

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

CPSC  
12/1/95

Subject: Log of CO detector workshop meeting, task force #4 - Standards Evaluation.

Meeting Date: December 1, 1995

Place of Meeting: CPSC, hearing room

Date of Entry: December 5, 1995

Source of entry: Tim Johnson, ESEE

Commission Attendees:

Tim Johnson, ESEE  
Sandy Inkster, EHHE

Non-Commission Attendees:

John Girman, EPA  
Morrie J. Farbman, North Maine Fire Department, Des Plaines IL.  
Tom Gionta, BRK Brands, Inc.  
Wendy Gifford, BRK Brands, Inc.  
Dr. Edward P. Krenzelok, Pittsburgh Poison Center  
Val DiGiovanni, American Sensors  
Kazumi Unno, Figaro USA, Inc  
Alex Spataru, The Adept Group (chair)  
Jim Clark, National Fuel  
Dr. Richard Y. Kwor, Nighthawk Systems  
Niren L. Nagda, ENERGEN Consulting Inc.  
Alan Korn, National Safe Kids Campaign  
Ken Perkins, Universal Safety Alarm, Inc.  
Lou Chavez, UL  
Dr. Bertram Carnow, Carnow, Conibear & Associates, Ltd.

Summary of Meeting:

This was the final meeting of task force #4 - standards evaluation. The purpose of the meeting was 1) to discuss a couple of items left over from previous task force 4 meetings, 2) to discuss new proposals, and 3) to discuss format and content for a final report to be issued by task force 4. In addition, the upcoming CPSC CO detector hearings were discussed as well as approval of the minutes from the previous task force 4 meeting, held on September 7, 1995.

✓  
CPSC

### Discussion of previous task force proposals - old business:

NOTE: The wording of the following proposals came from notes taken during the task force and may not be exactly what was voted on by task force 4 - approved minutes from this meeting are not yet available.

- Presentation by Alex Spataru on CO levels measured in Lynwood Calif, and their impact on the rush-hour test found in UL 2034. Mr Spataru then proposed a minor modification to the rush-hour test. The proposal was amended somewhat by the taskforce, voted on, and approved. The proposal was approx the following (see official minutes for more detail): If UL does not incorporate TF # 4's recommended change in the must-not-alarm level (from 2.5% to 5% COHb - which would negate the need for the rush-hour test), then the rush hour test should be amended as outlined in a study titled Review of UL 2034 Stability Test for Residential CO Detectors, Adept Group Inc., Nov 29, 1995.
- Reset Button proposal by Tim Johnson, CPSC, passed. The proposal read approx: UL should define the relationship between the reset/test button on a CO detector and the warning signal (if present on a detector). Currently, there is nothing in UL 2034 that addresses this.

### NEW BUSINESS:

NOTE: The wording of the following proposals came from notes taken during the task force and may not be exactly what was voted on by task force 4 - approved minutes from this meeting are not yet available.

- A) Set up a committee to address the need for a separate set of sensitive CO detector/alarm products for medical health monitoring purposes for "high risk population". Proposal passed.
- B) Proposal that it be a UL requirement that all CO detectors undergo a 24 month test program after being listed by UL to test for drift (relative to the must-alarm levels found in UL 2034). A number of problems were voiced by TF members on this proposal. First, what about CO detectors that may be manufactured that have a life of less than two years? Second, what about models that get modified before two years? This proposal did not pass.
- C) Proposal to require CO detectors to utilize design techniques to reduce susceptibility to common radio sources such as CB radio and Amateur radio transmissions. This proposal received no second, thus died in committee.
- D) Proposal that CO detectors employ design features to reduce/eliminate high frequency emissions from the product. Lou Chavez, stated that UL 2034 addresses this concern. Proposal received no seconds, died in committee.

E) Proposal that it be a UL requirement that the test button or some well defined CO detector testing procedure, be able to test periodically the sensor element for functionality in a CO detector. Proposal was amended somewhat and the new one read something like the following (again, see official minutes when they are available, at a later date): It is the sense of the taskforce that there is a need by a consumer to periodically be able to test the sensing element of a CO detector. This modified version passed.

F) Proposal that every CO manufacturer listed under UL 2034 should be testing 100% of its sensing elements under controlled CO conditions... Modified proposal passed.

G) Proposal that all CO detector manufacturers be required to have a 24 hrs-a-day manned customer service to answer public inquiries.... Proposal passed

#### Task Force 4 - Final Report:

- Discussed structure and time-line for a final taskforce report. The report will consist of the following sections: Intro/background, mission/purpose of TF 4, TF recommendations, discussion.

Alex Spataru to mail out draft report to TF delegates for input by 12/15. Submit comments to Alex by 1/4/96.

#### Minutes:

Draft minutes of this taskforce meeting (12/1/95) to be provided to all delegates at a later date. These will then be subject to correction/approval by task force members at that time.