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SUMMARY OF MEETING:

ASTM F08 (Sports Equipment) Bike Sub-Committee Meeting

Points of Order
Chair Dave Mitchell was not able to attend. The role of Chair was filled by Patrick Logan.

Secretary John Platt was not able to attend. The role of secretary was filled by Cory Sutela.

ISO/TAG update
Presented by Stefan Berggren
ISO has agreed to renew their existing standards for another 5 years. They may adopt the new CEN standards; the timing for that is 5 years out. Don Wright, the chair of ISO, has stepped down. His replacement is Allan Kator, incidentally also from the UK with experience working with Raleigh.

CEN news:
Standards for BMX and for bike trailers are expected in 2008. Work is being done on a standard for electric bikes.

Some changes to the racing bicycle standard are in review with an advisory board, including to handlebars, fork impact, and crank tests. There is some thought within the CEN group and European testers that the current tests may be too severe, a sentiment echoed by some members of this ASTM sub-committee. No changes are being contemplated for the brake standard. It was noted that the wet/dry ratio criteria can be difficult to meet for some brakes.

Mr. Berggren observed that new CEN standards, as well as revisions, can actually be pushed though quite quickly, on the order of 1 year, very quickly relative to ASTM F08.10 committee. The reason for this is because the CEN groups are relatively well resourced with motivated members from companies who have paid to participate in the process.

Wheels Group
Led by David Montague
The latest revision of the quick release-secondary retention system test standard was distributed. To summarize the main differences compared to previous proposals, the current proposal does not specify the operation of a secondary retention system; rather it simply calls out a test for its performance. Changed prohibited QRs to 20” wheeled bikes.

The proposed test consists of a 200N “pullout force” on the wheel, and a 100N side load applied sequentially in 2 directions at the circumference of the wheel. Since it had been observed that the geometry of fork dropouts and QRs can vary between sides, the test specifies that the side load should be applied sequentially in both directions (ie parallel to the wheel axle, in both directions). Then the wheel should be removed and rotated 180-deg about an axis perpendicular to the axle (ie, run the wheel backwards) and the test repeated. The test should be performed on a complete fork since different results were obtained when lower legs were tested on their own. Proof testing was performed by Montague and CI Dynamics.

The proposed wheel retention test standard was reviewed line-by-line. At the conclusion of the session Mr. Montague agreed to revise the proposal as per the suggestions of the group, and circulate the revised document to the Wheels group. It was noted that the deadline for the next ASTM ballot is July 31, 2007. It was further observed that full acceptance of this standard is not a pre-requisite for manufacturers to spec QRs for production.

Frames

Led by Patrick Logan

There were 2 negatives expressed on the last ballot for the frame test standard. Both were deemed persuasive.

The first negative referred to the allowed sequence of tests, in a case when the same frame is to be used for multiple tests. The group agreed that plastic deformation caused during an impact test can indeed affect the fatigue life during future tests, in a way that is not predictable. Therefore, an impact test will not be allowed before a fatigue test.

The second negative referred to the lack of a precision and bias (P&B) statement in the standard.

The ASTM has a service to support the generation of P&B statements, and will pay for the samples (but not the testing) required to create them. The action item here is for Patrick to contact Philip Godorov of the ASTM's Inter-Lab Study Group, pgodorov@astm.org, for more support.
Handlebars and grips

Led by John Bogler

The current revision of the grip standard was distributed. Mr. Berggren noted that in Europe, in addition to restrictions on lead content for grips, they are contemplating restrictions on PAH (polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons) content.

There was significant discussion about the grip geometry spec, and the distinction between a ‘core sample’ injury and a blunt trauma. There is an 80mm radius specification for grip ends and we wondered if this should be a minimum or if a range should be specified. Mr. Bogler will review the ski pole standard to see how the 80mm radius is applied, and circulate a proposal to the working group. He will also edit the proposed standard so that it conforms to ASTM conventions. He hopes to have something ready for subcommittee approval at the next meeting in Las Vegas in September.

Composite structures

This group had not formally met since our last meeting so progress was limited. Gerry Bretting has been the leader of this group, and he noted that with his other commitments it has been difficult for him to make headway on this topic. For many of us in the bikes subcommittee, this topic is very important and progress is urgently needed.

There is agreement that some kind of ‘fatigue plus impact’ (or possibly ‘stiffness-fatigue-stiffness-impact’) test would be appropriate for composite structures. It was suggested that both a frontal and a splay impact test should be included. The plan is to focus first on fork testing, then work on frames, then other components.

Forks

Led by Cory Sutela

Mr. Sutela shared Powerpoint presentation with the group

His suggestions for moving forward with fork tests included:
- revision of the class III fatigue test force and cycle requirements to align with the CEN mountain bike standard.
- Addition of several new tests to the fork standard, some following previous suggestions from Marzocchi: disc brake fatigue, splay impact, tensile and possibly a disc brake static load test.
- Wherever possible the new tests will be aligned with CEN, considering ASTM class I to be equivalent to the CEN city/trekking class, and ASTM class II
equivalent to the CEN racing class.
- The group agreed that the 3mm ‘mud clearance’ requirement in the current ASTM standard is a good idea (compared to the CEN test which does not specify this).
- Special requirements for composite forks will be added in cooperation with the composite working group.
- The group is interested in providing fork standards for tandems. Cannondale will share some field data and internal standards that they use for this application.
- The group would also like to set fork standards for BMX bikes. A sensible course of action here would be to observe the direction taken by the CEN group, and decide on an ASTM standard afterwards.
- Although the group is interested in standards for cyclocross bikes, it is not yet clear which classification is appropriate. It seems reasonable to classify them for now as either road or mountain bikes, at the manufacturers discretion.

Use classification

Primary group leaders Dave Mitchell and John Platt could not attend the meeting. Dave Mitchell did contribute to the meeting by phone:

Voting on the last ballot was negative but the negatives might be easily resolved. There was agreement within the group that numbers on proposed labels could be optionally included.

It was agreed that aftermarket components, in particular forks, could be labeled if a manufacturer chooses, according to the intended use and the test standards that had been used for evaluation.

Mr. Mitchell agreed to convene the group by phone or email during the next month, to assess whether a revised document could be presented for ballot before the July 31 deadline.

Accessories

Led by Patrick Logan

There were 2 notes for improvement to F1975, the trailer standard. 1) In the fatigue test for the coupling, the tongue height needs to be specified. 2) the group wants to rewrite the standard for the strength of the roll cage to match the CEN standard, which calls for a load of 1.5x the weight of the trailer.

There was no update about the trail-a-bike standard.

Full Committee meeting
Motion by Dave Campbell, 2nd Gerry Bretting

To direct the wheel working group to draft a dropout dimensional standard for bicycle forks which use ‘tap tips’ (also called ‘recesses’ or ‘lawyer lips’) as part of a secondary retention system

14 ayes 1 nay 1 abstention – motion passed.

Mr. Logan introduced a discussion about supply chain standardization within the industry. Such an effort could reduce both the cost and the environmental impact of producing bicycles.

The next meeting of the subcommittee was scheduled for Wednesday September 26, the first day of the indoor show at Interbike, from 9am to 3pm. John Bogler will reserve the room for this meeting.

Dave Duff moved to adjourn, Stefan Berggren 2nd, motion passed.
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