

LOG OF MEETING
DIRECTORATE FOR ENGINEERING SCIENCES

CPSA 600(1) CLEARED for PUBLIC
NO MFRS PRVTL OR
PRODUCTS IDENTIFIED
EXCEPTED BY: PETITION
RULEMAKING ADMIN. PRCDG
WITH PORTIONS REMOVED: _____

SUBJECT: Underwriters Laboratories (UL) Table Saw Working Group Meeting

DATE OF MEETING: September 12, 2011

PLACE OF MEETING: Web Conference

LOG ENTRY SOURCE: Caroleene Paul, ESME *CP*

COMMISSION ATTENDEES:

Caroleene Paul; ESME
Tim Smith; ESHF

NON-COMMISSION ATTENDEES:

Bob Backstrom; UL
Mahmood Tabaddor; UL
Fan He; UL
John Stimitz; UL
Peter Domeny; Power Tool Institute
Stephen Gass; SawStop LLC
Ted Gogoll; Black & Decker

SUMMARY OF MEETING:

Prior to the meeting, UL representatives distributed a research proposal for the development of performance criteria for active protective systems in table saw safety standards. The stated purpose of the working group is to develop performance criteria and associated testing methods for active safety systems on table saws to mitigate skin-to-blade contact injuries. UL recommends that a set of performance guidelines be generated rationally, reviewed by a technical panel, and submitted through a Standards development Process, as recognized by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI).

The following concerns were raised and discussed:

- Due to disputes over what has transpired in other public meetings, a request was made that the working group meetings be recorded.
- Strong opinions were voiced that because a viable technical solution exists to mitigate skin-to-blade contact injury, the only real work the working group should do is a cost benefit analysis of mandating that technology. In rebuttal, analogies were made to past UL action in mandating GFCIs on hair dryers where manufacturers protested the requirement and said it would be too expensive to implement. Today GFCIs are standard on all hair dryers and have not priced the industry out of business. The discussion on cost benefit analyses was closed until the next meeting when UL would have a formal response.
- UL representatives were asked to clarify UL's patent policy.

- A need to share documents in a public database was identified. UL representatives agreed to explore options and reminded the working group that the meetings are open to the public so documents to be shared will be public as well.

The following action items by UL representatives were summarized for the next meeting:

- Determine how to record or summarize meetings.
- Resolve cost analysis question.
- Provide information on UL's patent policy.
- Provide mechanism to share documents through a central portal.

The objectives for the next meeting are to:

- 1) Resolve the scope of the working group effort.
- 2) Discuss the first task outlined in the research proposal (literature review).