

MEETING LOG  
CPSC STAFF AND PORTABLE CAMPING EQUIPMENT MANUFACTURERS

WHERE: CPSC Headquarters  
WHEN: April 19, 1994  
ATTENDEES:

Commission staff: Lori Saltzman, HSPS  
Laureen Burton, HSHE  
Harleigh Ewell, OGC  
Sharon White, EPHF  
Larry Hershman, EXCE  
Al Martin, ESEL  
Robert Franklin, ECON  
Mark Eilbert, ESEL

Non-Commission staff: James Gazda, AGA Labs  
Ken Bell, Coleman Co, Inc.  
Randy May, Coleman Co, Inc.  
Tom Cove, Sporting Goods Manufacturers  
Assn. (SGMA)  
Roger Maxon, BernzOmatic  
Ralph Hokstra, Century Tool  
Shelley Deppa, Safety Behavior Analysis,  
Inc.  
Rick Schaeffer, Product Safety Letter  
Mary Spock, Product Safety Letter

The pupose of the meeting was to discuss the occurrence of carbon monoxide (CO) deaths associated with the use of portable camping equipment, the portable camping equipment market, product testing, ANSI standards for portable camping equipment, certification practices, and recommendations for eliminating deaths and injuries.

After introductions, Lori Saltzman opened the meeting by describing CPSC's interest in portable camping equipment and activities that had already occurred in this regard: CPSC staff has corresponded with the Canadian Gas Asssocation in support of the effort to harmonize the Canadian and ANSI standards on camping equipment, the Division of Human Factors reviewed CPSC files on CO deaths and camping equipment, and Human Factors application of the ANSI labeling guidelines should a label be developed by the staff. Sharon White (Human Factors Division) then described her review of the CO incidents. Meeting attendees discussed the incidents, asking if the indepth investigations contained information about whether the equipment was old or new and what type of tent the victims were found in if a tent was involved in the incident.

Ken Bell of Coleman then described Coleman's labeling program and suggested that an increase in the involvement of tents in CO incidents may be due to the fact that some tents are now being made impermeable so that air flow is significantly

✓

reduced. He believes that this contributes to the CO problem. Mr. Bell indicated that Coleman tents incorporate ventilation features and that Coleman was looking into the possibility of CO detector technology on their camping equipment. Randy May described Coleman's testing procedure and the fact that they test to various CO levels. CPSC staff asked for additional clarification of the CO levels they tested to, but no numerical level was given. Mr. May stated that they have to adhere to many standards in order to meet requirements for various states and countries, because there is not one standard that is adequate to meet all the needs. Coleman said that they go beyond the ANSI standard requirements and believe that their own level of testing and labeling is more stringent than the existing ANSI standard. Further, the total amount of CO that a product can produce is limited by the size of the fuel supply. Although Coleman supports the effort to harmonize the American and Canadian standard, they take issue with some of the requirements in both standards. In response to questions about standards, Mr. Bell mentioned that they would like to see a mandatory standard.

James Gazda, AGA and International Approval Services, described the status of the existing ANSI camping equipment standards as being retained but not maintained. He reiterated the effort being made to harmonize the ANSI standard with the Canadian standard and standards with Mexico to come up with a North American standard. If the group wanted to revise the ANSI standard, he would inform his management of such an interest and take steps to facilitate the process. The next meeting of the harmonization group is September 29-30 in Canada. Ralph Hoekstra (Century Tool) said that his company adhered to the existing ANSI standards, even if they weren't perfect, because that was what they would be held to in court.

Tom Cove (SGMA) explained that the smaller manufacturers in the Association did not understand why they should participate in efforts to revise the ANSI standard since their products were already safe. A number of participants expressed a desire to know the age of products involved in incidents and whether the products had been modified.

The CPSC staff stated that options to provide better consumer safety could include revisions to the ANSI standard, development of new standards, and/or education campaigns. CPSC staff asked why, if the industry did not like the ANSI standard, did they not want to revise it, and if they felt they had to adhere to many standards, did they not want to develop one standard that they could support? Recommendations were for the CPSC staff to provide SGMA with additional information on the CO incidents and for the possible formation of a smaller task force of interested parties to discuss revisions to the ANSI standard and input to the harmonization process prior to the September 29-30 meeting.