

## MEETING LOG

**SUBJECT:** Underwriter's Laboratory (UL) Table Saw AIMS Task Group Meeting

**FY 25 OP PLAN ENTRY:** Table Saws

**DATE OF MEETING:** 12/09/2024

**LOCATION OF MEETING:** Virtual

**CPSC STAFF FILING MEETING LOG:** Caroleene Paul

**FILING DATE:** 12/11/2024

**CPSC ATTENDEE(S):** Caroleene Paul (ESMC), Andrew Newens (EMSC)

**NON-CPSC ATTENDEE(S):** Contact UL for the full attendee list

### Summary of Meeting:

This was the third meeting of the Table Saw AIMS Task Group (TG), which was formed by the UL 745 technical committee in response to letters from CPSC staff expressing concern with trend analyses of table saw injuries from the National Electronic Injury Surveillance System (NEISS) that show no decline in the number or severity of injuries from 2004 to 2021.

The task group discussed the following topics:

- UL policy on patents. The UL Project Manager provided an update on UL's patent policy and reported that UL's attorneys cannot provide patent advice to the TG.
- Finger probe. The TG discussed the extreme difficulty of defining a "universal" finger probe that would accurately possess all properties of a human finger that could be used for detection. One TG member suggested allowing manufacturers to provide the probe that is appropriate to the technology on their product. Other members expressed discomfort with relying on the good faith of manufacturers and/or the variability that exists between the detection performance of the system on a probe versus on a real person's finger.
- Scope. The TG discussed whether requirements would be intended for all table saws, which would mandate AIM technology on all saws, or only for table saws that are equipped with AIM technology. The TG chair also noted that the scope of UL 62841-3-1 applies to transportable saws, which would exclude cabinet saws. The TG chair indicated cabinet saws would still be under the scope of UL 987 *Stationary and Fixed Electric Tools*, but the table saw requirements have already been deleted from the standard.
- Incident data. Some members of the TG questioned the validity of CPSC's incident data and cited discrepancies in past CPSC studies that have been published. CPSC staff explained that staff's letter to UL was prompted by the laceration, amputation, and fracture injuries reported by emergency departments that have not changed, year-after-year, for over a decade (since the voluntary standard was revised to required modular blade guards). One TG member questioned if CPSC staff have taken into account PTI's comment to the SNPR, specifically its claim that the efficacy of the modular blade guard is hidden in the NEISS cases because contractor and cabinet saws have such a long product life (and presumably the injuries have been occurring on these older saws). The TG members concluded that the group should look at all the data that is publicly available, including comments from PTI. CPSC

U.S. Consumer Product  
Safety Commission

4330 East-West Highway  
Bethesda, MD 20814

[cpsc.gov](https://www.cpsc.gov)

National Product Testing  
& Evaluation Center

5 Research Place  
Rockville, MD 20850

staff stated all the documents are available on regulations.gov, but given that the rulemaking has been ongoing for 20 years, there is a lot of information that may be difficult to sift through. The TG chair and the UL Project Manager stated they will work out a system to pool all relevant information for the TG to review.

**Next Steps:**

CPSC staff will work with the TG chair to ensure relevant documents are made available to the TG. Staff will participate in the next task group meeting TBD.