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SUMMARY OF MEETING:

Paul Schildhouse (Masterlock) chaired the meeting that began at 9:15 AM. The meeting followed the agenda (see Attachment) and the first four items were routinely dispatched. George Sushinsky was introduced as the new CPSC representative replacing Roy Deppa.

Item 5 on the agenda consumed most of the meeting time as draft 7 of the standard was reviewed section by section. Mr. Schildhouse stated that the subcommittee (SC) at the last meeting (April 2002) had judged that Draft 7 was suitable to conduct testing to determine the test protocol adequacy. Mr. Schildhouse reported that Masterlock had performed the specified testing on various products and was prepared to report on the results of the testing. Draft 7 contained editorial comments within the text of the draft standard and it was these comments that formed the basis of the SC review at this meeting. All sections of Draft 7, though, were open for discussion even if not singled out in the draft 7 text by a specific comment.

After discussion the following major changes were made to draft 7:

- Introduction – the word “preventing” was changed to “deterring” because the locking device could not be made to prevent all attempts to defeat it.
- Section 4.1 was removed because there were no tests for firearms discharge in the document. Also, all labeling is directed at using the locking device on an unloaded firearm.
- Section 4.7 (formerly 5.1.1.3) was reworded to make it mandatory (“shall” instead of “should”) and to define the intent of the requirement with respect to disassembly of the firearm.
• Section 5.1.1.4 was changed to require testing on a previously untested
device. Draft 7 required all tests to be conducted on a single locking device.
Paul Schildefuise reported that it was possible to conduct all the tests on a
single device if a particular sequence was followed. The discussion of this
point was lengthy and involved consideration of “real world” scenarios,
statistical sampling, and number of test repetitions on a single lock.
• Section 5.2 on lock picking was discussed in comparison with a similar test in
ASTM F883 for padlocks. In the F883 standard a Grade 1 lock must resist
picking by 5 experienced lock pickers for 30 seconds. The requirement in
Draft 7 uses a tester with no specialized lock picking or manipulation skills
and a limited access to “tools”. Several SC member stated that the intent of
this requirement was to eliminate the locks that have simple latches that can
be easily “picked” with a paper clip. It was also stated that the number of key
code required in section 4.4 (130) would make picking a relatively
unrepeatable act of luck – even for test personnel that have to perform the test
on a regular basis.
• A suggestion to include a plug torque test similar to that in the CA standard
was accepted.
• Section 5.5.2 – Paul Schildefuise presented data comparing CPSC cable
cutting tests with 8-inch side cutters with ASME specified cutting blades.
There was enough correlation in the data to allow a change in the draft 7
requirement from sidecutters to the ASME blades. That requirement will be
drafted with a force on the ASME blades approximately equal to a 100-pound
force on the sidecutters.
• Section 5.6 – Kirk Rice (NIST) presented information on an impact test
device designed to achieve higher impact velocities than capable in the free-
fall test specified. The test equipment simulates the speed (35 feet per second)
and motion of a person impacting a locking device attached to a firearm
against an anvil. Mr. Rice provided design and cost information and
presented some data. The SC voted to adopt Mr. Rice’s method and to replace
5.6 with the higher speed impact.
• Section 5.7 – The trigger lock impact test was discussed to clarify the impact
locations and directions.
• Section 5.8 – George Sushinsky (CPSC) was tasked to offer new wording to
reflect the repetitive prying motion that CPSC used to defeat trigger locks.

The meeting ended at 5:15 PM without discussion of the Instruction and Labeling
section. A new draft based on the changes was to be prepared prior to the next meeting. A
meeting was suggested for March 2003 to prepare the standard for ballot.
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MEETING AGENDA – F15.53 NON-INTEGRAL FIREARM LOCKING DEVICES
January 23, 2003  9am – 4pm
ASTM Headquarters, West Conshohocken, PA

1. Call to Order and Welcome – Paul Schildhouse, F15.53 Chairman
2. Approval of the April 24, 2002 Meeting Minutes
3. Membership Update – Kathie Morgan
4. CPSC Transfer of Representative – Roy Deppa, CPSC
5. Review of Draft Standard, Test Methods and Results of Testing – Paul Schildhouse
   a. Picking and Manipulation Test
   b. Shock Test
   c. Tensile Test
   d. Shackle/Cable Cutting Test
   e. Drop/Impact Test
   f. Pry Test
   g. Number of Samples and Sequence of Tests
6. Any further group discussion of draft
7. Proposed timetable for balloting
8. Next meeting date/location
9. Adjournment