

COPY 2/11/95  
X 3/11/95

**LOG OF MEETING**  
**DIRECTORATE FOR ENGINEERING SCIENCES**

**SUBJECT:** Meeting of ASTM F15.40.20 Section for Walkers

**DATE OF MEETING:** March 29, 1995      **PLACE:** Doubletree Hotel  
New Orleans, LA

**LOG ENTRY SOURCE:** John Preston, ESME *JP*

**DATE OF ENTRY:** April 11, 1995

**COMMISSION ATTENDEES:** John Preston, ESME  
Barbara Jacobson, HSPS

**NON-COMMISSION ATTENDEES:**

Nate Saint, Graco	Sharon Thompson, Summer Infant Prod.
Ron Hoffman, Graco	Cecil Cantey, Nelson
Clare Murnane, JPMA	Francois Dignard, Health Canada
Richard Glover, Cosco	Gary Sealy, J. Mason Products
Terry Emerson, Cosco	Kitty Pilarz, Fisher-Price
Perry McGlothan, Century	Michael Fredrick, Kolcarft
Gary Christman, Evenflo	Paul Doppelt, Consultant
Bob Craig, Consultant	Jerry Drobinski, Revmark
Kellen Watkins, Peg Perego	Susan Snyder, J.C. Penney
Art Kazianis, Hasbro	Bob Hart, Gerry Baby Products
Werner Frietag, Consumer	Mary Ellen Fise, CFA
Louie Shamie, Delta	

**SUMMARY OF MEETING:**

After approval of the minutes of the last meeting, the chairman asked for a status report on the CPSC walker project. Barbara Jacobson responded by stating that 13 comments had been received in response to an August 1994 ANPR. Seven comments supported a mandatory regulation for walkers and six were opposed. Five of the six that were opposed supported a voluntary standard. Comments were also received on the issues of labeling, parental supervision, and alternative products. None of the comments provided a positive solution to the problem of walkers falling down stairways. Barbara stated that the current schedule called for a briefing package to be delivered to the Commission in May 1995. However, she noted that until a third CPSC Commissioner is appointed, no decision can be made on whether to publish an NPR. Barbara noted that copies of the comments to the ANPR can be requested from the Office of the Secretary at CPSC.

In a discussion of the CPSC special study of walker incidents, it was noted that about 80% of the 25,000 annual incidents involved stairway falls. Based on subsequent on-site investigations, about 76% of the incidents involved stairs having doorways less than 36 inches in width. About 50% of the walkers

✓

involved in stairway falls bore a stairs warning label and about 67% were certified as meeting the voluntary standard.

In a report of the CPSC focus group study, it was noted that the purpose was to determine if parents would accept alternatives to conventional baby walkers. The study was conducted with a wide walker and three walker alternatives. Two groups of parents had children in the 5-15 month age range and had used walkers. Another two groups had children from 5 months to 5 years of age and had not used walkers. Parents had been selected to obtain a mix of race, income, and age of child. The focus group study showed that parents continue to use walkers even if they are personally aware of a stair fall incident. Parents not using walkers stated they did not want their children constrained. Parents expressed concern about the portability of some of the larger walker alternatives. Both the parents using walkers and those not using walkers responded favorably to the saucer-like product currently on the market.

In a report from an industry walker technical group, it was stated that the group had seven or eight members and had met twice during the past two days. They will meet again in June and their goal is to have a proposal addressing stair fall incidents for consideration by the walker section at its October meeting.

The chairman noted that three negative votes had been cast in a ballot of revisions to the walker standard that closed on March 14th. A negative objecting to the new language for the stairs warning label was ruled non-persuasive. Four comments accompanying a negative vote from a juvenile products consultant were accepted. These concerned a change to the definition of a walker in 3.1; an increase in the force for the latching/locking mechanism test from 10 lbf to 45 lbf; a change in the language for the stability test in 7.3.1.2; and a change to the labeling requirement in 9.1.

The third negative vote stated that the format required for the warning labels in 9.3.2 was poor and should follow the format required by the ANSI standard for Product Safety Signs and Symbols, ANSI Z535.4. The negative voter offered to rewrite the labeling requirements.

An affirmative vote from an independent testing lab noted that three sentences had been omitted from the test procedure in 7.1.2.4 of the revised standard. It was agreed that these will be restored.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned.

DISTRIBUTION:

OS(2), ES, EXHR, File