



**ASTM Meeting
F15.38 Subcommittee on Window Falls Prevention
Des Plaines, IL
August 3, 1999**

Log of Meeting

Date of Log Entry: Aug 24, 1999
Source of Log Entry: Susan Kyle, Ph.D., Project Manager
Window Falls
CPSC

CPSC/OFFICE OF
THE SECRETARY
1999 AUG 24 A 9 20

Attendees: Kathryn Coen, Andersen Corporation
Jim McMullen, The McMullen Co, Inc.
Daryl Hower, Leslie Locke
Keith Highland, Leslie Locke
Larry Livermore, AAMA
Larry Armstrong, ASMCO
Al Campbell, WDMA
Frank Fitzgerald, Screen Manufacturers Association
Jim Krahn, Marvin Windows
Jacquie Elder, CPSC
Sue Kyle, CPSC

Summary of Meeting

The subcommittee ballot on the provisional draft standard for guards for egress windows received two negative votes and one comment. The negatives concerned the draft requirement for two simultaneous actions to release the device, the draft requirement that the window guard for egress windows not be capable of being padlocked, and the fact that there was no minimum force requirement for the release mechanism.

Concerning the two simultaneous actions, the argument that two simultaneous actions may be too complicated for an emergency situation was considered persuasive and the second sentence of 3.3.3 was deleted. On the issue of padlockability, Daryl Hower and Keith Highland of Leslie Locke volunteered to determine whether their remote release mechanism could be easily modified so that, when installed, it would prohibit padlocking the guard shut and to contact John Sterling about how easy such a modification would be for him. The negative concerning no minimum force was withdrawn since two distinct actions were considered adequate to make it difficult for small children to open the guard.

The CPSC staff comment expressing concern that a realistic standard specifying the minimum requirements for safety be balloted as quickly as possible was acknowledged. Other editorial



CPSA 6 (b)(1) Cleared 8/24/99

No Mfrs/PrvtLbks or
Products Identified

Suggested by

SKB

comments were considered. A sample of a new egress guard, the "Guardian Angel II", currently in use in Boston, was shown.

Kathy Coen will discuss with ASTM staff how to proceed, whether changes to the standard as balloted can be considered editorial or whether reballot will be necessary.

One negative was received on the main committee ballot converting the non-egress standard from a provisional standard to a full consensus standard. The negative set forth a number of issues. All issues were found non-persuasive by a vote of 8:0:2 for the following reasons:

1. The recommendation to refer to "the device" rather than the "window fall prevention device" was found nonpersuasive because some of the information is to be provided to the consumer/occupant and needs to describe which device the information refers to.
2. The recommend change to "Blocks Escape in Fire and Emergency" was considered too wordy.
3. The recommendation to change the warning label "Do NOT install....on windows at or below 75 feet above ground" to "Use ONLY on windows that are at least 75 feet above ground" was found nonpersuasive because it would not be in the same format as the rest of the warning.
4. The recommendation that the "Possible Fall Hazard" be changed was rejected since the hazard is falls if the device is not installed properly. The wording as balloted conforms with ANSI guidelines that the hazard be stated explicitly and succinctly.
5. Changing the first bullet of Section 5.5 to tell the installer to use the four-inch sphere test was rejected since the bullet was considered necessary to explain the purpose for the four-inch sphere test which the installer is instructed to perform elsewhere.
6. The warning about adult supervision was considered necessary even though the device should prevent children from falling out the window because adult supervision is required to ensure that the device remains properly closed and operational.
7. Requiring that safety information be supplied with each lease agreement is beyond the scope of a product standard.

The reasons for finding the negative non-persuasive will be forwarded with the ballot results to the Committee on Standards for review.

The date of the next meeting will depend on the whether the egress standard is reballoted.