

Meeting Minutes-ASTM C21.06 subcommittee
May 3rd, 2005 Orlando Florida

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman Noah Chitty
Staff Manager Diane Rehiel also present
Roster was sent around and collected and a vote count established
Quorum was established

Total Vote Count: 62 (including proxies)

Motion: Frank Canto - motion to approve agenda
Motion seconded
Agenda approved-vote was unanimous

Motion: John Mulder – approve minutes
Motion seconded
Minutes approved-vote was unanimous

Report on small color differences – item to be submitted for ballot as is and then registered as WK item for revision by group of interested parties in the fall of 2005

Robinson floor test- item to be submitted for ballot as is and then registered as WK item for revision by group of interested parties in the fall of 2005

Negatives received from reinstatement ballot of ASTM C1028 closing May 1st 2005.

A copy of each negative was distributed to the group by the Chairman

Negative from David Natalzia

1st point

Motion: Eric Astrachan – Non Persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because **there is a need to measure the tile in the manufacturing process** when it is wet **to insure the tile manufacturing process is staying the same.**

Motion seconded

Vote count:
61 affirmative
1 negative
0 abstentions

2nd point

Motion: Roy Gorton – Non Persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the apparatus does include the standard tile.
Motion seconded

Vote count:
62 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstentions

Negative from Robin Harrison

Motion: Roy Gorton – Non Persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the premise of the entire negative addresses **walkway slip resistance which is not under the scope of test method C1028.**

Therefore, the entire negative is not related to this standard.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
61 affirmative
1 negative
0 abstentions

Negative from David Mumford

Let the minutes show that the chairman made multiple attempts were made to contact Mr. Mumford to clarify his position.

Motion: Roy Gorton – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the change to an aluminum sled eliminates the warping problem previously seen with wooden sleds.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
61 affirmative
0 negative
1 abstain

Note: **Rod Sigman**'s "Affirmative with comment" was read to the committee. The committee agreed the test method should stay in place.

Negative from William English

1st point

Motion: Eric Astrachan – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the entire standard was available for review in the 2005 book of standards and ASTM provided a copy to anyone who requested one.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

62 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

2nd point

Motion: Roy Gorton – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because there is sufficient language to describe an appropriate dynamometer without specifying a particular manufacturer.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
62 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

3rd point

Motion: Roy Gorton – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because due to the fact that tribometry is not addressed in the standard and no data was supplied to support his position.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
61 affirmative
1 negative
0 abstain

Negative from Richard Bowman

Withdrew negative- The subcommittee will address his concerns at the next task group meeting.

Negative from Paul Lewis

Let the minutes show that the November ballot was withdrawn. Mr. Lewis's first two points are related to a ballot that was withdrawn and is not currently under consideration, but the committee is addressing each of his negatives for thoroughness.

1st point

Motion: John Mulder – Non persuasive

The first bullet point addresses information that is not included in the current standard out for ballot.

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the first bullet point addresses information that is not include in the current standard out for ballot, and **neither hydroplaning nor foot strikes or pedestrian slip are covered under the scope of the standard.**

Motion seconded

Vote count:
61 affirmative
1 negative
0 abstain

2nd point

Motion: Brian Byrd – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because again he refers to information not balloted (i.e. table 1), and because **the scope of the test method is not intended to cover walkway safety.**

Motion seconded

Vote count:
61 affirmative
1 negative
0 abstain

3rd point

Motion: Jim Neel-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because a Mr. Lewis is discussing dynamic conditions when this is a method for measuring static COF.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
61 affirmative
1 negative
0 abstain

4th point

Motion: **Eric Astrachan** – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because **measuring slip resistance is not under the scope of the test method.**

Motion seconded

Vote count:
61 affirmative
1 negative
0 abstain

Two votes have left the room

5th point

Motion: John Mulder – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because neither the scope nor the significance and use sections address “safe under wet conditions.”

Motion seconded

Vote count:
58 affirmative
1 negative
0 abstain

The two votes have come back to the meeting

6th point

Let the minutes show his negative was taken out of context of the standard.

Motion: Chuck Muehlbauer – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the test method is useful for determining static COF as titled. Further, the other standards referenced are not under the jurisdiction of C21 and therefore not applicable.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
60 affirmative
1 negative
0 abstain

7th point

Motion: Eric Astrachan – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because his point is not under the scope of the test method.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
60 affirmative
1 negative
0 abstain

Let the minutes show the task group will consider as an item of new business the adoption of D2047 as suggested by Mr. Lewis.

Negative from George Sotter

Points are identified by number in **Mr. Sotter's Negative**

1st point

Motion: Roy Gorton – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because **C1028 does not purport to address human traction.**

Motion seconded

Vote count:

60 affirmative

1 negative

0 abstain

2nd point

Motion: Tom Sawyer – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because there is no referenced source to substantiate the data cited in the negative and there is no substantiation to the claim that the referenced injuries and deaths are attributed to the test method.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

60 affirmative

0 negative

1 abstain

3rd point

Motion: Tom Sawyer – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because there is no referenced source to substantiate the data cited in the negative and there is no substantiation to the claim that the referenced injuries and deaths are attributed to the test method.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

60 affirmative

0 negative

1 abstain

4th point

Motion: John Mulder

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because **neither the scope nor the significance and use address “pedestrian safety.”**

Motion seconded

Vote count:

60 affirmative

1 negative

0 abstain

One member holding a proxy has left the room, total vote count 59

5th point

Motion: Chuck Muehlbauer – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the limitations of the applicability of the data generated by the test method are clearly stated in section 1.3 and section 4.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

58 affirmative

0 negative

1 abstain

6th point

Let the minutes show the item previously balloted was withdrawn.

Motion: Roy Gorton-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the limitations of the applicability of the data generated by the test method are clearly stated in section 1.3 and section 4.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

58 affirmative

1 negative

0 abstain

Voting member holding proxy has come back to meeting, vote count 61

7th point

Motion: Eric Astrachan – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the limitations of the applicability of the data generated by the test method are clearly stated in section 1.3 and section 4.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

60 affirmative

1 negative

0 abstain

8th point

Motion: Frank Canto - Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because **the assessment of hydroplaning is not under the scope of this method.**

Motion seconded

Vote count:

60 affirmative

1 negative
0 abstain

9th point

Motion: Roy Gorton – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because **there is no statement of floor safety included in C1028** and the negative relates to how data is interpreted and not the test method.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
60 affirmative
1 negative
0 abstain

10th point

Motion: Steve Rausch-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because he is referencing dynamic tests which are not addressed by the method. In addition, ASTM standards are used and developed voluntarily.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
60 affirmative
1 negative
0 abstain

11th point

Motion: Chip O’Rear-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because **test method does not address human traction and such is not under the Scope or Significance and Use section of the method.**

Motion seconded

Vote count:
60 affirmative
0 negative
1 abstain

12th point

Motion: Joe Dutt – Non Persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because **this test method does not address human traction** and such is not under the Scope and Significance and use section of the method.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

60 affirmative

0 negative

1 abstain

13th point

Motion: Eric Astrachan – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because he does not specify the technical weaknesses nor important details. The subcommittee invites the voter to submit the technical weaknesses to the task group for their consideration. In addition, no reference standard exists against which a determination of bias can be made.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

60 affirmative

1 negative

0 abstain

Two voting members each holding a proxy have left the room, vote count 57

14th point

Motion: Tom Sawyer

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because **this test method does not address human traction** and such is not under the Scope and Significance and use section of the method.

Let the minutes reflect that the task group will seek the documentation referenced and review these items.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

56 affirmative

0 negative

1 abstain

Additional members have left the room, by show of hands and acknowledgement of proxies, Vote count: 56

Negative from Steve Dipilla

1st point

Motion: John Mulder – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because there is no test data submitted to document why wet testing should be removed and the Bucknell workshop addressed slip fall issues which are not part of the scope of this method.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

55 affirmative

1 negative

0 abstain

2nd point

Motion: Chuck Muehlbauer – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the use of this test method in the field is required to verify that no post production modification of the material has occurred. Additionally, **determination of slip resistance is not covered under the scope of this test method.**

Motion seconded

Vote count:

55 affirmative

0 negative

1 abstain

3rd point- abstention with comment

Let the minutes show this comment will be referred to the task group, to be addressed at the next ballot.

4th point

Motion: Steve Rausch-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the referenced document still available, and the task group will editorially update its source in the footnote.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

55 affirmative

0 negative

1 abstain

5th point

Motion: Eric Astrachan – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the definition of friction and COF provide additional clarity and are used in the document.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

55 affirmative

0 negative

1 abstain

6th point-abstention with comment

Let the minutes show this comment will be referred to the task group for consideration.

7th point

Motion: Tom Sawyer – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the test method already addresses these issues and other factors in section 4.2.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
55 affirmative
0 negative
1 abstain

One member holding a proxy has left the room, vote count 54

8th point

Motion: Bryan Byrd – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the use of this test method in the field is required to verify that no post production modification of the material has occurred.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
53 affirmative
0 negative
1 abstain

9th point

Motion: Bryan Byrd – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the use of this test method in the field is required to verify that no post production modification of the material has occurred.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
53 affirmative
0 negative
1 abstain

10th point

Motion: Tom Sawyer – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because weight is a measurement of the force of gravity which does not need ruggedness testing.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
54 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

11th point

Motion: Tom Sawyer – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the reference to the figures will be deleted as an editorial change. There is no Figure 3.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

54 affirmative

0 negative

0 abstain

Two members holding both holding proxies have left the room, vote count 50

12th point

Motion: Bryan Byrd-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because he provides no data that any of these suggestions will affect the variability of the test method and in the experience of the committee, the test method is sufficiently clear as written.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

48 affirmative

1 negative

1 abstain

13th point-abstention with comment

Let the minutes show this comment will be referred to the task group for consideration.

14th point-abstention with comment

The committee has already addressed this concern in a previous negative which was ruled non persuasive.

15th point-abstention with comment

Let the minutes show this comment will be referred to the task group for consideration.

Vote count recorded as 47, a few members are having to come in and out of the meeting

16th point

Motion: Eric Astrachan – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because we are not aware of a generic description that would be comparable. Additionally, this committee is not aware of an alternative product.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

47 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

17th point-abstention with comment

Let the minutes show this comment will be referred to the task group for consideration.

18th point-abstention with comment

Let the minutes show this comment will be referred to the task group for consideration.

19th point

Motion: Michael Byrne-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because in the opinion of the committee the language is clear and unambiguous, per the reference in section 7.1.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
46 affirmative
1 negative
0 abstain

20th point

Motion: Dan Marvin –Non Persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the time required to condition the neolite pad is sufficient for reasonable acclimation of the material. As well, correlation to standard tile minimizes variability.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
47 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

21st point

Motion: Eric Astrachan – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the use of a calibration tile helps eliminate variability and the issues raised in the negative are not significant.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
46 affirmative
0 negative
1 abstain

22nd point

Motion: Frank Canto – Non Persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because there is no test data submitted to document why wet testing should be removed and the Bucknell workshop addressed slip fall issues which are not part of the scope of this method.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

46 affirmative

1 negative

0 abstain

23rd point-abstention with comment

Let the minutes show the committee addressed this issue in the 16th point from Steve Dipilla.

Several members have had to leave the meeting, from here on we will record hand counts and use that vote tally, we will no longer try to note as each person comes and goes, if quorum is in jeopardy we will take a new count and reestablish proxy votes, members holding a proxy are instructed to hold up two hands-current count: 44 votes

24th point

Motion: Clay Collins-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because it is the opinion of the committee that the current reporting requirements are sufficient and the proposed language goes beyond what is required in most reports.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

44 affirmative

0 negative

0 abstain

25th point

Motion: Eric Astrachan – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because a precision statement is included in the method and the committee feels that statement is sufficient.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

44 affirmative

0 negative

0 abstain

26th point

Motion: Eric Astrachan – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the existing statement is sufficient for how the method is used and that the numbers are valid as stated.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

44 affirmative

0 negative

0 abstain

27th point

Motion: Eric Astrachan – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the calibration tile minimizes variability.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

44 affirmative

0 negative

0 abstain

28th negative

Motion: Eric Astrachan – non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the committee members involved in the study to change the apparatus did not impact the current precision and bias statement, therefore the P & B statement is correct.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

44 affirmative

0 negative

0 abstain

29th point-abstention with comment

Let the minutes show this comment will be referred to the task group for consideration.

30th point-abstention with comment

Let the minutes show this comment will be referred to the task group for consideration.

Negative from Keith Vidal

1st point

Motion: Roy Gorton – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find Mr. Vidal's introductory statement non persuasive because the entire document was open for review, the current version was published in the 2005 book of standards and copies were available from ASTM as needed, and based on the negatives received from Mr. Vidal and others it is clear the entire standard was considered.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
34 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

2nd point

Let the minutes show that Mr. Vidal is referencing a withdrawn ballot, the current ballot does not have stone in the title; however in the spirit of thoroughness, we will address each one of his negatives.

Motion: Jim Neel – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because stone is made of alumina silicates and stone and tile surfaces are sufficiently similar for the method to apply to both.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
38 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

3rd point

Motion: Ruy Fierro-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the use of this test method in the field is required to verify that no post production modification of the material has occurred. Additionally, determination of pedestrian safety is not covered under the scope of this test method.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
38 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

4th point

Motion: Jim Neel – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics includes SCOF values of wet and contaminated surfaces and the model used is the same as the physical principals that this test is based on.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

38 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

5th point

Motion: Craig Miller – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the use of this test method in the field is required to verify that no post production modification of the material has occurred. Additionally, **determination of pedestrian safety is not covered under the scope of this test method.**

Motion seconded

Vote count:

38 affirmative

0 negative

0 abstain

6th point

Motion: John Mulder-Non Persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because neither the word slip nor resistance is ambiguous, these words are common in the English language, and **slip resistance is not covered under the scope of this method.**

Motion seconded

Vote count:

38 affirmative

0 negative

0 abstain

7th point

Motion: Ruy Fierro-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics includes SCOF values of wet and contaminated surfaces and the model used is the same as the physical principals that this test is based on. In addition, **stiction is related to slip resistance, which is outside of the scope of this test method.**

Motion seconded

Vote count:

38 affirmative

0 negative

0 abstain

8th point

Motion: Roy Gorton – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the test method already addresses these issues and other factors in section 4.2, and the use of a calibration tile eliminates the affect of the variability mentioned in the negative.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

38 affirmative

0 negative

0 abstain

9th point

Motion: Brendan Doherty-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the issue of pedestrian safety is outside of the scope of the method and the effect of COF as a factor on slip resistance is well known and the negative does not provide data to the contrary.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

36 affirmative

0 negative

0 abstain

10th point

Motion: Roy Gorton – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the negative does not apply to the current method being balloted – section 3.2 is not part of the current standard being balloted and size of footwear is not referenced.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

37 affirmative

0 negative

0 abstain

11th point

Motion: Michael Byrne-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because neither the word slip nor resistance is ambiguous, these words are common in the English language, and slip resistance is not covered under the scope of this method.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
32 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

12th point

Motion: Craig Miller – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the use of this test method in the field is required to verify that no post production modification of the material has occurred. Additionally, **determination of pedestrian safety is not covered under the scope of this test method.**

Motion seconded

Vote count:
32 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

13th point

Motion: Ruy Fierro-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics includes SCOF values of wet and contaminated surfaces and the model used is the same as the physical principals that this test is based on. In addition, **stiction is related to slip resistance, which is outside of the scope of this test method.**

Motion seconded

Vote count:
32 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

14th point

Motion: Jim Neel-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics includes SCOF values of wet and contaminated surfaces and the model used is the same as the physical principals that this test is based on.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
31 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

15th point

Motion: Joe Dutt – non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the standard tile corrects for changes in the sled assembly that could occur over time. The negative reference to wet conditions has already been addressed.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

31 affirmative

0 negative

0 abstain

16th point

Motion: Michael Byrne – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the section and procedure referred to by Mr. Vidal does not exist in the balloted standard.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

31 affirmative

0 negative

0 abstain

17th point

Motion: Craig Miller-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because there is no new set of standard tile included in the current ballot as referenced by Mr. Vidal, so no relevant documentation can be provided. Table 1 is not part of the current ballot being addressed. The current calibration tile referenced in C1028-96 is still in use.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

31 affirmatives

0 negatives

0 abstain

18th point

Motion: Michael Byrne-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because weight is a measurement of the force of gravity which does not need ruggedness testing.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

31 affirmatives

0 negatives
0 abstain

Let the minutes reflect the Chairman has tabled the meeting until 5/4/05 at 8:00am.

Vote count at time of tabling: 25

The meeting was reconvened by the Chairman on 5/4/05 at 8:00am.
Vote count established as 25 including proxies
Quorum established

19th point

Motion: Jim Neel – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the reference to the figures will be deleted as an editorial change.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
25 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

20th point

Motion: Jim Neel-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because he provides no data that any of these suggestions will affect the variability of the test method and in the experience of the committee, the test method is sufficiently clear as written.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
25 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

Additional members slowly arrived, voting status and proxy was reconfirmed as each person entered meeting. Varying vote counts were taken by hand for each vote.

21st point

Motion: Joe Dutt – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because I feel that the method described is adequate as is.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

27 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

22nd point

Motion: John Mulder – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the apparatus includes standard tile. The current calibration tile referenced in C1028-96 is still in use and available.

Motion seconded

27 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

23rd point

Motion: Roy Gorton – Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics includes SCOF values of wet and contaminated surfaces and the model used is the same as the physical principals that this test is based on.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
27 Affirmative
0 Negative
0 Abstain

24th point

Motion: Jim Neel-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the use of the 400 grit sand paper introduces no scoring of the neolite sensor, but provides adequate ability to resurface the neolite. “Ruggedness testing” is an arbitrary term and undefined in this committee; consequently it has no place in this test method.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
27 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

25th point

Motion: Jim Neel-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because sanding in one direction affects frictional values, therefore the sled is sanded in multiple directions per section 5.3.2.2 of the current balloted item.

“Ruggedness testing” is an arbitrary term and undefined in this committee; consequently it has no place in this test method.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
25 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

26th point

Motion: Roy Gorton-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because section 5.3.2.3 of the current ballot addresses this concern and the scientific study that determined the effects of variables are quantitatively noted in the precision statement.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
27 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

27th point

Motion: Sharon Jones-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because section 5.3 of the current ballot defines the issues of what is a cycle and clarifies the issue of initial use by indicating removal of the sheen from the neolite. It is clear that section 5.3 is only for preparation of a previously unused sensor. Section 7.2 of the current ballot addresses the resurfacing of a previously used sensor. Additionally, a cycle is defined by section 5.3 of the current ballot.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
29 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

28th point

Motion: Jim Neel-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the equipment specified in section 5.1 of the current ballot (i.e. the dynamometer pull meter capable of measuring to .1 pounds force accuracy) is adequate for weighing all components. Due to the additive property of mass, it is not relevant if components are weighed individually or separately.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
31 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

29th point

Motion: John Mulder-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because section 6.8 of Mr. Vidal's negative is not a part of the current ballot or the current standard.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
30 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

30th point

Motion: John Mulder-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because section 6.9 of Mr. Vidal's negative is not a part of the current ballot or the current standard.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
31 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

31st point

Motion: Craig Miller-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because there is no test data submitted to document why wet testing should be removed and the Bucknell workshop addressed slip fall issues which are not part of the scope of this method.

Motion seconded

Vote count:
29 affirmative
0 negative
0 abstain

32nd point

Motion: Joe Dutt-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because the CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics includes SCOF values of wet and contaminated surfaces and the model used is the same as the physical principals that this test is based on. Also, we move to find the negative non persuasive because

the use of this test method on unprepared surfaces is required to verify that no post production modification of the material has occurred.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

31 affirmative

0 negative

0 abstain

33rd point

Motion: Ruy Fierro-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because a precision statement is included in the method and the committee feels that statement is sufficient. Additionally, the second and third paragraphs of this negative references a precision statement that is neither in the current ballot nor current standard.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

31 affirmative

0 negative

0 abstain

Negative from Melvin Friedlander

1st point

Motion: Joe Dutt-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because slip and fall is outside of the scope of this method.

Motion seconded


Vote count:

29 affirmative

0 negative

0 abstain

2nd point

Motion: Bob Daniel  Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because there is a need to measure the tile in the manufacturing process when it is wet to insure the tile manufacturing process is staying consistent.

Additionally, if his negative is referring to slip fall under wet conditions, that is outside the scope of this method.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

29 affirmative

0 negative

0 abstain

3rd point

Motion: Joe Dutt-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative non persuasive because pedestrian travel is outside of the scope of this method. Additionally, the statement that use of the test method results in fallacious readings is related to the interpretation of the data in a slip fall context which is outside of the scope of this method. The test method accurately determines SCOF.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

29 affirmative

0 negative

0 abstain

4th point

Motion: Jim Neel-Non persuasive

Rationale: I move to find the negative referenced in paragraphs 4 through 13 non persuasive because pedestrian travel is outside of the scope of this method. Additionally, the statement that use of the test method results in fallacious or incorrect readings is related to the interpretation of the data in a slip fall context which is outside of the scope of this method. As noted by Mr. Friedlander, the phenomenon of wet adhesion (also known as stiction) is real and therefore a component of the static measurement. His objection to stiction applies only to interpretation of the data in a slip fall context and in comparison to dynamic measurements, which are outside the scope of this method. His statements regarding misuse reflect trying to use the data as a measurement of slip fall resistance which is not intended under the scope of this method.

Motion seconded

Vote count:

29 affirmative

0 negative

0 abstain

The Chairman asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting

Motion to adjourn – Eric Astrachan

Motion seconded

Meeting adjourned at 10:05 am 5/4/05