

time available for escape. The difference between the minimum time available for escape and the time required for evacuation of building occupants would be the target margin of safety. Various alternative protection strategies would have to be evaluated to determine their impact on the times at which hazardous conditions developed in the spaces of interest and the times required for egress. If a combination of fire protection systems provides a margin of safety equal to or greater than the target margin of safety, then the combination could be judged to provide an *equivalent level of safety*.

(3) As a third option, other technical analysis procedures, as approved by the responsible agency head, can be used to show equivalency.

(c) Analytical and empirical tools, including fire models and grading schedules such as the Fire Safety Evaluation System (Alternative Approaches to Life Safety, NEPA 101M) should be used to support the life safety equivalency evaluation. If fire modeling is used as part of an analysis, an assessment of the predictive capabilities of the fire models must be included. This assessment should be conducted in accordance with the American Society for Testing and Materials Standard Guide for Evaluating the Predictive Capability of Fire Models (ASTM E 1355).

§ 101-6.605 Responsibility.

The head of the agency responsible for physical improvements in the facility or providing Federal assistance or a designated representative will determine the acceptability of each *equivalent level of safety* analysis. The determination of acceptability must include a review of the fire protection engineer's qualifications, the appropriateness of the fire scenarios for the facility, and the reasonableness of the assumed maximum probable loss. Agencies should maintain a record of each accepted *equivalent level of safety* analysis and provide copies to fire departments or other local authorities for use in developing prefire plans.

Subparts 101-6.7—101-6.9 [Reserved]

Subpart 101-6.10—Federal Advisory Committee Management

AUTHORITY: Sec. 205(c), 63 Stat. 390; 40 U.S.C. 486(c); sec. 7, 5 U.S.C. app.; and E.O. 12024, 3 CFR 1977 Comp., p. 158.

SOURCE: 52 FR 45929, Dec. 2, 1987, unless otherwise noted.

§ 101-6.1001 Scope.

(a) This subpart defines the policies, establishes minimum requirements, and provides guidance to agency management for the establishment, operation, administration, and duration of advisory committees subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended. Reporting requirements which keep the Congress and the public informed of the number, purpose, membership activities, and cost of these advisory committees are also included.

(b) The Act and this subpart do not apply to advisory meetings or groups listed in § 101-6.1004.

[52 FR 45929, Dec. 2, 1987, as amended at 54 FR 41215, Oct. 5, 1989]

§ 101-6.1002 Policy.

The policy to be followed by Federal departments, agencies, and commissions, consistent with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended, is as follows:

(a) An advisory committee shall be established only when it is essential to the conduct of agency business. Decision criteria include whether committee deliberations will result in the creation or elimination of, or change in regulations, guidelines, or rules affecting agency business; whether the information to be obtained is already available through another advisory committee or source within the Federal Government; whether the committee will make recommendations resulting in significant improvements in service or reductions in cost; or whether the committee's recommendations will provide an important additional perspective or viewpoint impacting agency operations;

(b) An advisory committee shall be terminated whenever the stated objectives of the committee have been accomplished; the subject matter or work of the committee has become obsolete