

## US Consumer Product Safety Commission Log of Meeting

Subject: ASTM F15.10 Task Group Meeting on Flame Mitigation Devices (FMDs)

Date: August 29, 2018

Location: Teleconference

Prepared By: Scott Ayers ([sayers@cpsc.gov](mailto:sayers@cpsc.gov), 301-987-2030), August 29, 2018

CPSC Attendees: Scott Ayers

Non-CPSC Attendees:

Contact Len Morrissey of ASTM (610-832-9719 or [lmorriss@astm.org](mailto:lmorriss@astm.org)) or Phil Monckton ([PMonckton@scepter.ca](mailto:PMonckton@scepter.ca), 416-883-0627) for a list of attendees

Summary of Meeting:

Contact Len Morrissey of ASTM (610-832-9719 or [lmorriss@astm.org](mailto:lmorriss@astm.org)) or Phil Monckton ([PMonckton@scepter.ca](mailto:PMonckton@scepter.ca), 416-883-0627) for a more detailed information on the meeting

Phil Monckton of Scepter handed the chairmanship of the meeting to Cheryl Atkinson of the PFCMA. Phil participated as a regular member of the task group. This meeting was convened to discuss the Gasoline Container FMD standard. The group discussed the comments made to the initial ballot to the subcommittee of the standard.

Early on, there were substantial discussions on alternative flame tests, including FMD tests used by Factory Mutual (FM), the US Coast Guard, and the US Department of Defense.

- Two comments regarded incorporating the FMD requirements into F852 rather than as a stand-alone document.
  - The group voted 8 – 4 with no abstentions that the comments were non-persuasive and therefore the FMD will continue as stand-alone
- Two comments felt the standard was prescriptive and not performance based
  - The group voted 9 – 4 with no abstentions that the comments were non-persuasive
- Several comments involved the scope
  - The first scope item pertained to including references to the OSHA requirements for safety cans and possibly including safety cans within the scope of the document
    - The group voted 8 – 4 with one abstention that the comments were non-persuasive
  - The second scope item pertained to the ballot rationale
    - The group voted 9 – 0 with two abstentions to find it persuasive, the group will take the language on the background of the development of FMDs offered in the comment which was developed at a subcommittee meeting in July 2016 and create an appendix in the standard with it
  - The third scope item pertained to single-use containers but was not a negative vote

- Cheryl will reach out to the voter and let the voter know that another ASTM task group is working on products that may include the single-use containers the commenter was concerned about
- The next group of comments was on the term “non-metallic” in the definition of FMD
  - The “non-metallic” definition was largely incorporated by the manufacturers who make only plastic containers and a recommendation during the development phase to avoid metal FMDs for concerns over static discharge.
    - The group voted 5 – 4 with two abstentions to find it persuasive, the term “non-metallic” will be removed from the definition as it may be construed as a requirement. The group will table whether a requirement that FMDs be non-metallic to a future meeting when more information on will be presented.
- The next comment was on whether an FMD should be required to be permanently installed
  - This issue was tabled until a future teleconference
- The next comment was on representative PFC size
  - This issue was tabled until a future teleconference
- The next comment was in regards to the reserved section for a future flow out test
  - The task group voted in the past to reserve a section for a flow out test and start a task group to determine an appropriate flow out test after the FMD standard is initially approved. The group was in agreement to continue that course of action.
  - The commenter agreed to withdraw the comment
- The next comment was in regards to the pull out-test
  - This issue was tabled until a future teleconference and tied to the permanently installed comment
- The next comment was in regards to fuel conditioning
  - This issue was tabled until a future teleconference
- The next comment was in regards to the length of time to chemically condition the samples
  - The group considered making a change to a specified “minimum” time rather than a specified single time
  - The commenter agreed to withdraw the comment dependent on UL conversations

The meeting wrapped up and the group planned the next meeting. All votes are considered final on the disposition of the negative comments. Cheryl is tracking the results of the voting in a spreadsheet that will be circulated to the group.

The group scheduled the next teleconference for Friday September 14, 2018 from 10m to 12pm EDT.