

**LOG OF MEETING
DIRECTORATE FOR ENGINEERING SCIENCES**

CPSC ACTION PLAN FOR PUBLIC
[Handwritten signature]
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
PRODUCT IDENTIFIED
EXCEPTED BY PETITION
RULEMAKING ADMIN. PROC. DG.
WITH PORTIONS REMOVED.

SUBJECT: ASTM Home Playgrounds

DATE OF MEETING: 1/29/08

PLACE OF MEETING: Via Telephone Conference Call (meeting at Tampa, Florida)

LOG ENTRY SOURCE: Troy Whitfield, Mark Kumagai

COMMISSION ATTENDEES: Troy Whitfield, Mark Kumagai

NON-COMMISSION ATTENDEES: See Attached List

SUMMARY OF MEETING:

The subcommittee chairperson opened the meeting by announcing the passing of her friend and colleague, Dr. Francis Wallach, former chairman of the Subcommittee for the F1487 Public Playground standard. Through her leadership and determination, a comprehensive standard for Public Playgrounds was published in 1993. Fran's work has saved lives and lessened injuries to children while providing them playground activities important for both physical and cognitive development.

Introduction of attendees (see attached list).

The group approved the September minutes.

Review Correspondence: The subcommittee chairperson requested that authors of any email correspondence submit their emails to the chairperson if they want them to be in the ASTM minutes.

Reports from Group: CPSC staff reported that the Handbook should be going to the publisher in the near future. Staff will provide notification to ASTM.

Constant Air Inflatables – A new standard should be out for Main Committee Ballot sometime in March.

Donna Thompson reported that National Program Playground Safety (NPPS) online training for childcare supervision and playground safety is currently availability. The next playground safety school is coming up in Iowa in August.

Other Playground subcommittee meetings will be scheduled for sometime in May in Denver.

Negatives:

ITEM #1

ITEM 1– Note: this motion is to clarify the type of swings that are considered capable of unlimited lateral motion. The standard did not have a definition of a rotating swing and the term rotating swing was used in work item 12047 that went to ballot as item 005 in Ballot F15 (06-06). This motion is in response to continuing comments from voters.

Add to section 4.1.8.2 Swing elements that are ~~capable of~~ intended to have unlimited lateral motion such as, but not limited to, a rotating swing or disc swing shall not occupy a swing bay with any other swinging element. There shall be a minimum separation of 15 inches between the outermost extremity of the swinging element

Item #1 Negative Vote statement: “not enough info to properly cast a vote”

Results Item # 1: The negative was found non-persuasive. A comment was made to add a label to warn against adding a rope to the equipment. The subcommittee accepted this comment and will add it to New Business.

ITEM#2

ITEM 2

Note: A previous work item 12047 was balloted as item 005 on Ballot F15 (06-06). The one negative was withdrawn with the understanding that the following clarification to the exception one be noted. Continuing discussion on this item prompted the additional changes. This is part of the section on Use Zones that is being added to the standard. The underlined text would be added to the previously balloted item.

X.3.2.2 No play component of the attached play structure or separate play structure shall occupy or exit into the ground level protective surfacing area located in the use zone of a ~~rotating swing~~ swing element intended to have unlimited lateral motion.

- 1) Exception: Adjacent to-fro swings where the support structure of the swings is designed to minimize the likelihood of the unlimited lateral motion swing intruding into the to-fro use zone.
- 2) Exception: The support structure of the ~~rotating swing~~ capable of unlimited lateral motion.
- 3) Exception: The use zone for ~~rotating swings~~ swing elements intended to have unlimited lateral motion attached to the underside of a platform may overlap the use zones of other play components placed on the perimeter of the supporting platform. The ~~rotating component~~ swing element may not make contact with the strike any portion of the vertical support structure or attached play components, and may not swing out beyond the perimeter of the platform it is suspended from. When to-fro swings are adjacent to the supporting platform the minimum separation between the pivot point of a swing capable of unlimited lateral motion and the to-fro swing shall be X + 8 inches as measured from the pivot point to the adjacent to-fro swing. X = the distance from the pivot point of the unlimited lateral motion swing to the underside of the swing seat.

Item #2 Negative Vote statement - The proposed change will make it unfeasible to produce a play set with the tire swing under the deck. Almost all if not all units with tire swings under the deck in the market today would be in violation. There is no data that supports tire swing under decks are a safety issue.

Results Item #2: The negative was found persuasive. Item 2 will be reworked in new business.

ITEM #3

WK14565 – Revision to F1148-05

Item 3

Add new section 4.10.3:

4.10.3: To-fro swinging components such as, but not limited to, swings, trapeze bars, trapeze rings, and gliders, shall not be attached to upper body components such as horizontal ladders.

Rationale:

1)

In 2005, this subcommittee voted to replace the drawing in Figure A1.2 because it was not our intent to suggest by illustration that it was an acceptable design alternative. Figure A1.2 now shows these two components as separate items with their own separate use zones. This ballot will match the drawing with new text.

2)

This ballot item eliminates numerous hazardous situations such as those that are created by conflicts in circulation patterns, conflicts in use patterns, children falling from an upper body component onto an underlying (i.e., glider) or adjacent (swing) swinging component (occupied or not) and becoming injured, children attempting to access an upper body component from a swinging component and becoming injured, etc. This has been recognized by incident data provided by the CPSC, as well as a recall (#99-166) that identifies injuries being the result of falls from upper body components onto protruding bolts on a trapeze swing component. There were also several presentations/reports submitted to this ASTM F15.09 Subcommittee that identifies numerous other sources that recognize this design as a known hazard.

3)

It was voted and approved for ballot that swing Use Zones cannot overlap the Use Zone of any other component. If swings hang from an upper body component, then the swings overlap the Use Zone of the upper body component and conflict with the spirit of what we previously voted on.

4)

ASTM #F1148 Sections 4.1.8 and 4.1.9 have addressed the importance of not allowing the user that is swinging to contact adjacent equipment or users. This ballot item if passed would prevent users of upper body equipment from contacting adjacent swinging components while attempting to use the upper body component. Also, Section 6.3.4 already says to "Warn the buyer to instruct children not to walk close to, in front of, behind, or between moving items." This design allows a child to unknowingly violate that rule, and parents will assume that it is "safe as built" and is intended to be used in that manner, which is actually hazardous.

5)

In addition, ASTM #F1148 Section 6.1.2 identifies the importance of having surfacing for the users to fall onto instead of another component ("a fall onto a hard surface can result in serious injury to the equipment user."), and this ballot item will allow them to do that. Additionally, in the CPSC "Outdoor Home Playground Safety Handbook" (#324), Section 1 states that children can injure themselves when they fall between pieces of play equipment, and to keep the area obstacle-free.

We ask that you vote Affirmative (that you agree with the ballot item), or Negative (where you feel that the ballot item should not pass), or Abstain. Note that any vote marked as "Abstain" does not count towards the 90% (of the total Affirmative and Negative votes received) that is required for this ballot to be valid and to proceed to the next level.

Item #3 Negative Vote statements: in summary, there were 8 negatives for item #3. The meeting members debated each proposal and the rationale for several hours (see ASTM minutes for more detail).

Results Item #3: The meeting attendees voted all 8 negatives non-persuasive. The recommendation to rule the negatives non-persuasive will be balloted at the full subcommittee and main committee.

Old Business:

The group discussed the dynamic impact test for swing elements. A report from the ISO committee on their proposed dynamic impact test was discussed. The group will continue to review this test method.

The group decided to drop plans for a study of monkey bars over swings due to the vote results.

Task groups were formed to address:

- Review and update the definitions section
- Review components that incorporate water for possible requirements
- Review warning labels that may be incorporated onto the product

New Business:

The chairperson requested manufacturers of tire swings to draft a recommendation to address the persuasive negative for Item #1.

ATTENDANCE ROSTER

The following is a roster of those in attendance at the Jan. 29-30, 2008 F15.09 meeting

Member Names

Gregory Abplanalp
Carl Abraham
Danny Bears
Matt Bolland
Scott Burton
Tim Burton
Darrin Cowan
David Dick
Elizabeth Dickerhoff
Esther Grossman
Teri Hendy
Tom Kalousek
Jacob Kearl
Jade Martinsen
Stephanie Martinsen
Art Mittelstaedt
Peggy Paine
Rob Pepper
Tim Saylor
Keith Shelton
Elaine Sherman
Margaret Smerglia
Wes Sutton
Donna Thompson
Thom Thompson
Scott Vomacka
Robert Webb
Len Morrissey *ASTM Staff Manager*

By Phone:

Mark Kumagai
Fred Rieber
Troy Whitfield

Visitors:

Keith Ward
Kevin M. Jones
Emily Allen
By Phone: Melinda Frost