

CPSA 6 (b)(1) Cleared  
No Mfrs/Prvtlblrs or  
Products Identified  
Excepted by  
Firms Notified,  
Comments Processed.

## LOG OF MEETING

**SUBJECT:** Playground Surfacing - ASTM F08-63 Subcommittee Meeting

**DATE OF MEETING:** December 8, 1998

**DATE OF LOG ENTRY:** December 11, 1998

**PERSON SUBMITTING LOG:** George F. Sushinsky

**LOCATION:** Opryland Hotel Convention Center  
Nashville, TN

**CPSC ATTENDEE(S):** George F. Sushinsky

**NON-CPSC ATTENDEE(S):** Members and Guests of ASTM F 08.63  
An attendance list is not yet available but is being mailed to attendees. It will be attached to this log when available

1998 DEC 21 A 11:12  
CPSC/OFFICE OF  
THE SECRETARY

### SUMMARY OF MEETING:

The meeting was called to order by subcommittee chairman Robert Heath at approximately 8:10 am. A packet of information was distributed to the meeting participants, It contained the minutes of the last meeting and comments and negative votes from ballots of:

- ◊ PS 083 - Determination of Accessibility of Surface Systems Under and Around Playground Equipment and
- ◊ F-1292 - Impact Attenuation of Surface Systems Under and Around Playground Equipment.

The minutes of the last meeting were approved after some discussion of the use of "free-fall" apparatus in other than field test situations. The information packet is available on request.

The discussion of negative comments on revisions to PS 083 issue prompted a general discussion concerning the need for the information (including minutes) prior to the meeting. Then, ASTM staff were consulted on the proper handling of comments and negative votes in terms of voting and item resolution. After a discussion with ASTM staff about membership categories, voting members and proxies were identified and 16 producers were potentially added to full voting status. (There are only two membership categories: producers and everybody else.)

The comments and negative votes on PS 083 were generally resolved. One issue, on the need to test for accessibility on other than level surfaces, was deferred. A motion was passed to request Peter Axelson to develop data on wheelchair accessibility on deformed surfaces. Mr. Axelson was responsible for most of the test provisions in PS 083 and authored the original draft of the provisional standard. He was not at this subcommittee meeting.

The comments and negative votes on balloted revisions to ASTM F 1292 produced spirited discussions around two main issues: (1) operator certification, and (2) the use of "free fall" instrumentation for surface certification in a laboratory. All negative votes on these issues were either withdrawn or found non-persuasive. A task group was established to look at what is needed in terms of operator certification and training. After all comments and discussions were concluded, the revisions to the standard were accepted as editorial in nature.

In the discussions of F 1292 revisions Martyn Shorten, a statistician, presented the results of the round robin comparison of the free-fall device and laboratory instrumentation. His conclusions, based on three independent analyses of the data, were that both tests produce equivalent results, but the reproducibility of the results between laboratories is "lousy." Therefore, the equivalency of both types of instrumentation was judged to be sufficient to allow the free-fall apparatus to be used as a laboratory device. This equivalency exists despite differences in the physical characteristics (mass and shape) of the impacting missiles. The need to reduce the data spread between laboratories was addressed by myself and others. However, this was not discussed in detail.

Mr. Shorten presented data showing the effect of more impacts on the repeatability of impact data from a single unitary material. In his tests, 25 impacts were recorded on a single material each day for 4 days. His data showed that the most variability occurred in the first three impacts, and that the impact levels increased with each days tests. He concluded that the data produced by following the current standard, using the average of the second and third impacts, could be made less variable by averaging the third and fourth impacts (or the ninth and tenth). Richard Schefsky and I pointed out that more impacts in loose-fill materials will succeed in burying the headform, impacting the bottom of the test box, or, for rail-guided systems, result in interference between the drop test carriage and the box containing the material. Six laboratories, including CPSC-LSE, agreed to conduct five or more impacts over a 4-day period on a material to be sent to them, in order to look at this issue further.

A task group presented its draft standard-in-progress to define the physical characteristics of 'engineered' wood fiber. Several people objected to the use of the term "engineered" and a discussion ensued about the use of a better descriptive term for the product. No resolution to this discussion was reached. In other business a task group was established to look at flammability issues. Durability (longevity and resiliency) issues were also discussed briefly but no action was proposed. Also, the work of a task group to

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.