

**U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission
LOG OF MEETING**

SUBJECT: ASTM F08.10 Bicycle Subcommittee Meeting

DATE OF MEETING: May 17, 2006

LOG ENTRY SOURCE: VJA

DATE OF LOG ENTRY: May 23, 2006

LOCATION: Sheraton Centre, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

CPSC ATTENDEE(S): Vincent J. Amodeo

NON-CPSC ATTENDEE(S):

Name	Company	E-mail
Alteirac, Sylvie	Mavic/ Salomon	sylvie_alteirac@salomon-sports.com
Becker, Bill	Fox Racing Shox	bbecker@foxracingshox.com
Berggren, Stefan	Trek	stefan_berggren@trekbikes.com
Bogler, John	CID, Inc	jbogler@cy-dynamics.com
Boyer, Scott	Answer	sboyer@answerproducts.com
Bretting, Gerry	CID, Inc.	gbretting@ci-dynamics.com
Burns, Bob	Trek	bob_burns@trekbikes.com
Campbell, David	Cannondale	david.campbell@cannondale.com
Chamberlain, Jason	Specialized	jchamber@specialized.com
De Rose, Jim	Answer	jderose@answerproducts.com
Delaney, Rich	Chubb Group	rdelaney@chubb.com
Duff, Dave	Huffy	dave.duff@huffy.com
Freeman, James	Kent Int.	jaflil@klotmach.com
Gitelis, Rob	PMG	rob@pmg.com.tw
Guidazzi, Filippo	Marzocchi	mutec02@marzocchi.it
Horwood, Graeme	True Temper Sports	graeme.horwood@truetemper.com
Hoying, Tony	Huffy	tony.hoying@huffybikes.com

Kennedy, David	Prototype Development	prototype_dev@yahoo.com
Kisamore, Gilbert	Cannondale Bicycle	gilbert.kisamore@cannondale.com
Logan, Patrick	K Ridley	engineer@kridleytech.com
Manuell, Chad	Trek	chad_manuell@trekbikes.com
Mitchell, Dave	Met Ltd.	dave@metltd.com
Montague, David	Montague Inventive Tech	dmontague@montagueusa.com
Nagode, Steve	REI	snagode@rei.com
Nichols, Nicole	TenCafe	n.nichols@tencafe.com
Olken, Rich	Montague Inventive Tech	rolken@montagueusa.com
Parnello, Dana	REI	dparnel@rei.com
Pfeffer, Matt	Trek	matt_pfeffer@trekbikes.com
Pickman, Sam	Specialized	sam.pickman@specialized.com
Platt, John	Trek	john_platt@trekbikes.com
Quan, Kevin	Cervelo	kevin@cervelo.com
Razionale, Luca	Marzocchi	mutec02@marzocchi.it
Rhomberg, Mark	Bike Testing Inc.	mrhomberg@aol.com
Rosenlund, Paul	Hancock, Rothert & Bunshoff	prosenlund@hrblaw.com
Ross, Sherwood	Ross	sherwoodross@earthlink.net
Schumann, Brian	Trek	brian_schumann@trekbikes.com
Sturaro, Fabio	Marzocchi Asia	fabio.sturaro@marzocchiasia.com
Sutela, Cory	SRAM	csutela@sram.com
Swart, Randy	Bicycle Helmet Safety Institute	randy@helmets.org
Tamaka, Koichi	Shimano American	koichi@shimano.com
Tudor, Andrew	Meridian One, Inc.	atudor@meridianonece.com
Wesson, Tad	Answer Products	twesson@answerproducts.com
Yelkerton, Forrest	Pacific Cycle	forrest@gtb.com
Yoshimura, Shinji	Shimano Inc.	
Young, Sean	Met Ltd.	sean@metltd.com
Vandenberg, Jonathan	Montague Inventive Tech	jvandenberg@montagueusa.com
Wilke, Marty	Huffy	marty.wilke@huffy.com

SUMMARY OF MEETING: ASTM F08.10 Bicycle Meetings

May 17, 2006

F08.96 US ISO /TAG Meeting

Jason Chamberlin reported on the Passage of Euro Bike CEN Standards. Most European Countries will be adopting 4 new CEN bicycle standards. Since new CEN standards will override ISO 4210, the ASTM bicycle group voted to recommend withdrawal of ISO 4210.

New Business:

The Subcommittee Chairman requested nominations for a new ASTM/ISO-TAG chairman to replace Jason Chamberlin. The TAG chairman should be an engineer with a testing background working on ISO committee w/financial ability to support meetings. Steffan Bergren/Trek, Sam Pickman/Specialized were potential nominees,

F08.10.19 Bicycle Accessories Meeting

Patrick Logan reported on the status of the Trailer standard. Patrick wants to get a small group to work on revising trailer standard.

The database for bicycle company VIN numbers is progressing. Many of the smaller companies are not yet on board. Would a CPSC press release help?

Standard Specification and Test Method for Rear-mounted Bicycle Child Carriers needs to be reviewed and re-approved by the end of the year or it gets dropped.

New business:

Representatives from R.E.I. showed an interest in developing a new Trail-a-bike standard. The group voted to approve new standard development under the Accessories task group.

F08.10.04 Frames Meeting:

Patrick Logan presented the revised draft standard for test method for Frames. The Composites group is working on addressing carbon fork issues. They will look at the carbon frames later and may recommend changes to the frames test method.

Drafts for Test Method and Condition 3 Specification will now go to vote.

F08.10.01 Handlebars and Stems Meeting:

John Bogler presented the revised Draft Standard for Test Method for Handlebar Grip Safety. This standard will cover all grips or handlebar end closures, not just for kid's bicycles. The standard includes a "Go-No-Go" gage to measure grip dimensions. The working group came up with an impact Punchout test based on lab testing of samples. Also worked on a Grip pull-off test. The working group needs comments on those two areas by the October Las Vegas meeting. John conducted tests on about 35 grips for punchout impact. Came up with a test that subjects the grip to a 100 mm drop at 10 kg for 10 hits. The lab testing compared hits on asphalt to hits on steel surface. Asphalt was much more abusive and took about 10 hits compared to 15-20 hits for the flat steel surface.

The group asked if they could add Environmental testing for pull off and impact,

such as hot/cold/wet, etc. John will do more testing and have results by next meeting in Las Vegas.

F08.10.02 Suspension and Forks Meeting

Dave Mitchell recommend nominating a new leader for the Suspension & Fork Task Group. Cory Sutela was nominated and voted on as the new leader.

Marzocchi reps made a presentation on their further test and validation of mtb forks and recommended test loads for the fork standard.

Marzocchi's recommendation was for 2 classes of forks:

Cat A: XC and Trekking forks

Cat B: All mountain, free ride, downhill. Etc.

Marzocchi tried to determine a correspondence between the field results and the lab testing in their recommendations.

Marzocchi recommended loads for Lab Testing: Compression Load A/B, Traction, Longitudinal Bending, Transverse Bending, Torsion, Impact, Shock, Fatigue and Flex.

Sherwood Ross asked the group to address negative comments against adding Quick Release hub retention test to Condition 3 Standard Test Method. The negative comments were not addressed and therefore the revision to the standard was dropped.

F08.10. Composites Meeting:

John Bogler stated that the group reviewed ASTM and other voluntary standards for Carbon Fiber. The current fork standard was reviewed. A proposal is being developed by Cory and Bud on composite forks. They are trying to come up with functional tests. They recommended a fatigue test followed by an energy absorption test (impact). They recommended to run the ASTM fork test a specified number of cycles per the Fatigue test and follow with a drop test that will expose any fractures in the fork.

Gerry Bretting stated that developments in acoustic emission can detect hidden defects during a static test, but not impact. Trek said they would provide guidance from their work with acoustic emission of carbon fiber forks.

Multiple test scenarios may be needed. How do we test for a latent defect that's not obvious to the user. Proof load every fork? Qualification test could be a low load with an acoustic emission test.

New Business: Montague reps presented their Wheel Retention System:

Reviewed of background on quick-release usage.

Montague presented draft standards for Dropout Dimensional Standards. Group commented that the dimensional standard should be changed to a tolerance standard, instead of a dimensional standards. For example, say fork dropouts are +1.0, -0.5 mm of the hub outer boss width.

Montague presentation a draft standard for manually operated front wheel retention systems.

CEN is interested in the type of standards that Montague presented.

Motion to create a front wheel retention performance standard was approved

F08.10 Use Conditions Meeting:

Dave Mitchell presented revisions to the Bicycle Use Conditions standard. The revision added use “0” and “5”.

John Platt presented proposed sticker labels for bicycles to describe design and testing parameters to instruct user on safe riding based on the bicycles use conditions.

Condition “0” – New use – requires parental supervision (side-walk bikes).

Condition “1” – Riding on pavement

Condition “2” – Riding on improved paths and roadways only – no jumping.

Condition “3” – Unimproved trails

Condition “4” – Jumps

Condition “5” – high-speed or Jumps up to 48”

The group discussed Road racing (Condition 1) requires higher test loads than hybrids or city bikes (Condition 2) as presented. Recommended these use conditions be switched. Group liked numerals (but not ‘0’)