LOG OF MEETING
DIRECTORATE FOR ENGINEERING SCIENCES

SUBJECT: Meeting of ASTM Work Group on Battery-Powered Ride-On Toys to discuss proposed requirements for F963, Standard for Toy Safety

DATE OF MEETING: April 11, 2000

PLACE OF MEETING: Toy Manufacturers of America, Inc., 1115 Broadway, New York, NY 10010

LOG ENTRY SOURCE: Doug Lee, ESEE

DATE OF LOG ENTRY: April 25, 2000

COMMISSION ATTENDEES: Doug Lee, ESEE
Andrew Stadnik, LS

NON-COMMISSION ATTENDEES:

Robert Coughlin, Fisher-Price, Committee Chairman
Joan Lawrence, Toy Manufacturers of America
Wolfgang Casta, Hedstrom Corporation
Rick Locker, Locker, Greenberg & Brainin, TMA Counsel
Timothy Harris, Peg Perego
Roland Riegel, Underwriters Laboratories Inc.
Michael Babiak, Energizer

SUMMARY OF MEETING:

The work group met and discussed revised requirements that were proposed at the February 7, 2000 meeting. Prior to the meeting, Mr. Lee provided written modifications by the CPSC technical staff incorporating many suggestions by work group members. Mr. Lee's revisions were used for the basis of the discussions at the April 11, 2000 meeting.

A discussion was held on the CPSC technical staff proposal adding a voltage cap on the battery for the scope of these requirements because of the potential shock hazard. The work group thought that this was redundant because ASTM F963 already defines a toy to be 24 V or less.

Much of the rest of the meeting was used to discuss normal operating conditions which is used for the basis of many of the other tests.

The CPSC technical staff position is that normal tests should include testing at the upper end of normal operating conditions and environments to which the vehicle is exposed. These include testing with inclines and bumpy terrain, maximum weight limits specified by the manufacturer, and exposure to outdoor environments in various geographic locations. The CPSC technical

staff believes that abnormal testing should include foreseeable misuse of the toy including: stalling, overloading, and constant rocking or switching from forward to reverse of the BPRO toy.

The CPSC technical staff is concerned that the majority of the work group member's proposed requirements do not adequately address the hazards. Additionally, the majority of the work group member's proposed requirements may result in increased nuisance tripping that will lead to consumer modifications and bypassing of the accessible overcurrent protection devices.

The CPSC staff proposal suggested adding tamper resistant overcurrent protection if normal operating conditions could not be met without nuisance tripping. One manufacturer rejected this proposal because they believe the CPSC staff's proposal was not realistic use of the BPRO toy. The same manufacturer also believed that they would destroy gear boxes during testing. Mr. Lee commented that destruction of a gear box would not present a safety risk or a failure of the test. Mr. Lee also stated that many in-depth investigations of incidents have revealed bypassing of overcurrent protection devices.

The work group will reconvene in May. Two of the manufacturers said they would perform additional tests on their BPRO toys and write proposals to combine tests that would address CPSC's concerns.