V New Issues / Action Items for multiple standards


1st Motion: Remove the language under NSF/ANSI 58 and 62 that allows for 10% of samples to not meet the effluent requirement under the contaminant reduction protocols. R. Regunathan motioned; F. Brigano seconded.

Discussion:

R. Regunathan stated that under NSF/ANSI 58 and 62 the standard allows 10% of samples to not meet the requirement if the overall mean meets the requirement. He noted that these are two of the most capable technologies and it no longer make sense to allow this type of deviation in the present-day context. He recommended that this allowance be eliminated and that all samples be required to meet the same level as listed for the NSF/ANSI 53 protocols.

A question was raised with regards to implementation. It was noted that there would likely be an implementation period allowed by the testing agencies and certifiers. It was clarified that this proposal is for all contaminants, not just TDS. E. Leung stated that there is an issue with respect to nitrate and the ability to get even 70% efficiency. He expressed concern with regards to the 7-day test and TDS. He noted that this should not be a problem for other contaminants, however. S. Murphy stated that he didn’t disagree with the proposal but believed some initial research should be completed first to determine the impact on the industry. T. Palkon stated his opinion that this would not have a major impact but agreed that research should be done first.

The group discussed why this allowance was added to the standards in the first place. R. Herman explained that one reason was that the first sample taken after the weekend stagnation period can be elevated due to creep. He noted that this was very common 25 years ago. Several members stated their opinion that it is not acceptable to have the elevated level after this stagnation period. G. Hatch noted that in addition to nitrate, this may also be a problem for chlorate. R. Regunathan reiterated that it is only a problem because the system is not working properly, and if that’s the case it shouldn’t be certified.

Vote: 4 in favor (F. Brigano, M. Bicking, S. Ver Strat, R. Regunathan); 24 opposed; 1 abstention (F. Lemieux)

Motioned failed.

2nd Motion: Form a task group to consider the potential impact of removing the allowance discussed above under NSF/ANSI 58 and 62. R. Herman motioned; G. Hatch seconded.

Vote: All in favor.

Motioned passed.
TG: R. Herman (chair); R. Regunathan; T. Palkon; M. Bicking; Z. Gleason; E. Leung