

# U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission

## Log of Meeting

SUBJECT: F15.42 Age & Weight Task Group meeting

DATE OF MEETING: 10/30/2018

LOG ENTRY SOURCE: Michael Taylor

DATE OF LOG ENTRY: 11/8/2018

LOCATION: teleconference

CPSC ATTENDEES: Michael Taylor, Max Sanborn, Kristen Talcott, Hope Nesteruk

NON-CPSC ATTENDEES: 15.42 Age & Weight Task Group

### SUMMARY OF MEETING:

- TG chair shared recently released CPSC Update letter analyzing fatality data correlating victim height and CSU height to answer the question "Does the height of the victim show any relationship to the CSU height in tip over fatalities?" He stated that he felt the data showed the data did not support a strong correlation.
  - Don Huber of Consumer Reports commented that the height of units they tested did not indicate any difference in susceptibility to tip over
    - Factors they believe contributed to tip over include a combination of:
      - Drawer extension
      - Weight
      - Back panel Construction
      - Drawer front Construction
  - Bill Perdue agreed the data does not support a tiered testing system
  - Nancy Cowles agreed the data does not support a tiered testing system
    - Stressed we need to find the right weight to perform testing
  - Group consensus was not to pursue a tiered approach
- Bill Perdue believes 50lb is adequate to address the most affected age group (2-3yr olds)
- Task group members expressed concern about the current lack of data to support increased weight.
- CPSC staff were asked if the same analysis could be performed on injury data
  - We explained it would be very difficult given the detail of data collected for injuries. We would not have the same confidence in analysis as we do with fatality data
    - Hope explained injury reports will often make estimates like
      - The victim was about 40"
      - The unit was 3-4 ft tall
    - A special study could potentially address the question, but would be prospective (i.e., it would be some time before we had answers) vs the retrospective analysis on existing data

- One task group member began a discussion about non-compliant furniture, stating that the incident data shows that incidents are only occurring with non-compliant furniture because the weights of children are lower than the test weight.
  - The conversation digressed into importance of enforcement
  - One task group member wanted to “level the playing field”
  - CPSC staff reminded task group that compliance discussion are out of the scope of the task group, and that they have CPSC *technical* staff on line.
- Group discussed whether the scope task group is considering lower test weight for units under 30 inches. Task group members generally did not seem in favor of lowering weight for shorter units.
- Group revisited discussion of what “up to and including five year old” means
  - Claimed that CPSC staff isn’t even consistent in what they call 5-year-olds since we have a report that breaks down 4.5-4.9, 5-5.5, 5.5-5.9, etc
  - The group discussed if they were talking about “clarifying” the language or if they were really trying to change the number. Several task group members said they wanted to change the number.
- Matt Howsare recapped AHFA’s recent tech to tech meeting with CPSC and how our areas of agreement will help
  - Nancy Cowles raised issued about AFHA meeting with CPSC discussing ASTM issues outside of the ASTM process.
- Task Group Chairman refocused discussion to what can we do to improve safety.
  - Bill Perdue spoke of their hiring of Exponent to analyze incident data and indicated that AHFA believes that report will justify revision of the scope of F2057 to a lower age group. He suggested that the results of the analysis will show that the 2-3 year old age group is the one most affected. AHFA plans to present their proposed scope language when the report is complete.