

CPSCA & (b)(1) Cleared  
10/27/97  
No. Mfrs/PrvtLbys or  
Products Identified  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Excepted by  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Firms Notified,  
Comments Processed.

MEETING LOG  
DIRECTORATE FOR ENGINEERING SCIENCES

SUBJECT: Meeting with the Camping Heater Coalition to  
Discuss Status of Standard Development for Carbon  
Monoxide Performance Requirements for Camping  
Heaters

PLACE: Offices of Foley and Lardner, One IBM Plaza, Suite  
3300, 330 N. Walbash Ave., Chicago, IL

MEETING DATE: October 6, 1997 *DWS*

LOG ENTRY SOURCE: Donald W. Switzer

ENTRY DATE: October 22, 1997

COMMISSION ATTENDEES:

Don Switzer	ES
Ron Medford	EXHR

NON-COMMISSION ATTENDEES:

Mr. DuRoss	Mr. Heater Corporation
Mr. Abele	Mr. Heater Corporation
Mr. Foley	Foley and Lardner
Mr. Hoekstra	Century Primus
Mr. Wegand	Coleman Corp.
Mr. Bondi	BP Paulin
Mr. Haire	Mr. Heater Corporation

MEETING SUMMARY

The purpose of this meeting was for CPSC staff to explain the procedures the Commission staff follows in reporting to and making recommendations to the Commission, and to explain staff's expectations for the development of carbon monoxide (CO) performance requirements to be included in the ANSI Camping Heater Standard.

Staff explained CPSC's procedures with regards to voluntary and mandatory standards development.

The ANSI camping equipment subcommittee has been letter balloted to accept for public review and comment a draft harmonized standard for camping heaters containing CO performance requirements. The ballot vote is due October 24, 1997. Staff explained that development of the requirements are a critical point, and that staff expects the subcommittee to adopt the recommended performance requirements for review and comment. The manufacturers responded that they have concerns about several

proposals in the standard and, while they support the development of the CO requirements, and have no changes on that part of the draft standard, they are reluctant to send the standard out for review and comments when they know it will need to be amended. Staff explained that it is critical for the process to proceed as quickly as possible, and that satisfactory progress on the development of CO coverage could hinge on acceptance of the draft standard for review and comment. Delay in accepting the standard would need significant justification to maintain satisfactory performance rating.