A. SECTION 4.1.2 – REWORK MATERIALS (P2012-8)

**Motion:** Ballot proposed language as written to allow the use of different compounds as rework material for polyethylene (PE) pipe. B. Pines motioned; C. Bush seconded.

**Discussion:** N. Kashefi summarized the discussion that took place at the 2011 annual JC meeting regarding the issue paper submitted by B. Donaldson of WL Plastics (P2010-10). B. Donaldson had originally proposed a revision to section 4.1.2 to allow different compounds to be used as rework material. From this discussion, a task group was formed and charged with the assignment of addressing the definition of “formulation.” N. Kashefi reported that the task group has determined that defining the word formulation will not address the intent of the original issue paper. The task group is recommending that the word “formulation” be left in 4.1.2, and is proposing additional language under 4.1.2 that would allow for the use of a different compound of the same cell classification or material designation in rework material specifically for PE pipe. The task group is also recommending the addition of an upper limit of 10% rework material. N. Kashefi stated that the industry usually doesn’t add more than 6-7%, so it should not have an adverse effect on them. It was noted that the reason for the 10% limit is for the tracer.

J. Hoover asked if the 10% rework has been evaluated and if it affects performance. N. Kashefi clarified that the proposed the language states that it must meet the performance requirements of the standard. In addition, it has not been shown to have problems in the field.

M. Ocedek raised the question of whether in most cases the product standards address rework materials. N. Kashefi stated that they do in most, but not all. The group discussed why this proposal is unique to PE. It applies to PVC also, but in theory one can’t mix those. It was suggested that perhaps the language should be worded so that it only applies in the event that rework material isn’t addressed in another standard. N. Kashefi clarified that each product type needs to be looked at individually. There was general agreement among the group that this should be broadened and the task group should look at other materials as well.

J. Brown noted that ASTM F714 does allow rework from one compound to be worked into another mixing compound. The language is the same with the exception of the 10% limit.

J. Kendzel stated his agreement with the opinion that this should be addressed in the product standard and not be in conflict with NSF/ANSI 14.

B. Pines read the definition of rework to the group. N. Kashefi suggested to expand the current task group with members from other industries to help address other materials. She reiterated
that all this requirement would do is limit the regrind. It would not be in conflict with the other standards.

There were differing opinions with regards to having the 10% limit. Some felt that it was appropriate to have it in the standard and not just as a certification policy. Others expressed concern of the possibility that other product standards could be revised and impose a different limit amount for the tracer, therefore making it in conflict with NSF/ANSI 14. The suggestion was made to state a limit of 10% unless meeting the requirement of another standard. A couple of members were opposed to this suggestion, stating that you could potentially be making NSF/ANSI 14 stricter than the other product standards.

**Vote:** 3 in favor; 14 opposed.

**Motion defeated.**

**Additional TG added:** R. Houle; J. Roethemeier; M. Ocedek; P. Spirkowyc; M. Huynh; A. Fisher; S. Paolucci (observer)