

CPSA 6 (3M) Cleared
09/27/95
Product: [unclear]
Escaped: [unclear]
Firm: [unclear]
Comments: [unclear]

Date: 9/27/95

TO : Office of the Secretary
FROM: Tim Johnson, ESEE

Subject: Meeting Log for CO detector taskforce #4 - Standards Evaluation, held 9/7/95 at the CPSC.

Attendance:

Commission Staff:

Tim Johnson, ESEE
Don Switzer, ESEE
Sandy Inkster, HS

Non-Commission Staff:

Alex Spataru, The Adept Group (chair)
John Girman, EPA
Morrie J. Farbman, North Maine Fire Department, Des Plaines IL.
Tom Gionta, BRK Brands, Inc.
Wendy Gifford, BRK Brands, Inc.
Paul Patty, UL

Other non-commission staff were in attendance - complete list of personnel attending the meeting will accompany official minutes at a later date.

- Minutes of workshop #4 will be available at a later date.

Issues discussed:

There were two proposals on the agenda for task force 4. The first proposal can be paraphrased as follows:

Proposal #1

Residential CO detectors be permitted to have only one standardized audible output at a standardized level of CO (eg 5% - 10% COHb range). Clearly explained visual warning outputs (eg digital output or non-threatening lights) should be permitted in the 2.5% to 7.5% COHb range.

This proposal passed when voted on by taskforce delegates. Exact vote totals available when official taskforce 4 minutes are available.

The exact wording for the proposal was changed slightly, exact proposal wording will be available when official taskforce minutes are available.

Proposal #2

The proposal concerned a modification to the "rush hour" test specified in UL 2034 - 10/1/95 edition. The proposal read:

Replace the currently UL 2034 specified exposures of "not above 2 ppm CO" conditions for the six (6) hr. and sixteen (16) hr. periods to "constant CO concentrations of 5 to 6 PPM.

This proposal did not get a second and thus was not voted on. There were some discussions as to whether any type of rush-hour test was needed.

Other Business

1) The issue of alarm and warning levels again came up during this meeting. A vote was taken on both the COHb (carboxyhemoglobin) levels to both alarm and warn at. In addition, some specific test points were voted on. The following passed when voted on. Additional test points, to be defined.

Warning levels:

Must-not-warn - below 2.5% COHb (test point at 15 ppm/ 30 days)
Must-warn below 7.5% COHb (test point at 60 ppm/2 hrs 15 minutes)

This implies that the warning range would be 2.5 - 7.5% COHb

Alarm levels:

Must-not-alarm - below 5% COHb (test point at 35 ppm/3 hours)
Must-alarm - At or below 10% COHb (test points as defined in the 10/1/95 UL 2034 standard)

This implies that the alarm range would be 5% - 10% COHb

2) A document was provided that compared UL 2034 requirements with those of Japan and Europe. The European document was only a proposal and NOT an adopted standard. The Japanese document was an adopted standard.