U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission
LOG OF MEETING

SUBJECT: Meeting of ASTM Changing Table Collapse task group

DATE OF MEETING: 3/8/2016

LOG ENTRY SOURCE: Shaina Donahue

DATE OF LOG ENTRY: 03/21/2016

LOCATION: Telecon

CPSC ATTENDEE(S): Shaina Donahue

NON-CPSC ATTENDEE(S): Please contact ASTM for list of non-CPSC attendees

SUMMARY OF MEETING:

The teleconference was held to discuss the status of proposed requirements to address changing table collapse incidents in preparation for upcoming Spring ASTM subcommittee meetings. The chairman of this task group, Steven Anzaroot, shared with the group that the CPSC test data indicated the previously proposed diagonal static load test as well as a cyclic/dynamic load test did not fail tables known to be involved with collapse incidents. He raised another suggestion that came out of that testing. Shaina explained how the exemplar tables of known incident models arrived to the test lab with either their center support straps never installed or else mis-installed (upside down). (This had also

been previously mentioned at the Winter ASTM subcommittee meeting.) The group discussed the potential option of running all existing ASTM tests without the consumer-installed support strap assembled per manufacturer's instruction. (Since it was apparent consumers were regularly not installing or mis-installing these components.) It was suggested that the existing static load test (100 lb placed on center of table for 1 minute) could help weed out the "bad" tables since previously, they passed with their straps installed per manufacturer's instructions. The team seemed somewhat open to this suggestion if further testing was carried out. They requested an overload test wherein the exemplar incident models were put under an increasing load (without their support straps installed) and loaded to the point of collapse to see how much weight they could withstand before failure. Shaina pointed out that if this ends up being a load more than 100 lbs, the task group would be hardpressed to justify a rationale for increasing the static load test weight (since tables are only intended for use by 30lb occupants). The team was still interested in doing the test and comparing to newer models which don't exhibit collapse issues. The team was also interested in seeing if the cyclic/dynamic load test might help weed out incident tables if the load was increased from the previous 45lbf to 60lbf (and felt they could justify 60 lbs since its simply double the max. recommended load for changing tables).

Shaina said she would check with the CPSC lab to see if it would be possible to run this testing prior to April ASTM subcommittee meeting.