

CPSC 6 (b)(1) Cleared
No Mrs/...
Products Identified
Excepted
Fire
1998 JUL 15 A 10:15

MEETING LOG

DIRECTORATE FOR ENGINEERING SCIENCES

SUBJECT: Gas Range/Oven Emissions Meeting between CPSC staff and the Gas Industry

PLACE: CPSC Directorate for Laboratory Sciences, Building A Conference Room

MEETING DATE: July 1, 1998

TIME: 9:00 am

LOG ENTRY SOURCE: Ronald A. Jordan *RAJ*

ENTRY DATE: July 10, 1998

COMMISSION ATTENDEES:

See attached sign-in sheet for Commission attendees.

NON-COMMISSION ATTENDEES:

See attached sign-in sheet for Non-Commission attendees.

MEETING SUMMARY:

Representatives from the Gas Range Industry and U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) met, at the CPSC Directorate for Laboratory Sciences facility, to discuss the range emissions testing that CPSC was beginning to conduct. This was a follow up meeting to a meeting held in March 1998. At the March meeting, CPSC presented a test plan to the gas range industry. At this meeting CPSC discussed revisions that had been made to the test in response to industry comments as well as the staff's response to other industry comments that were not incorporated into the test plan.

The CPSC staff estimated that it would probably take 200 working days to test the ranges and perhaps 50 more days to write up the report. A member of industry suggested that CPSC and industry should have regular meetings during this time in order to get updates about how the testing was progressing. Staff stated that he thought quarterly meetings may be excessive. Some industry representatives suggested that meeting every 3 to 5 months may be useful. They also suggested that the meetings should coincide with the meetings on the range fire project. It was suggested by an industry person that the next meeting for an update should be in September or October, at the time of the range fire meeting.

AHAM stated that they had a strict records retention policy and after 3 years all were disposed.



Staff asked if we could have access to the data from manufacturers regarding emissions during their quality testing. AHAM replied that they would study the request and get back to us, hopefully, within a month.

A member of industry raised a question about the Directorate for Economics paper that used the Department of Energy RECS data. He was primarily concerned with how he could duplicate the results.

Members of industry stated there was no doubt that blocking the vent holes with aluminum foil would likely cause elevated CO. There was some discussion about the need for the testing. CPSC staff related an anecdote about a consumer who had 250 ppm of CO measured in the kitchen but was told by the manufacturer's representative over the phone that it was ok because the standard allowed 800 ppm. There was a lot of discussion related to the misunderstanding of the 800 ppm "air free" standard.

A manufacturing representative also stated that they objected to the reference in one of the CPSC memos about some manufacturers buying back ranges when consumers have complained about CO emissions. The representative stated that they have a policy to satisfy the customer, and when nothing satisfies the customer, they will give the customer his money back. He stressed that it was not necessarily because the range was emitting high levels of CO. CPSC staff stated that we are aware manufacturers are buying back perfectly good ranges, but he also indicated that sometimes manufacturers have bought back ranges and other products to keep consumers from complaining. Staff described manufacturers buying back ranges as a "flag." It is an indication that something is going on that needs to be investigated. It doesn't necessarily mean there is a problem with the functioning of the ranges.

One industry representative suggested that the 800 ppm air free flue standard could be consistent with an ambient room level that exceeds the 25 ppm level recommended by CPSC. He wanted to know if that means that CPSC will try to set a new standard. There was extensive discussion of this issue. Some CPSC staffers stated that there would have to be a lot of work to develop a standard, including modeling, time of exposure, carboxyhemoglobin levels and so on must be included. The 25 ppm level is not a standard but a recommendation. Staff indicated that we would not rule out bringing recommendations for a standard to a voluntary standards organization, if the outcome of this project suggested that a now voluntary standard was needed.

Directorate for Laboratory Sciences staff showed the industry representatives the laboratory set up and demonstrated how the tests were being performed.

The meeting adjourned about 12:30 p.m.

cc:

Office of the Secretary
Colin Church
ESEE Chronological File

Attachments

CPSC/AHAM
 RANGE EMISSION MEETINGS
 July 1, 1998

- 1) Swortzer CPSC STAFF D (301) 504-0508 X1303 F 504-0533
2. Bill MENZA CPSC 301-504-0994 X 1388
3. Brenda Gillum CPSC 301-504-0470 X 1258
4. Robert Franklin CPSC-Economist 301/504-0962 X 1328
5. Elizabeth W. Leland CPSC-EC 301/504-0962, X. 1321
6. Mohammed KHAN CPSC-ES 504-0508 X 1302
7. William King CPSC-ES 301-504-0508 X 1296
- Lawin Billock WEC/GEI 301-299-5302
- 9 Warren Postn CPSC 301-413-0040
- 10 LINDA GREINER WEC/FRIGIDAIRE 202-638-7878 F - 7887
- 11 JACK THOMAS AMANA 843-679-0450 FAX - 0460
- 12 Rick Seib Whirlpool 616-923-3289 FAX 923-3959
13. Wayne Morris AHAM 202-434-7478 Fax - 7400
14. Ronald Jordan CPSC-ES (301) 504-0508, X-1295/Fax (301) 504-0508
15. ISSAC SARGUNAM MAYTAG 423-476-4300
16. TED A. WILLIAMS A.G.A. 703/241-8644 FAX: 8692
- 17 Dean LaRue CPSC-LSE 301-413-0194
- 18 Christopher J Brow CPSC-LSE 301-413-0157
19. Andrew Ulsamer CPSC/LSE 301 413 0150