

## U.S. CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION WASHINGTON, DC 20207

Arthur Lee Electrical Engineer Division of Electrical Engineering Directorate for Engineering Sciences Tel: (301) 504-7539 Fax: (301) 504-0533 Email: alee@cpsc.gov

October 31, 2003

Ms. Kristen Andrews Standards Department kristen.l.andrews@us.ul.com

Re: Request for Comments on the Proposed Requirements for the Fifth Edition of the Standard for Single and Multiple Station Smoke Alarms, UL 217, Bulletin Dated October 1, 2003

Dear Ms. Andrews:

This letter presents recommendations from the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) staff regarding proposed changes to UL 217, *Single and Multiple Station Smoke Alarms*.

CPSC staff has no additional comments to the proposed changes for topics 1, 3, 4, and 5. CPSC staff has several editorial comments on topic 2 as follows.

## 2. Visual Indication When a Non-Replaceable Battery Type Alarm is Not in Operational Condition

CPSC STAFF PROPOSAL (New text underlined, Deleted text strikethrough)

8.4 Deactivation of the battery of a smoke alarm that uses a non-replaceable battery with a 10-year minimum battery life shall result in a readily apparent and prominent visual indication. The visual indication shall consist of:

a) A warning flag that is exposed with the battery removed <u>deactivated</u> and the cover closed with the battery deactivated;

b) A hinged cover that is resistant to being closed with the battery deactivated; or
c) An equivalent arrangement (such as an audible trouble signal on an AC with battery backup).

8.4 8.5 Deactivation of a battery of a battery-operated (or AC with battery back-up) smoke alarm that is

intended to be removed from its mounting location for battery deactivation, shall render the unit resistant to reinstallation.

Kristen Andrews Page 2

8.5 8.6 When a warning flag, or equivalent, is employed to comply with the requirements of 8.1 or 8.3, it shall be marked as required in 88.6.

Thank you for the opportunity to make these recommendations. We look forward to participating in further discussions on this matter. The views expressed in this letter are those of the staff and have not been reviewed or considered by the Commission.

Sincerely,

Arthur Lee Electrical Engineer Directorate for Engineering Sciences