



**ASTM Meeting**  
**F15.38 Subcommittee on Window Falls Prevention**  
**Washington, DC**  
**June 15, 1998**

**CPSC/OFFICE OF  
THE SECRETARY**  
**1998 NOV 30 P 3:51**

**Log of Meeting**

**Date of Log Entry:** November 30, 1998  
**Source of Log Entry:** Susan Kyle, Ph.D., Project Manager  
Window Falls  
CPSC  
*SKL*  
**Attendees:** See attached ASTM minutes

**Summary of Meeting**

See attached ASTM minutes

Attachment

*12/19/98*  
CPSA 6 (b)(1) Cleared  
 No Mfrs/PrvtLblrs or  
Products Identified  
\_\_\_\_ Excepted by \_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_ Firms Notified,  
Comments Processed



**ASTM SUBCOMMITTEE F15-38  
JUNE 15, 1998  
MEETING MINUTES**

**ATTENDEES**

Sue Kyle	Consumer Product Safety Commission	310-504-0470
James McMullen	The McMullen Co, Inc.	530-757-1291
John Drengenber	UL	847-272-8800
Tom Vaughn	AMSCO	715-234-0241
Michelle E. Perrault	MEP Consulting	781-871-1990
John R. Sterling	John Sterling Corp.	815-678-2031
Daryl Hower	Leslie-Locke	800-755-9392
Keith Highland	Leslie-Locke	800-249-6374
Al Campbell	NWWDA	800-223-2301
Phil Morton	Dayton Technologies	800-432-9560
Michael Tracy	New Visions Corp.	800-921-9516
Andrea Nordaune	A.J. Nordaune & Associates	612-224-4407
Kathy Coen	Andersen Corporation	612-430-7490

The meeting was called to order. introductions of those present were made. and the minutes from the previous meeting approved. The first matter discussed was the Provisional Standard Safety Specification for Window Fall Prevention Devices for Non-Emergency Escape (Egress) and Rescue (Ingress) Windows.

**Provisional Safety Standard for Window Fall Prevention Devices for Non-Emergency Escape (Egress) and Rescue (Ingress) Windows**

**Introduction:** There were slight revisions made to the introduction. (Please see the ballot).

**Scope:** Paragraph 1.3 of the Scope was revised to state: "This specification applies only to devices intended to be installed at heights of more than 75 feet above the ground level in multiple family dwelling buildings. This specification is not intended to apply to windows below 75 feet because these windows can be used for emergency escape and rescue."

Sections 1.4 and 1.5 of the Scope will be reversed.

**Terminology:** The definition of "window falls" at 2.1.3 should be moved up to 2.1.2 to appear before the definition for "window fall prevention device." The definition for "window" should be moved from 2.1.4 to 2.1.1. The definition of "window fall prevention device" was changed from "...a product installed into an existing window opening, and in conjunction with the properly functioning window unit, for the purpose of preventing children five years old or younger from falling from the open window" to "...a product installed into an existing window

opening, and in conjunction with the properly functioning window unit, for the purpose of preventing children five years old or younger from falling from or out of an open window.”

**General Requirements:** There was discussion of 3.1 regarding the 4-inch spacing requirements for guards. A negative vote on the last ballot was based on the recommendation that the spacing requirement should be 3.5 inches. The subcommittee has reviewed this issue previously. Darrel Hower moved the negative vote was nonpersuasive, and this was seconded by Mike Tracy. There were seven votes supporting the motion finding the ballot nonpersuasive. There is a need to develop a substantiated rationale for anthropometric measurements. Keith Highland from Leslie Locke will gather this information. Footnote number 7 will be revised accordingly.

Section 3.2 should reference the impact test in 7.2. There is some deflection expected during the test. The specification needs to address acceptable deflection during and after the test.

Sue Kyle and Keith Highland will check on analogous deflection criteria for cribs and playground equipment.

Al Campbell asked about the duration the load should be placed on the window fall prevention device. Section 3.2 was changed from “The distance between window fall prevention device structural members or components after all testing is conducted shall not exceed 4.0 in (102 mm) when a 60 lb direct force is applied in accordance with the test method according to 7.3” to “The distance between window fall prevention device structural members or components after all testing is conducted shall not exceed 4.0 in (102mm) when applied in accordance with the test method according to 7.2.”

**Installation Instructions:** Placement of the Safety Information heading information was discussed. Installation Instructions should refer to and incorporate safety information. When cross-referencing this information, we need to keep in mind that there may be different audiences for installation instructions and safety information.

**Safety Information:** Section .1 (now Section 5.1) should be clarified to indicate what “separate page” means. Leslie Locke representatives and John Sterling suggested incorporating this information into the packaging.

**Performance Tests:** The test will be based on the impact-glazing test. The impact test will be a pendulum test using 1 impact. The committee needs a rationale for speed. Fifty pounds is the 95 percentile for a 5-year-old. The CPSC and Leslie Locke will do a test with 1 hit of the pendulum at 100 pounds released at 12 inches.

For hang test and amount of deflection, we should look at head size for a 95th percentile 5 year old. The window fall prevention device should return to 4 inches after testing.

The end of July is the deadline for test results to be obtained by the CPSC and Leslie Locke based on the ANSI Glazing Impact Test.

**Discussion of UL Test:** We should steer away from representing the device for the next portion of the specification as a "security" device. A question arose regarding regulations for fire service ingress. UL is waiting for a response from the fire service industry.

UL is willing to help with the ASTM specification development process with information, testing etc.

The next part of the standard (addressing application of window fall prevention devices to windows intended for emergency escape and rescue) should focus on release devices. All devices do not work on all different bars. What is the age group and what is the manual dexterity level for the release mechanism?

Safety caps/packaging for medicine focus can be reviewed to provide guidance. The release mechanisms for safety caps/packaging are based on two requirements: a) physical strength b) mental capacity.

We should evaluate requiring two actions-- one mental, one physical. Parental supervision and education still need to be a consideration. Another question arose regarding the replacement of the guard after it has been released.

Perhaps an alarm in combination with release device could be considered. The cost and ease of installation are critical concerns. Michelle Perrault and Sue Kyle will collect information regarding analogous products. Jim McMullen will send out California information on release mechanism requirements. We should begin drafting the egress specification on a release mechanisms is the key issue.