VI Section 5 - NSF/ANSI/CAN 60

E. 3-MCPD (Table 4.1) (DWA-60-2019-3)

**Motion:** Ballot the proposed addition as written. S. Randall motioned; B. Mersch seconded.

**Discussion:** S. Randall explained that he had received an inquiry regarding 3-Chloro-1,2-propanediol (3-MCPD) as a possible contaminant. S. Randall reported that NSF has not historically tested for it, but that they decided to conduct a survey of certified products to evaluate its prevalence. NSF developed a test method using GC/FID with a reporting limit of 25 mg/kg. He noted that it is a direct solvent extraction on the polymer. S. Randall stated that the survey includes samples from January 2019 to the present, and most of the samples were from currently certified polyamines. Of the 29 polyamines tested, 12 had positive detections. The highest was level detected was 1.2 ug/L. The rest were close to the reporting limit. S. Randall stated that he suspected that 3-MCPD may be present in the other samples, but below the reporting limit. The standard doesn’t currently have a limit for it. S. Randall added that the NSF toxicology group is working on a risk assessment. Tentatively the total concentration would be set at 10 ppb with a SPAC of 1 ppb. However, this has not been finalized; it still needs to be reviewed by the Health Advisory Board (HAB) and the Joint Peer Review Steering Committee (JPRSC).

T. Palkon asked if there were other known sources that may add this to drinking water, as this seems restrictive. S. Randall stated that it could potentially be a disinfection by-product, so it’s hard to rule out. He agreed, however, that the standard should not be overly conservative.

R. Lorenz asked whether a health effects value needs to be established first. S. Randall explained that procedurally it can happen either way. If 3-MCPD is balloted and approved, it would be a requirement in the next edition of the standard. By that time the risk assessment should be completed, and modifications can be made at that point if needed. He added that there would still be an implementation period with the certifying bodies.

**Vote:** 26 in favor; 1 abstention (T. Palkon)

**Motion passed.**