

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

CPSC/OFFICE OF  
THE SECRETARY  
1998 NOV 24 P 12

**LOG OF MEETING**

**SUBJECT:** Multi-Purpose Lighters -  
Meeting of Technical Task Group 2 of ASTM Sub-Committee F15.02,  
Safety Standards for Cigarette Lighters

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 18, 1998

**PERSON SUBMITTING LOG:** Barbara J. Jacobson

**LOCATION:** LaGuardia Airport, American Airlines Admiral Club Business Center

**CPSC ATTENDEE(S):** Barbara Jacobson, Directorate for Epidemiology and Health Sciences, and Harleigh Ewell, Office of the General Counsel

**NON-CPSC ATTENDEE(S):** See listing of attendees in the attached ASTM F15.02 Technical Task Group 2 Minutes.

**SUMMARY OF MEETING:**

**NOTE:** The purpose of this meeting was to discuss draft provisions for a mandatory standard that would require multi-purpose lighters to be child-resistant.

We determined that the common industry term for the product is "utility" lighter. We discussed a preliminary definition of "utility lighter":

Utility lighter, also referred to as grill lighter, fireplace lighter, multi-purpose lighter, and gas match means: a hand held, flame-producing product used by consumer to ignite candles, fuel for fireplaces, charcoal or gas-fired grills, campfires, camp stoves, lanterns, and fuel-fired appliances or devices. We said we expected the scope to include both refillable and non-refillable lighters using any type of fuel, and having any customs valuation or ex-factory price.

There was a discussion about adding the term "self-igniting" to the definition to make it clear that products that require a separate ignition source are excluded. There was a discussion about specifying a fuel capacity or weight limit (e.g., greater than 10 grams) to make it clear that large welding torches were excluded from the scope.

There was a discussion about whether micro-torch devices intended for soldering, brazing, or welding should be included within the scope. We expressed concern that the products were being marketed for general consumer uses such a lighting grills. A Task Group Member said that excluding them could introduce a loophole (e.g., a utility lighter with a pre-mixing burner could fall outside of the scope.)

1222

✓

We told the members that we supported an effective date of one year from publication of any final rule. One year would allow manufacturers adequate time to develop and test child-resistant designs.

We said that most of the other provisions of the preliminary draft were the same as the provisions in the cigarette lighter standard. Differences included a requirement for an audible signal for the surrogate lighters, more specific requirements for setting the activation point of the surrogate electronics, and requirements that would allow the child-resistant mechanism to automatically reset after multiple operation attempts. Task group members said that the definition of surrogate lighter should continue to allow a separate receiver for the electronics within the lighter body. There was a discussion about development of a performance requirement based on lighting efficiency to preclude a hazardous situation resulting from "flashback."

Task group members recommended the following wording for the automatic reset provision: "The CR feature resets itself after each operation, or in designs allowing multiple operations, after the last operation." The members opposed a requirement that the lighter become non-functional if the child-resistant feature is defeated by the consumer.

We said that most of the provisions for the certification requirements were the same as the provisions in the cigarette lighter standard. A Task Group member suggested clarifying the language in the standard to make it clear that "in bond" shipments of non child-resistant lighters are not violative since the lighters are not being imported into the U.S.

Task group members suggested adding new requirements to the anti-stockpiling provisions including using the most recent calendar year as the base period and providing documentation of numbers of lighters imported during both the base period and the period between publication of the final rule and the effective date.



June 2, 1998

TO:           **Members of F15.02 on Safety Standards for Lighters**

Subject:      **Minutes of F15.02 Task Group #2 on Utility Lighters**

Enclosed for your review are the minutes from the May 18, 1998 Utility Lighter meeting which was held at the LaGuardia Airport.

Please do not hesitate to contact me or Ed Lewiecki with any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Kathie Morgan

Staff Manager

Committee F15

Ph# 610-832-9721

e-mail: [kmorgan@astm.org](mailto:kmorgan@astm.org)

**THIS IS A WORKING DOCUMENT NOT REVIEWED BY SUB-COMMITTEE F15.02**

**MINUTES OF TECHNICAL TASK GROUP #2---UTILITY LIGHTERS**

**MEETING PLACE: LaGuardia Airport---Admirals Club Business Center**

**DATE OF MEETING: May 18, 1998**

May 26, 1998

ASTM Sub-Committee F15.02 approved the formation of TTG2 on utility lighters at its regular meeting of April 16th and 17th, 1998. The purpose of this meeting was twofold: (1) to dialogue with the CPSC on matters pertaining to the writing of a mandatory rule to make utility lighters more child resistant and (2) to discuss the feasibility of F15.02 formulating a general safety standard for utility lighters.

1. Discussion on the potentially forthcoming mandatory rule for utility lighters followed the outline submitted by Barbara Jacobson (Appendix 1). Suggestions by the Task Group to be considered by CPSC were made and can best be followed by referring to Appendix 1.

**A. Scope, Application and Effective Date**

The product under discussion should be referred to as a "utility" lighter exclusively. The effective date for the standard should be 1 year from date of publication of the final rule.

**B. Definitions**

The definition of a utility lighter should include that it is a self igniting, flame producing product.

Lengthy discussion followed as to whether or not lighting devices intended primarily for soldering, brazing or welding should fall under the mandatory rule. It was mentioned that if they were excluded, a loophole in the rule might arise if a utility lighter were to be introduced with a premixing burner type tip, thus allowing it to fall outside the CR standard. The definition of a utility lighter needs further consideration and it was felt this could be addressed in the scope of the standard.

**C. Surrogate Lighter**

safety standard for utility lighters. The first step to be taken is drafting the scope for the standard. Once this has been established, the writing of the remainder of the standard would follow.

The writing of the scope is of particular importance because it establishes exactly what products would fall under a utility lighter standard. In addition, it would provide input to CPSC on what products should be covered in a mandatory CR standard.

Tom Kelleher, Roger Ducharme and Mike Forys agreed to submit to the chairman drafts of the scope by the end of July. These will be distributed to all F15.02 members prior to the next regular meeting of the Subcommittee.

Sincerely,



Edward M. Lewiecki, P.E.  
Chairman, ASTM Sub-Committee F15.02  
Safety Standards for Lighters

#### TTG2 Meeting Attendees

Ed Lewiecki	Chairman
Keith Pearce	Swedish Match
Jean Yves Carco	Swedish Match
K. Y. Sung	Calico Brands Inc.
Felix Hon	Calico/Thai Merry
Aman K. M. Chung	Thai Merry Co. Ltd.
Roger Ducharme	Colibri
Takao Fujimoto	JETRO
Mike Forys	Scripto-Tokai Corp.
Tom Kelleher	Bic Corporation
Matt McLaughlin	Swedish Match
Barbara J. Jacobson	CPSC
Harleigh P. Ewell	CPSC/OGC

EML/vnl

Page 2 - DISCUSSION POINTS

Requirements for utility lighters.

- D
- o acceptance criterion - 85% - same as cigarette lighters.
  - o reset provision - allow multiple operations before child-resistant mechanism resets.
  - o not impair safe operation - same as cigarette lighters
  - o effective for reasonably expected life of the lighter - same as cigarette lighters.
  - o not easily overridden or deactivated - same as cigarette lighters or require lighter to become non functional if child resistant mechanism is removed/defeated.

Test protocol.

- E
- o Same as cigarette lighters except clarify certain provisions - for example, make it clear that a demonstration is conducted with each child's lighter even if one child is successful in the first 5-minute test period.

CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.

- F
- o Same as cigarette lighters?
    - o Certificate of compliance.
    - o Certification tests.
    - o Qualification testing.
    - o Specifications.
    - o Production testing.
    - o Recordkeeping and reporting.

STOCKPILING.

- G
- o Same as cigarette lighters?
    - o Base period - for cigarette lighters - any 1-year period during 5-year period prior to publication of final rule.
    - o Allowable rate of production during publication and effective date of final rule - 120 per cent for cigarette lighters.