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Discussion

M. Conrad welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. J. Snider took roll and read the anti-trust statement. Three of the 12 voting members were present (25%) which did not represent a quorum.

M. Conrad began by reviewing the issue paper that the group had been focusing on. He explained that the groups’ efforts had started to stray from the original intent of the issue paper. The issue paper was submitted because the current language could be interpreted as allowing two different chlorine resistance classifications. The issue paper had been submitted to clarify language to allow rework with similar chlorine classifications. The group agreed to refocus on language to specify chlorine classification with regards to rework. There was discussion on what rating an end product would receive when two chlorine resistance classifications are mixed, with general agreement that end product should receive the lower rating.

The group chose to edit language regarding oxidative resistance classifications, including distinctions for potable and non-potable use. It was also agreed to include informative notes to clarify the Oxidative Resistance Classification (ORC) classification the rework would receive, with those on the call agreeing to the changes proposed on the following page.

J. Snider informed the group that this language would be sent to straw ballot with the Task Group before being sent to the Joint Committee for approval.

M. Conrad presented the results of a tracer study conducted by NSF that showed current tracers can be detected but the concentration will be reduced if two resins are mixed. It was highlighted that this could result in product failing current criterion for tracers as the level would fall below that specified. The group decided to table this topic for a different task group.

Clarity on the interpretation of “same manufacturer” was also discussed. B. Donaldson advised that “manufacturer” was originally intended to mean pipe manufacturer, and that the mixing of different resins (i.e. from different resin manufacturers) would be permitted. Task group members agreed that the language should be clarified but should be handled as a separate issue paper/task group, as to not cloud the current issue.
4.1.2.2 Polyethylene

The use of clean, rework polyethylene material from the same material designation and from the same manufacturer shall be acceptable provided that the finished products meet the requirements of the applicable product standard(s). Plastic piping system components and related materials shall be manufactured in such a way as to prevent contamination.

4.1.2.2.1 Potable water use

Rework must be of the same oxidative resistance classification (ORC) as the virgin compound.

 NOTE - For example, rework of CC2 ORC must be mixed with CC2 ORC virgin compound, and not CC3 ORC virgin compound.

4.1.2.2.2 Non-Potable water use

It is permissible to use rework of a different ORC than the virgin compound. The resulting product receives the ORC of the lowest rated compound within the mixture.

 NOTE - For example, rework of CC2 ORC can be mixed with CC3 ORC virgin compound, and the resulting product would be classified as CC2 ORC.

Action items
J. Snider to send language to straw ballot with the Task Group.