, vol. 106, no. 1-2, 1996, pp. 89-109.
- [17] G.W. Mulholland, "Smoke Production and Properties," *SFPE Handbook*, 2nd ed., Quincy, MA: National Fire Protection Association, 1995, pp. 4-167.
- [18] NFPA 72, *National Fire Alarm Code*, National Fire Protection Association, Quincy, MA, 2001 ed.
- [19] ANSI S3.41, *Audible Emergency Evacuation Signal*, American National Standards Institute, New York, 1990.
- [20] C.P. Bankston, B.T. Zinn, R.F. Browner, and E.A. Powell, "Aspects of the Mechanisms of Smoke Generation by Burning Materials," *Combustion and Flame*, vol. 41, no. 3, 1981, pp. 273-292.
- [21] C.P. Bankston, R.A. Cassanova, E.A. Powell, and B.T. Zinn, "Initial Data on the Physical Properties of Smoke Produced by Burning Materials under Different Conditions," *Journal of Fire and Flammability*, vol. 7, 1976, pp. 165-180.
- [22] C.P. Bankston, E.A. Powell, R.A. Cassanova, and B.T. Zinn, "Detailed Measurements of the Physical Characteristics of Smoke Particulates Generated by Flaming Materials," *Journal of Fire and Flammability*, vol. 8, 1977, pp. 395-411.
- [23] E.A. Powell, C.P. Bankston, R.A. Cassanova, R.A., and B.T. Zinn, "The Effect of Environmental Temperature upon the Physical Characteristics of the Smoke Produced by Burning Wood and PVC Samples," *Fire and Materials*, vol. 3, no. 1, 1979, pp. 15-22.
- [24] NFPA 921, *Guide for Fire and Explosion Investigations*, National Fire Protection Association, Quincy, MA, 2001 ed.

EXHIBIT D

A FIRE ANALYSIS TOOL REVISITED

ACOUSTIC SOOT AGGLOMERATION IN RESIDENTIAL SMOKE ALARMS



Patrick M. Kennedy, CFEI, CFPS
Kathryn C. Kennedy, CFEI
Gregory E. Gorbett, CFEI

August, 2003
July, 2004

Investigations Institute
857 Tallevast Road
Sarasota, FL 34243
Telephone: 941-351-6409
Facsimile: 941-351-5849

Interflam 2004
10th International Engineering
Conference
Edinburgh, Scotland
July 4-7, 2004



A FIRE ANALYSIS TOOL - REVISITED ACOUSTIC SOOT AGGLOMERATION IN RESIDENTIAL SMOKE ALARMS

**PATRICK M. KENNEDY, CFEI, CFPS
KATHRYN C. KENNEDY, CFEI
GREGORY E. GORBETT, CFEI**

**John A. Kennedy & Associates, Inc.
Fire and Explosion Analysis Experts
857 Tallevast Road
Sarasota, Florida 34243**

Abstract

In modern fire incident analysis and the litigations that frequently follow from them, it is often of great importance to know whether a particular smoke alarm operated during a fire event. Like so many other issues involving the interpretation of fire analysis data, some scientifically verifiable means of determining if a given smoke alarm had activated properly was needed. Best would be some identifiable physical evidence of smoke alarm activation. As early as 1996, it had been put forward that the presence of enhanced soot patterns on fire event exposed smoke alarms was a useable method of determining that a particular smoke alarm had or had not properly activated. Research first published in 1999 and later updated research published in 2001 began to scientifically address the issue. Building on that earlier research, this paper produces additional research particularly focusing on the production of acoustic soot agglomeration patterns in both ionization and photo-electric single station residential smoke alarms. Producing new test data, and combining that with previously reported data, this research work concludes that the presence or absence of acoustic soot agglomeration patterns on smoke detectors exposed to sooty smoke atmospheres was in fact a viable fire analysis tool.

Introduction

Since the early 1970s, single station smoke alarms, both 9-volt battery and 120-volt AC powered, have been the chief fire protection device in most homes and residential occupancies. Over the ensuing years, the early fire warning that these devices have provided to potential fire victims has saved thousands of lives. In household settings it is clear that a well-functioning smoke alarm is the most important fire safety innovation ever. The National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) estimates that 94% of U.S. homes have at least one smoke alarm today, and most states have laws requiring them in residential dwellings.¹ Millions of people have come to rely upon the residential smoke alarm as their primary fire safety resource.

The NFPA also reports that in three of every ten reported fires in homes equipped with smoke alarms, the devices did not work. Households with non-working smoke alarms now outnumber those with no smoke alarms.²

In modern fire incident analysis and the litigations that frequently follow from them, it is often of great importance to know whether a particular smoke alarm operated during a fire event. Issues of available egress time can become paramount in establishing whether fire victims could have been saved if timely smoke alarm activation had occurred. It is not uncommon for surviving witnesses to report that no alarm was heard. This is often an area of dispute in ensuing litigations. The cognitive abilities and accuracy of the memories, and even the veracity of individuals who suffer the trauma of having to escape from burning buildings are frequently questioned.

This issue has led to many important and costly civil law suits. Smoke alarm manufacturers, marketers, installers, and landlords frequently find themselves as defendants in multimillion-dollar lawsuits hinging in whole or in part on the question of smoke alarm performance.

Like so many other issues involving the interpretation of fire analysis data, some scientifically verifiable means of determining if a given smoke alarm had activated properly was needed. Best would be some identifiable physical evidence of smoke alarm activation.

Single Station Residential Smoke Alarms

Most modern single station residential smoke alarms are designed and operate similarly. The basic components are a power source, smoke-sensing chamber, printed circuit board, horn, and an outer container or cover (See Figure 1).




Figure 1 – Typical smoke alarm components

The power sources include a 9-volt battery, hardwired connection to a household 120 volt AC electrical system, or both hardwired as a primary power source with a battery backup in the event of power failure.

Smoke sensing chambers are of two basic types, ionization or photoelectric. Ionization types detect smoke particles by sensing small decreases in current in a monitored circuit. Inside an ionization smoke detection chamber is a small amount of the radioactive element Americium-

241. The alpha-radiation from this material ionizes the oxygen and nitrogen atoms of the air between two parallel plate electrodes. The detector senses the small amount of electrical current that flows between these plates. When smoke enters the ionization smoke detection chamber, it disrupts this current and the smoke alarm senses the drop in current between the plates and sends an alarm signal to the horn.

Photoelectric types detect smoke particles by sensing small increases in current in a monitored photoelectric cell. Inside the photoelectric smoke sensing chamber there is a small light source and a light sensitive sensor. They are positioned at right angles from one another, so that the light source does not normally illuminate the photo sensor. When smoke enters the chamber, however, the smoke particles scatter the light and some amount of light hits the sensor. This creates a small increased current flow and the smoke alarm senses the increased current and sends an alarm signal to the horn. Some more up-to-date smoke alarms are available with dual (ionization and photoelectric) sensor systems.

Underwriters Laboratories³ sets the Visible Smoke Obscuration Limits within which a smoke alarm must activate at 0.5 – 4.0% / ft. Most smoke alarms on the market today list their smoke obscuration sensitivity between 0.64% / ft. \pm 0.14% / ft. and 2.08% / ft. \pm 1.23% / ft. The majority of smoke alarms have their sensitivities the area of 1.1% / ft. \pm 0.4% / ft.

The printed circuit boards contain the circuitry for power input connections (either pigtail connections for AC or battery connection terminals for 9 volt operation), smoke detection chamber operation, alarm activation, low battery (no power) alert, the test button function, temporary alarm deactivation warning, escape or test light circuits, and LED indicator light. The actual smoke detection chambers and horn assemblies are often attached to the circuit boards themselves as well.

Modern smoke alarm horns are small ~1.25" diameter stainless steel disks. They are frequently, but not always, enclosed in molded thermoplastic compartments, which have small (0.43" and 0.375") central openings that serve as sound outlets. In some older model smoke alarms the horn compartments and the horns themselves are of a brass alloy. Some horn enclosures have additional smaller openings. The horn is activated by electrical current that causes the horn disk to vibrate at frequencies up to ~4000 hz, depending upon which function the circuitry is calling for (full alarm, low battery warning, temporary alarm deactivation warning).

The outer covers and bases of modern smoke alarms are constructed of thermoplastics. They are capable of melting and deforming at elevated temperatures. UL 217 section 62.2 sets the maximum temperature to which smoke alarm thermoplastic components must maintain their shapes at 194° F. (90° C).⁴ Our testing disclosed an initial softening temperature of a representative smoke alarm cover at 199° F. (93° C), initial softening of the plastic horn compartment at 250° F. (121° C), and smoke sensing chamber plastic components at 351° F. (177° C).

Among the various manufactures there are many minor design differences, but virtually every manufacturer's smoke alarm covers contain some arrangement of grillwork or other opening for smoke entrance, for alarm sound exit, and an opening for a test button and or alarm condition

LED indicator light. Most smoke alarms are basically designed as a squat cylinder in shape with outside diameters ranging from ~5.0” to ~5.5” and heights from ~1.25” to ~1.5.” They are all designed to be installed in the ceilings of rooms not closer than 4” from the sidewalls or on sidewalls not less than 4” nor more than 12” down from the ceiling.⁵

Background in Previous Research

In 1999 Munger produced his doctoral thesis on residential smoke alarms.⁶ Prior to that time he had become aware of theories put forward by some smoke alarm manufacturer’s defense experts that the presence of certain soot patterns (Chladni Figures) on alarm horn disk plates could be used as proof that a particular alarm had sounded.⁷ As part of his doctoral dissertation research, Munger conducted an experiment in which he placed six smoke alarms, (three energized and three de-energized) in a “smoke box” and exposed them to a burning polyurethane smoke source for fifteen minutes. His results were “... [that] there was no discernable difference in the smoke patterns on the discs of the horns regardless of whether the device was operational or not.” Munger’s testing was quite limited in its scope, involving only three energized smoke alarms. Also, Munger’s experiment was pointed entirely to an investigation of the production of Chladni Figures on the horn disks themselves and not on other areas or types of soot deposition.

Worrell *et al* reported in 2001, and citing Munger, that up until that time there had been “...no published methods for determining whether a particular detector actually sounded in response to a smoke exposure.”⁸ Their testing appears to be the first published work on the topic. In their article abstract they reported:

“A full scale house test was conducted to investigate the accuracy of two proposed methods for determining whether a smoke or carbon monoxide (CO) alarm sounded during smoke exposure. One method involves examining the plastic case of the alarm’s piezoelectric horn for locally enhanced soot deposition and agglomerated soot particles. The other method involves examining the metal disc of the piezoelectric horn for a Chladni figure. Pairs of detectors, each consisting of one detector with its battery properly inserted and the other with its battery disconnected, were placed throughout the house. Each of the properly charged detectors was monitored to determine if and when the detector sounded. It was found that the presence of locally enhanced deposition and soot agglomerates on the main central opening of the plastic horn enclosure of a smoke or CO detector was a strong indicator that the alarm sounded. It was also found that the use of Chladni figures on the piezoelectric discs as an indication of the smoke detector sounding was not an accurate predictor.”⁹

Chladni Figures

The experiments of both the Worrell *et al* group and Munger dealt to a certain extent with the production “Chladni Figures,” the earliest experimental technique to visualize patterns of vibration. Ernst Chladni (k্লাhd'nee) (1756-1827) first published his method in 1787. He excited a plate into vibration with a violin bow and sprinkled sand on the surface. The sand gathered at the nodal lines, revealing the vibration pattern. Chladni had used this method to study vibration of plates of many shapes, and these results were important in validating the theoretical models for plate vibration that were developed during the nineteenth century.¹⁰ The method is still in wide use today for varying vibration wave inquiries and as a teaching method for elementary wave theory physics.

On circular plates, similar in shape to the smoke alarm horn disk, Chladni Figures can be displayed as circumferential circles centered at the center of the flat disk (see a. in Figure 2a), radial arms radiating outward from the center of the disk or combinations (see Figure 2b and c)

and variations of both including certain “starburst” type shapes (see Figure 3, nos. 4, 6, 8, 11 and 12).




Figure 2 - Examples of Circumferential (circular) and radial Chladni figures




Figure 3 – Additional Chladni Figures
 (from Chladni’s original text).^{11,12}

Soot Deposition and Acoustic Soot Agglomeration

The other physical phenomenon particularly addressed by Worrell *et al* is Acoustic Soot Agglomeration in the activation of a smoke alarm. The simple definition of Acoustic Agglomeration from Morfey in the Dictionary of Acoustics is: “the grouping of suspended

particles into larger aggregates by the action of sound waves in the suspending fluid, usually at high intensity.”¹³

Acoustic agglomeration of aerosols has been known since at least 1931 when it was first observed that small particles tend to "stick" together in the presence of an intense acoustic field, thereby forming larger particles. NFPA 921 defines smoke as: “an airborne particulate product of incomplete combustion suspended in gases, vapors, or solid and liquid aerosols” and soot as: “black particles of carbon produced in a flame”¹⁴ The smoke produced in a structure fire contains both soot and other liquid and solid aerosols. Smoke and soot in combination with the high frequency (~4000 hz) and high sound pressure (~>85 decibels) of a properly operating smoke alarm are key elements for producing localized soot agglomeration on surfaces of the smoke alarm.

Though Worrell *et al* use the separate terms of “Enhanced [Soot] Deposition” and “Acoustic Soot Agglomeration,” they give this explanation of both terms by way of a definition, “When individual soot particles collide under certain conditions, they adhere or agglomerate to form larger particles.”¹⁵

Focusing their research on Enhanced Deposition, Acoustic Soot Agglomeration and Chladni Figures, the Worrell *et al* research reported three main conclusions.¹⁶

1. “For the conditions generated by a room fire that grows to flashover in a typical residential occupancy, the presence of locally enhanced deposition and soot agglomerates on the main opening of a smoke or CO detectors horn case, relative to soot deposits elsewhere on the case, is a strong indication that the alarm sounded”
2. “Due to the limited focus of the current research, the absence of such enhanced deposition and agglomerates does not necessarily indicate that the alarm did not sound.”
3. “The absence of a Chladni figure on the piezoelectric horn disc or horn enclosure does not necessarily exclude the possibility that the alarm sounded.”

Purpose of Kennedy *et al* Testing/Research

Building on the ground breaking work of Worrell, Roby, Streit, and Torero,¹⁷ and also in part on Munger, we proposed to produce additional research particularly focusing on the production of acoustic soot agglomeration in both ionization and photo-electric single station residential smoke alarms.

There were several aspects of the Worrell *et al* testing which we felt limited and called into question the breadth of some of their conclusions. We were particularly interested in their conclusion that while the presence of soot agglomeration was an indicator of smoke alarm activation, the absence of soot agglomeration was not a viable indicator of smoke alarm failure. There are many aspects of acoustic soot agglomeration that must be fully and objectively evaluated in order to reach the conclusion that the absence of soot agglomeration was not a viable indicator of smoke alarm failure. Among these are particle size distribution (10µm),

smoke mass loading, gas temperature (25-1000 C), sound pressure level (≥ 85 dbA), and frequency of the acoustic field (~ 4000 hz). Most important of these is the presence of a truly sooty environment. In real world fire conditions, knowing the actual smoke or soot distribution and density to which a smoke alarm is exposed is problematical. In the bench-type testing which forms the basis of our research we can quantify and reproduce the amount of soot and smoke exposure of the test alarms. The Worrell *et al* group's testing cannot.

The conclusion that the absence of enhanced soot deposition does not accurately report the non-operation of a smoke alarm is totally dependant on some reasonable report of the nature and amount of smoke and soot to which the subject smoke alarm was exposed. In real world investigation conditions this can only be accomplished by accurate description of the visual obscuration by eyewitnesses, post-fire examinations of the soot deposition in the burned structure and perhaps by mathematical modeling of the fire. Though each of these data collection methods is somewhat subjective, reasonable estimations can be made if the analyst is conservative and objective in his or her analysis.

In addition, though the Worrell *et al* research was partially concerned with an inquiry into the production of Chladni Figures on the horn disks themselves, we found what appeared to be the presence of unreported "starburst" radial Chladni Figures on five of the photographs of soot agglomeration presented in the Worrell *et al* paper.¹⁸ These photographs displayed soot agglomerations around the tops of the "main central opening[s]" of horn disk enclosures. Our testing also produced similar Chladni Figures. This was in addition to the one circumferential Chladni Figure on the exterior top surface of a horn enclosure that Worrell *et al* did report, but which our testing did not reproduce.¹⁹

The purpose of our current research is to further refine the question of whether the presence or absence of acoustic soot agglomeration and Chladni Figures are in fact viable tools in the determination of whether or not a smoke alarm had activated in an actual fire incident.

Research Testing Considerations

The only previous published testing in the subject area [Worrell *et al*] was conducted in a full-scale house fire. While real world conditions testing is an important part of such research, conditions with such a "test chamber" are extremely difficult to control. Witness that fully 30% of their test data was lost due to complete destruction of some of the subject alarms themselves by the fire (six units), other data acquisition failures (four units), and one case in which they were unable to recover a unit horn. While the house fire scenario did give the testing a wide variety of test media (smoke, soot, pyrolysis products, etc.), control of the test media (e.g. mass optical density, smoke obscuration, time of exposure, and chemical composition) is impossible in such a test environment. In addition trans- and post-test conditions: wind, continued emberous fire exposure, extinguishment water, disturbance of the test area by firefighters, etc. is remarkably difficult or impossible to control.

In formulating our test protocols and conducting the actual research testing we focused on six issues of consideration. Each of which was lacking in the previous research.

Reproducibility of Testing Results

The testing and data must be reproducible. For this, the test protocol, testing equipment, subject smoke alarms, smoke test chamber, smoke/soot medium, and smoke/soot generation system must be simple enough so that they can be reproduced in any competent fire science laboratory. At the same time the test set-up must have the characteristics to be serviceable for the production, confinement, and control of the test environment. The testing protocol must be carefully crafted so as to allow identical testing of each subject smoke alarm, and reduce the effect of uncontrolled variables on test results.

Reduction in Test Variables

Test variables must be kept to a minimum. In our testing we tried to limit the variables to only the actual smoke alarm units themselves. Each unit tested was of a basically similar design, with some slight variations in physical size. Each smoke alarm was purchased locally, “off-the-shelf” from regular home improvement style vendors and was representative of the most common and popular manufacturers of single station residential smoke alarms. Each was basically cylindrical in shape with outside diameters ranging from ~5.0” to ~5.5” and heights from ~1.25” to ~1.5.” A variety of AC and battery powered, and ionization and photoelectric models was utilized. Each tested unit was placed in the same position on the ceiling of the test chamber. Each unit was tested under the same smoke conditions and for the same time of smoke exposure.

The variable of actual elapsed time of alarming was uncontrolled by the testing lab technicians and depended solely upon the functional characteristics of the smoke alarms themselves. Not all of the smoke alarms tested began alarming at the same point in time relative to initial smoke exposure nor persisted in the alarm mode for the same time periods, but these time factors were recorded in the data collection stage.

Control of Test Conditions

Test conditions must be controllable, particularly the most important factors of extent and time of smoke exposure. Outside variable factors such as ambient conditions of temperature, humidity, and wind outside the test chamber must also be eliminated as test variables. This simply cannot be done in a full-scale acquired house burn. In most cases the agglomerated soot is fragile and susceptible to disturbance and removal by careless handling. Therefore post-testing conditions; such as careful removal of the test subject smoke alarms from the test chamber without disturbance to the important soot evidence, and limiting handling and transportation before laboratory examination are also important. Here the advantage of in-lab bench testing comes into play.

Increased Database Size

One of our primary concerns was to increase the information database of tested smoke alarms, both in total number and in variety of smoke alarm designs. This was accomplished by combining and, to the extent possible, integrating the tests results from the Worrell *et al* research and our own test results. Thusly, the database upon which Worrell *et al*'s conclusions were drawn can be more than doubled and we gain the benefit of their viable and diverse test data as well as our own.

The integration of the two databases can be justified if the following key points of difference between the sets of data are duly noted and kept in mind: The Worrell *et al* data was achieved from a full-scale, largely uncontrolled house burn; 30% of their data was lost or deemed by them

as not reliable; their smoke and CO alarm database designs, consisted entirely of BRK manufacture; and subjective, qualitative data analysis, particularly with regard to the presence of Chladni Figures and the sufficiency of soot deposition for analysis, may vary widely between the two research teams. So in order to use the two sets of data we must take the Worrell *et al* data reporting as accurate as given.

Two of the key elements in differing alarm manufacturers' designs are smoke inlet grill design and horn enclosure or compartment design. The horn enclosure design displayed in the Worrell *et al* paper is completely of the BRK type (e.g. BRK, First Alert, Sears brands). Other manufacturers such as Kidde employ different horn enclosure or compartment designs or in the case of FireX, no horn enclosure or separate chamber at all. While BRK-types and Kidde both employ the relatively large central opening in their respective horn enclosures (approximately 0.43" and 0.375" diameter, respectively), FireX has no such construction at all other than a relatively small cover grill work sound exit hole as also do Kidde, Family-Guard, and First Alert.

Similarly, widely differing designs in the size and style of smoke inlet grills are employed among the BRK-type, Kidde, Family-Guard, and FireX brands, with the Kidde and FireX brands being considerably smaller in overall entrance area and the inlet area of the tested First Alerts being roughly one-half the size of the BRKs.

Data Collection

We endeavored to keep our data collection simple and accurate. Worrell *et al*'s 30 % data loss was important in our thinking. Two kinds of data are needed and collected in this type of research, quantitative data and the more subjective observational data. Quantitative data includes temperatures, timing of events such as initial smoke alarm activation, and total smoke exposure and alarm activation times. The more subjective data is the recognition and characterization of soot patterns. Both are important to this kind of smoke alarm activation recognition research. Technicians' observations and notes, particularly with respect to alarm initial activation and total alarm activation times, were backed-up by temperature and time data-logger input. In this topic area the advantage of in-lab bench testing over field-testing is apparent. Technicians in the laboratory could actually hear and note when the smoke alarms went into alarm and did not have to rely solely upon the electrical data acquisition which was sometimes lost in the full-scale house fire field tests. In addition, it is not unheard of that when a smoke alarm sensor detects a fire and sends an electrical signal to the horn, the horn does not sound properly. The mere monitoring for the presence of the alarm electrical activation signal will not verify that the horn is in fact sounding or sounding with the prescribed minimum sound pressure level (≥ 85 dBA).²⁰ It is in fact this elevated sound pressure level that is a key factor in whether Acoustic Soot Agglomeration will occur at all - the very point of the entire research. "Do properly sounding smoke alarms produce enhanced soot patterns while improperly operating smoke alarms do not?"

Qualitative data recognition, particularly the presence or absence of enhanced soot deposition, Acoustic Soot Agglomeration, and Chladni Figures, was particularly more subjective. We are acutely aware of our opinions that the Worrell *et al* researchers missed or failed to report the presence of "starburst" Chladni Figures on the horn enclosures displayed in their report. We have the utmost respect for the expertise of our colleagues among the Worrell *et al* researchers. It is, in fact, this unequivocal respect that points up the pitfalls of these subjective characterizations of the presence of Chladni Figures. There is no doubt that we see these figures

both in their published photographs as well as in the soot agglomeration test results of our own work. That our much-esteemed colleagues failed to cite them in their work points up the importance, and pitfalls, of the qualitative nature of these observations. In order to mitigate these kinds of subjective evaluations, we utilized a “triple blind” analysis technique for all of our agglomeration and Chladni Figure opinions. Each of the three authors of our research independently examined visually, with naked eye, and with both macro- and micro-magnification, the presence of soot depositions, particularly with reference to agglomerations on the outer covers of the smoke alarm bodies, the inner and outer surfaces of the horn enclosures, and the Chladni Figures present.

Exploring Pattern Persistence

Lastly, an issue that frequently comes up in other pattern-based fire analyses, including smoke alarm acoustic soot agglomeration litigation cases, is the issue of patterns persistence.²¹ Pattern's persistence is commonly defined as a fire pattern's ability to endure through the continued fire growth affecting the surface[s] upon which the patterns occur and still be present for post-fire analysis. Smoke alarms are frequently heated by their presence on walls and ceilings within the hot upper layers of compartment fires. This heating takes place within the same upper smoke layer that distributes the smoke that causes the smoke alarm to activate and the production of acoustic soot agglomeration, soot deposition, and Chladni Figures that are the subject of this research. After fire events, the remnants of smoke alarms are seldom found in their original pristine conditions. In fact they are seldom found in their original positions at all. The thermoplastics of which smoke alarms are commonly constructed have a softening and melting temperature of approximately >199-351° F. (93-177° C). Thereby when heated to those temperatures both the outer covers and the horn enclosures begin to soften, melt, and frequently fall to the floor, with their previously deposited soot patterns already applied.

In a single, specific bench test in a laboratory Transit oven, a specimen smoke alarm fell from its gypsum wallboard vertically mounted position at a temperature of 283° F. (139° C).

The question of patterns persistence is whether the previously deposited soot patterns have the ability to persist through the continued increased heating which takes place while the smoke alarms are in place on the ceiling or upper walls or ultimately on the floor as the compartment fire continues to grow through flashover where average upper layer temperatures approach and exceed 1112° F. (600° C).²²

In a second single specific bench test, a previously smoke tested smoke alarm, (P3) bearing acoustic soot agglomeration was subjected to 30 minutes of heating to a temperature of 433° F. (223 C) in a lab furnace. After air cooling the resultant softened and re-solidified plastic of the outer cover and the horn enclosure were examined to see if the deposited Acoustic Soot Agglomerations persisted.

Test Procedures

Equipment

A specially constructed smoke chamber was used in all testing. It measured 24”L x 24”W x 14”H, producing an interior volume of 2.8 cu. ft. There was a 9”W x 7”H glass viewing window placed 5” above the chamber floor in the center of the front wall. The 24” x 24” lid of the chamber was constructed of ½” gypsum wallboard and fit (smoke-tight) into the top of the chamber on nominal 2” horizontal flanges. In the center of the right wall of the smoke chamber was an 8”W x 8.5”H manually operated dampered smoke vent. This vent remained closed during testing.

The test smoke alarms were attached to the underside of the gypsum wallboard ceiling, on the lateral centerline, with the rear edge of the smoke alarm 5” from the rear wall.

A type “K” thermocouple was attached to the inside surface of the chamber ceiling on the lateral centerline ~2” forward of the tested smoke alarm (see Figures 5 and 6).

The smoke source was an ~2” laminar gas flame of MAPP Gas (C_3H_4) (mixture of 56.0% Propane and 44.0% methylacetylene-propadiene) from a ¼” diameter copper tube burner. The ~2” MAPP Gas laminar flame from a ¼” diameter copper tube burner produces an extremely sooty black smoke which is primary carbon soot in composition. The smoke source is inserted into a hole in the lower center of the chamber front wall beneath the viewing window and extends into the chamber at floor level a distance of 6” (see Figure 4).




Figure 4 – Smoke Source, 2” laminar MAPP Gas flame

A Fire Analysis Tool Revisited –
 Acoustic Soot Agglomeration in Residential Smoke Detectors
 Page 12




Figure 5 - Top View Drawing of Smoke Test Chamber




Figure 6 - Front View Drawing of Smoke Test Chamber

Protocol

A Fire Analysis Tool Revisited –
 Acoustic Soot Agglomeration in Residential Smoke Detectors
 Page 13

A test smoke alarm was powered, either with a prescribed internal 9V battery or if a hard wired designed unit, with external standard house line 120V AC, and attached in place on the interior ceiling (lid) of the test chamber. The monitoring thermocouple was attached through the top of the chamber lid and the lid is screwed in place onto the nominal 2" flanges. (See Figure 7).




Figure 7 – Top View of Smoke Test Chamber displaying Smoke Alarm Placement

The smoke source was lighted outside of the chamber and inserted into place within the chamber through a hole in the lower front center of the chamber and extended into the chamber a distance of 6".

Timing begins when the smoke source is inserted. Temperature in the upper layer of the chamber is recorded each minute. Time and duration of alarming are recorded. Total time of smoke exposure is 15 minutes. Immediately thereafter the smoke source is promptly removed and the vent damper and chamber lid are opened.

After allowing the smoke alarm to air cool, its outer surface is visually examined and photographed. Then the smoke alarm is carefully disassembled and any interior soot patterns are noted and photographed.

The testing is then repeated with a duplicate smoke alarm that is not energized.

Discussion

Chladni Figures on Horn Enclosures – Horn enclosures are not true disks as is the horn disk itself. Therefore Chladni Figures do not appear in the classical fully developed forms.

In the combined Worrell *et al* and Kennedy *et al* data we found both circumferential (Worrell *et al* only) and radial “starburst” Chladni Figures on the horn enclosures (both Worrell *et al* and Kennedy *et al*).

Though the basic operational design (sensing chamber, circuit board and horn) are in all residential smoke alarms, Individual Smoke alarm designs differ greatly from manufacturer to manufacturer, particularly with respect to horn enclosures or compartments and smoke inlet grills. For example, FireX Brand alarms do not have separate horn compartments.

The presence of Chladni figures in the agglomerated soot is important because it is also indicative of the vibrating nature of the dynamics of the horn operation – proving that the horn had activated a high frequency (~4000 hz)

Sympathetic Vibrations - Sympathetic vibrations can produce acoustic soot agglomeration in non-operating alarms if they are placed too close to other operating alarms of the same manufacturer (i.e. identical horn disks), for example if a CO alarm, a photoelectric smoke alarm, and an ionization smoke alarm are mounted close together by an installer in an attempt to provide a wider coverage of various expected unsafe atmospheres. Manufacturers frequently recommend the installation of multiple types of alarms to increase safety from the various types of fires (smoldering and fast flaming).

In our earliest test, two identical smoke alarms, one powered (P1) and one not powered (NP1) were tested simultaneously installed in the smoke test chamber about 4 inches apart. The powered alarm produced easily identifiable soot agglomeration depositions. Surprisingly the non-powered alarm produced similar, though much lighter, soot agglomeration. We attributed this to sympathetic acoustic vibration of the identical non-powered horn from the high frequency high sound pressure activation of its nearby, twin, powered horn; and to the vibrations transmitted to the non-powered horn from the powered horn through the gypsum wallboard ceiling of the test chamber itself. In all subsequent testing we tested powered and non-powered horns separately and no non-powered horn produced any evidence of agglomerated sooting patterns.

Patterns Persistence – To test patterns persistence, a previously smoke tested alarm, (P3) bearing acoustic soot agglomeration was subjected to 30 minutes of heating in a lab furnace to a temperature of 433° F. (223° C). After air-cooling the resultant softened and re-solidified plastic of the outer cover and the horn enclosure were examined to see if the deposited Acoustic Soot Agglomerations persisted. Patterns persistence was evident.

Evaluation of Combined Data

Combining the data from the Worrell *et al* and our testing effectively doubles the database. Worrell *et al* produced a total of 30 tests, 15 powered and 15 non-powered. Table A displays the test results for the Worrell *et al* testing.

Of the Worrell *et al* testing, 9 tests produced anomalous or unusable data. A listing of these anomalous tests can be found in Table D.

Removing the anomalous tests from the database, Worrell *et al* produced 9 powered tests (Table B) and 12 non-powered tests (Table C).

Kennedy *et al* produced a total of 22 tests, 12 powered and 10 non-powered (Table E). The first two of the powered tests were for preliminary equipment setup and were labeled Exemplar 1 and Exemplar 2. The exemplar tests smoke alarms were subjected to less total smoke exposure than the subsequent tests, but because they did produce identifiable results, they were included in the total test database. None of the test data from the Kennedy *et al* testing was classified as anomalous.

The combined Worrell *et al* and Kennedy *et al* tests results (less anomalous tests) encompassed a total of 42 tests, 21 powered and 22 non-powered (see Table F).

All of the powered tests (21) displayed acoustic soot agglomeration and none of the non-powered tests (22) produced any enhanced soot deposition.

None of the tests (Worrell *et al* or Kennedy *et al*) produced any Chladni Figures on the horn disks. Five of the Kennedy *et al* tests produced “starburst” type Chladni figures, 4 on the outer surfaces of the horn compartments around the central sound outlet hole and 1 on a smoke alarm outer case. Though the exact number is unknown, several of the Worrell *et al* tests also produced “starburst” type Chladni Figures on the outer surfaces of the horn compartments around the central sound outlet hole.

More information on the evaluation of the combined Worrell *et al* and Kennedy *et al* test data can be found in Table F.

Findings

Acoustic Soot Agglomeration

The presence of soot agglomerations is a strong indicator that a particular smoke alarm activated properly in a fire (see Figure 8).




Figure 8 – Acoustic Soot Agglomeration around central and circumferential sound holes of a powered horn disk enclosure.

Absence of soot agglomeration products on a fire exposed smoke alarm is evidence that the alarm did not sound, providing that the atmosphere to which the smoke alarm was exposed was sufficiently sooty (see Figure 9).





Figure 9 – Lack of Acoustic Soot Agglomeration on the horn enclosure of a non-powered smoke alarm

External agglomeration will appear in the cover grillwork of properly operating smoke alarms, particularly in the areas of horn chamber sound outlets (see Figures 10a and 10b and Figure 11).



Figures 10 a. and b. – Acoustic Soot Agglomeration around the sound exit grillwork of a Kidde Smoke Alarm






Figure 11 – Non-powered Kidde Smoke Alarm without Acoustic Soot Agglomeration on the sound exit grillwork

Internal Agglomeration will appear on various internal parts of a properly operating smoke alarm, particularly the sound exit openings of horn enclosures, but also frequently on such other parts as electrical components, circuit boards, and the inside surfaces of the cover grillwork close to the horn disks or horn enclosures (see Figures 12a. and 12b.).



Figures 12a. and b. - Acoustic Soot Agglomeration on the interior surface of the smoke alarm case directly over the horn compartment central sound exit opening

Agglomerated soot deposits were found on the top surfaces of several horn disks themselves, but not in the form of Chladni figures.

Chladni Figures

Chladni figures, on one occasion circumferential, but recurrently starburst-shaped, were frequently present on the external surfaces of horn enclosures immediately adjacent to the large sound outlet holes.



No Chladni figures were found on any horn disks themselves.

Sympathetic Vibrations

Sympathetic vibrations can produce acoustic soot agglomeration in non-operating alarms if they are placed too close to other operating alarms of the same manufacturer (i.e. identical horn disks).

Patterns Persistence

Through heating to temperatures exceeding the approximate temperature at which smoke alarm falldown occurs, 283° F. (139° C), soot deposit patterns persistence occurs as long as the subject smoke alarm is not completely destroyed by subsequent burning.



Figures 13 a. and b. – Patterns Persistence
Soot agglomeration on a horn enclosure central sound exit opening before (left) and After (right) heating to 433° F. (223° C) for thirty minutes

Additional Research

Our work is not complete. Such issues as soot particle size, optical obscuration data, agglomeration per unit time, ceiling vs. wall mounted smoke alarms, minimum time for agglomeration to occur, and other soot and smoke sources, all need to be addressed. Work in these regards has already begun both by the Kennedy *et al* and the Worrell *et al* teams.

END

TABLE A - WORRELL *et al* TESTS RESULTS²³

No.	Type	Powered	Activated	Macro Black Ring	Micro Black Ring
1	Ion	Yes	Yes	A*	A*
2	Ion	No	No	No	No
3	Photo	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
4	Photo	No	No	No	No
5	CO	Yes	B*	No	No
6	CO	No	No	No	No
7	Ion	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
8	Ion	No	No	No	No
9	Photo	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
10	Photo	No	No	No	No
11	CO	Yes	Yes	No	C*
12	CO	No	No	No	C*
13	Ion	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
14	Ion	No	No	No	No
15	Photo	Yes	Yes B*	Yes	Yes
16	Photo	No	No	No	No
17	CO	Yes	B*	Yes	Yes
18	CO	No	No	No	No
19	Ion	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
20	Ion	No	No	No	C*
21	Photo	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
22	Photo	No	No	No	No
23	CO	Yes	B*	No	C*
24	CO	No	No	No	No
25	Ion	Yes	Yes	D*	D*
26	Ion	No	No	D*	D*
27	Photo	Yes	Yes	D*	D*
28	Photo	No	No	D*	D*
29	CO	Yes	B*	D*	D*
30	CO	No	No	D*	D*

* - Anomalous Tests results

A – Horn not recovered

B – Data acquisition failure

C - Not enough soot to determine

D – Detector Consumed in Fire

**TABLE B – COMPILATION OF WORRELL *et al* RESULTS FOR POWERED
 DETECTORS THAT ACTIVATED**

No.	Type	Activated	Macro Black Ring	Micro Black Ring
3	Photo	Yes	Yes	Yes
7	Ion	Yes	Yes	Yes
9	Photo	Yes	Yes	Yes
11	CO	Yes	No	C*
13	Ion	Yes	No	Yes
15	Photo	Yes B*	Yes	Yes
17	CO	B*	Yes	Yes
19	Ion	Yes	Yes	Yes
21	Photo	Yes	Yes	Yes

B – Data acquisition failure

C - Not enough soot to determine

**TABLE C – COMPILATION OF WORRELL *et al* RESULTS FOR NON-POWERED
 DETECTORS THAT DID NOT ACTIVATE**

No.	Type	Activated	Macro Black Ring	Micro Black Ring
2	Ion	No	No	No
4	Photo	No	No	No
6	CO	No	No	No
8	Ion	No	No	No
10	Photo	No	No	No
12	CO	No	No	C*
14	Ion	No	No	No
16	Photo	No	No	No
18	CO	No	No	No
20	Ion	No	No	C*
22	Photo	No	No	No
24	CO	No	No	No

C - Not enough soot to determine

TABLE D – COMPILATION OF WORRELL *et al* ANOMALOUS TEST RESULTS

No.	Type	Powered	Activated	Macro Black Ring	Micro Black Ring
1	Ion	Yes	Yes	A*	A*
5	CO	Yes	B*	No	No
23	CO	Yes	B*	No	C*
25	Ion	Yes	Yes	D*	D*
26	Ion	No	No	D*	D*
27	Photo	Yes	Yes	D*	D*
28	Photo	No	No	D*	D*
29	CO	Yes	B*	D*	D*
30	CO	No	No	D*	D*

* - Anomalous Tests results

- A – Horn not recovered
- B – Data acquisition failure
- C - Not enough soot to determine
- D – Detector Consumed in Fire

TABLE E - KENNEDY TEST RESULTS

Outer Case	Horn Case	Horn Disk	TEST Model		Agglomeration	Horn Case Agglomeration	Outer case	Horn Disk
			MFG. Code or Photo	Ionization/Powered				
Exemplar 1	1235K	Ion	Yes	Yes ^{*i}	Yes	Yes ^{*i}	Yes	No
Exemplar 2	83R	Ion	Yes	Yes ^{*i}	No	Yes	No	No
P1	83R	Ion	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
NP1	83R	Ion	No	Yes ^{**a}	No	Yes ^{**a}	No	No
P2	83R	Ion	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes ^{*b}	No
NP2	83R	Ion	No	No	No	No	No	No
P3	83R	Ion	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
NP3	83R	Ion	No	No	No	No	No	No
P4	83R	Ion	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
NP4	83R	Ion	No	No	No	No	No	No
P5 ^{*c}	1235K	Ion	Yes	Yes	Yes ^{*d}	Yes	No	No
NP5	1235K	Ion	No	No	No	No	No	No
P6	1235K	Ion	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes ^{*e}	Yes ^{*e}	No
NP6	1235K	Ion	No	No	No	No	No	No
P7 ^{*f}	CPBC	Photo	Yes	Yes	No	N/A ^{*g}	N/A ^{*g}	No
NP7	CPBC	Photo	No	No	No	N/A ^{*g}	N/A ^{*g}	No
P8	AD	Ion	Yes	Yes	Yes ^{*h}	Yes ^{*h}	Yes ^{*h}	No
NP8	AD	Ion	No	No	No	No	N/A ^{*g}	No
P9	FG888D	Ion	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
NP9	FG888D	Ion	No	No	No	No	No	No
P10	FG888D	Ion	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
NP10	FG888D	Ion	No	No	No	No	No	No

* NOTES FOR TABLE V a – Sympathetic vibration from P1; b – side nearest contact “B” has indistinct Chladni Figure; c – Agglomeration on circuit board in area of horn; d – Chladni Figure found inside of outer case near the horn area; e – Chladni Figure found inside of outer case near the horn area and on the inside and outside of the horn case; f – Through exposed to smoke for full 15 minutes, P7 horn only operated for 3 minutes; g – This model has no horn case; h – Agglomeration around outer edge of horn disk; i – Minimal soot for classification

TABLE F - EVALUATION of COMBINED WORRELL *et al* and KENNEDY *et al* TEST DATA

TYPES OF TESTS	WORRELL <i>et al</i> TESTS		KENNEDY <i>et al</i> TESTS		TOTAL NUMBER OF TESTS	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Total Number Of Tests	30	30/30 (100%)	22	22/22 (100%)	52	52/52 (100%)
Powered Tests	15	15/30 (50%)	12	12/22 (55%)	27	27/52 (52%)
Non-Powered Tests	15	15/30 (50%)	10	10/22 (45%)	25	25/52 (48%)
Anomalous Tests	9	9/30 (30%)	0	0	9	9/52 (17%)
Anomalous Powered Tests	6	6/15 (40%)	0	0	6	6/52 (12%)
Anomalous Non-Powered Tests	3	3/15 (20%)	0	0	3	3/52 (6%)
Tests with Viable Data	21	21/30 (70%)	22	22/22 (100%)	43	43/52 (83%)
Soot Agglomeration (Powered - less Anomalous Tests)	9	9/9 (100%)	12	12/12 (100%)	21	21/21 (100%)
Soot Agglomeration (Non-Powered - less Anomalous Tests)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Non-Powered Tests w/o Soot Agglomeration (less Anomalous Tests)	12	12/12 (100%)	10	10/10 (100%)	22	22/22 (100%)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Underwriter's Laboratories Standard for Safety UL 217, Single and Multiple Station Smoke Alarms, Fifth Edition, dated February 21, 1999 Northbrook, IL

C. L. Worrell, R. J. Roby, L. Streit, and J. L. Torero, "Enhanced Deposition, Acoustic Agglomeration, and Chladni Figures in Smoke Detectors," *Fire Technology*, 37, 343-362, (USA: Kluwer Academic Publishing, 2001). 343

J. Munger, "Residential Smoke Alarms: Their Effect on the Reduction of America's Fire Death and Injury rate," Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia Southern University, 1999

Endnotes

¹ NFPA Fact Sheet "Smoke Alarms – Make Them Work for Your Safety," National Fire Protection Association, Quincy, MA, 2003.

² NFPA Fact Sheet.

³ UL 217, Single and Multiple Station Smoke Alarms, Underwriter's Laboratories Standard for Safety, Fifth Edition, dated February 21, 1999 Northbrook, IL. 37.1.

⁴ UL 217, 62.2

⁵ National Fire Protection Association, "NFPA 72 - 2001, The National Fire Alarm Code," (Quincy, MA: National Fire Protection Association, 2002) Sec. 11.8.3.4*

⁶ J. Munger, "Residential Smoke Alarms: Their Effect on the Reduction of America's Fire Death and Injury rate," Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia Southern University, 1999

⁷ J. R. Munger, Ph.D., CFPS, Personal Communication, July, 2003.

⁸ C. L. Worrell, R. J. Roby, L. Streit, and J. L. Torero, "Enhanced Deposition, Acoustic Agglomeration, and Chladni Figures in Smoke Detectors," *Fire Technology*, 37, 343-362, (USA: Kluwer Academic Publishing, 2001). 343

⁹ Worrell et al. 343

¹⁰ University of Cambridge, Dynamics and Vibration Group, web page, www-mech.eng.cam.ac.uk/dynvib/ (2001-2002)

¹¹ Ernst F. F. Chladni, *Entdeckungen über die Theorie des Klanges (Discovery of the Theory of Pitch)*, Leipzig, 1787

¹² Copyright, 1985 Smithsonian Institution

¹³ Christopher Morfey, *Dictionary of Acoustics*, Institute of Sound and Vibration Research, (2000): Academic Press, University of Southampton, U.K.

¹⁴ NFPA 921 – 2001, sections 1.3.108 and 1.3.111 respectively

¹⁵ Worrell et al. 345

¹⁶ Worrell et al. 361

¹⁷ Worrell et al.

¹⁸ Worrell et al, Figures 6a, 9, 11 (top), 13 (top), 13 (center)

¹⁹ Worrell et al. p. 351 and Figures 9, 10

²⁰ UL 217.

²¹ Patrick M. Kennedy and James H. Shanley, Jr., "Report of the United States Fire Administration Program for the Study of Fire Patterns," FA 178, (Emmitsburg, MD: Federal Emergency Management Agency United States Fire Administration 1997)

²² Patrick Kennedy and Kathryn Kennedy, "Flashover and Fire Analysis," (Sarasota, FL: Investigations Institute, 2003)

²³ Worrell et al. 351

EXHIBIT I



MEMORANDUM

TO: NFPA Technical Committee on Fire Investigations
FROM: Stacey Van Zandt
DATE: May 21, 2010
SUBJECT: NFPA 921 F2010 ROC Letter Ballot


The ROC letter ballot for NFPA 921 F2010 is attached. The ballot is for formally voting on whether or not you concur with the committee's actions on the comments. Reasons must accompany all negative and abstention ballots.

Please do not vote negatively because of editorial errors. However, please bring such errors to my attention for action.

Please complete and return your ballot as soon as possible but no later than **Friday, June 4, 2010**. As noted on the ballot form, please return the ballot to Stacey Van Zandt either via e-mail to svanzandt@nfpa.org or via fax to 617.984.7056. You may also mail your ballot to the attention of Stacey Van Zandt at NFPA, 1 Batterymarch Park, Quincy, MA 02169.

The return of ballots is required by the Regulations Governing Committee Projects.

Attachment



Report on Comments – November 2010**NFPA 921**921-20 Log #84
(6.2.10.3)

Final Action: Reject

Submitter: B. Don Russell, Texas A&M University**Comment on Proposal No:** 921-79**Recommendation:** For the reasons set forth in Section 5 below, the entire proposed methodology on soot deposition should be eliminated and not included in this edition of NFPA 921.**Substantiation:** NFPA 921 should only include accepted scientific theories and methods derived therefrom. As a practical document, NFPA 921 should not include any hypotheses that are not broadly proven and practiced. The basic scientific question is how much testing and validation must a hypothesis receive before it can be elevated to a theory. In practical terms, the proof of a hypothesis should not be based on a small handful of researchers running a limited number of experiments, under limited protocols and conditions. I am not questioning the reporting accuracy for the data collected by the researchers cited. However, the hypothesis that soot deposition analysis can generally be used to prove the sounding, or not, of smoke alarms under a broad range of conditions with acceptable levels of false positives and false negatives has not yet been proven by the cited researchers or by broader, independent testing and experiments conducted by researchers outside the current small community.

The theory set forth in 6.2.10.3 "Enhanced Soot Deposition on Smoke Alarms" does not have broad scientific basis and: validation and therefore should not be included. It is still a hypothesis. The number of researchers who have conducted statistically valid experiments and the total body of results that have been presented for scientific review is inadequate to prove this concept and create a theory for practical use. With no criticism of the work of any individual researcher, the total number of independent researchers and their peer reviewed papers that have been published on this subject is miniscule. Without respect to the quality of the individual work of any individual researcher, the total body of work is insufficient to prove the theory reliable under the wide range of fire conditions-that must be addressed by NFPA 921.

There are specific scientific concerns that have not been addressed in the test protocols of researchers. All causes of false positives and false negatives are not yet scientifically established nor is the rate of false indications established using statistically accepted methods. The peer reviewed papers that are cited in substantiation for this modification to NFPA 921 show multiple repetition of authors or dependent connections between authors. One must ask what significant group of informed scientists provided the peer review for this relatively small community of individuals who have acquired data or analyzed data on smoke alarm soot deposition. In truth, the number of practitioners of smoke alarm soot deposition analysis is an exceptionally small community and the peer reviewed literature from this community, to date, is insufficient to support this theory for broad practical application.

While a review of the papers cited in the substantiation cannot be completed here, there are certain obvious questions. The wording leaves the reader with the impression that the presence of soot deposition on a smoke alarm indicates that the alarm has just sounded in the fire under investigation. It must be noted that prior smoky conditions, including specifically previous kitchen fires, may establish various levels of soot patterns that persist over time or are enhanced over time, unrelated to the last fire that occurred or the current fire under investigation. Furthermore, no scientific work has been performed to create a formula or a method where researchers or investigators can determine (a) when the smoke detector first sounded in the subject fire, or (b) how long the smoke alarm sounded in the fire.

Based on the above, investigators using this technique are left with significant scientific uncertainty even with the presence of soot deposition on smoke alarms. If they reach a positive conclusion of soot deposition patterns on a specific smoke alarm, they must also conclude that (1) they do not know when the smoke alarm sounded in the fire, (2) they do not know how long the smoke alarm sounded in the fire, and (3) they do not know if the smoke alarm sounded in this fire or in some previous smoky condition or fire that occurred at an unknown time. Investigators analyzing soot deposition patterns on smoke alarms after a specific fire do not know the condition of the smoke detector prior to the fire with respect to previous soundings to smoke conditions. Therefore, no conclusion can be reached that the mere presence of soot deposition patterns on or inside a given smoke detector originate from the subject fire of investigation as opposed to previous soundings of the detector in previous smoky conditions and/or fires (e.g. kitchen fires). Given these uncertainties that are obvious limitations to the proposed technique as set forth in the cited literature, the technique becomes virtually useless for drawing practical conclusions related to a specific fire under investigation.

I have conducted hundreds of smoke alarm fire tests under a wide range of fire conditions. Figures 6.2.10.3(c),(d) showing soot deposition around the exterior of the horn face are not at all representative of the post fire condition of the vast majority of smoke detectors that I have reviewed from my own experiments of staged fires or in the case of naturally occurring fires I have investigated. In fact, the condition represented in these figures is very rare even after exposure of smoke detectors to multiple fires. Therefore, the inclusion of these figures without qualification as to its

Report on Comments – November 2010NFPA 921

representation of an extreme condition is misleading and inappropriate. Based on experiments that are documented with data available from the Smoke Detector Test Facility of the Texas Engineering Experiment Station, deposition of significant patterns at the face of smoke detectors exposed to one significant fire, or multiple significant fires, or multiple low smoke fires do not show the patterns indicated in Figure 6.2.10.3(c),(d) for smoke alarms that sounded. (Data records, Smoke Detector Test Facility, Dr. B. Don Russell, Texas Engineering Experiment Station, Texas A&M University System, College Station, Texas, 77843.)

It should also be qualified in the text of the document that the presence of soot deposition on or inside a smoke alarm provides no indication as to when the smoke alarm sounded in the subject fire under investigation. A smoke alarm sounding late in a fire after victims are deceased may develop smoke deposition patterns (or not!). The levels, and quantity, and characteristics of the smoke and the location of the detector with respect to the fire source will all affect levels of soot deposition, if any, and the time progression of soot deposition in a given fire. There has been no scientific research relating the specific patterns of soot deposition on specific smoke detectors to a timeline of sounding in a given fire under given fire development conditions. Since no such formula exists, an analysis of these factors is speculative based on unknown conditions of a given fire; therefore, no conclusions can be reached based on analysis of soot deposition patterns as to how long a smoke detector sounded and/or when a smoke detector sounded in a given fire.

The language of the proposed additions to NFPA 921 with respect to soot deposition leave the incorrect impression to those not skilled in this specific art that the mere presence of accumulated soot on the outside, inside, or on the horn area of a smoke alarm is an indication that the alarm worked as designed, and is intended, and provided a timely warning, etc. None of these conclusions can be scientifically reached. An investigator seeing soot deposition patterns on a smoke detector following a given fire can only conclude that it is possible that the smoke alarm sounded, with an unknown probability, in one or more fires, not necessarily the subject fire under investigation. Once again, the investigator can conclude nothing as to when the smoke alarm sounded in the fire or the duration of it sounding in the fire, early or late. It should be noted that the design of certain smoke alarm horns allow for the partial failure of the horn resulting in vibration at a low sound level (non resonant condition) without the required volume to awaken residents. Soot deposition patterns could theoretically form around the horn even though the alarm sound level is far too low to be effective. This failure mode of smoke alarms has not been adequately addressed in the proposed method.

Unless the proposed language of soot deposition analysis is highly qualified in this document, many investigators attempting to use this section of NFPA 921 will reach erroneous or misleading conclusions and/or will not understand, the limits of the methodology with respect to conclusions in their specific fire investigation.

In conclusion, soot deposition analysis of smoke alarms is not yet broadly proven nor its limitations fully established by broad experimentation and repetition of experiments by a significant number of independent researchers and practitioners. Without respect to the issue of overall validity, the uncertainties of specific conclusions that can be reached by five investigators make the technique of little practical use and frequently misleading as to its support for findings in any specific fire investigation.

Even if this technique ultimately is proven reliable, which will require much greater definition of error rates and extensive independent testing under carefully designed protocols, it should not be included in this document at this time because it remains a hypothesis that does not yet meet the requirements of the scientific method to be elevated to a theory. To include the method at this stage will violate basic principles of the scientific method.

While it is my preference that the proposed analytical method of soot deposition analysis be struck and not included in this revision of NFPA 921, the newness of this proposed technique and the lack of broad, independent testing and validation, coupled with the technical limitations and unknown error rates, demand that the technique be at least qualified significantly with adequate warnings as to the limitations of the technique if it is to be used by fire investigators. Hence, I have proposed 6.2.10.3.4 and 6.2.10.3.5 to provide clarity as to the limitations of the technique under the best of conditions.

My qualifications to offer these opinions as to the scientific validity of the proposed hypothesis (alleged theory) include 35 years of scientific research and experimentation. I am a Regents Professor and Distinguished Professor of the Texas A&M University System. I am a fellow of five societies, hold the Bovay Chair at Texas A&M, and am a member of The National Academy of Engineering. I teach the scientific method and its application to electrical design engineers.

Committee Meeting Action: Reject

Committee Statement: The use of acoustic soot agglomeration for the determination of smoke detector activation is supported in the scientific literature. as referenced in the original proposal.