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Discussion
S. Randall welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. J. Snider took roll and read the anti-trust statement. Nine of the 19 voting members were present (47%) which did not represent a quorum.

S. Randall began with RWF-2019-5 – Annex R. S. Randall asked for input from the group again on the possibility of increasing the 10 ppb threshold of evaluation level. K. Cox explained that the 10 ppb level was possibly too conservative, and was looking for input from the committee on rationale for raising the level. The group reviewed how the Standard 60 thresholds were determined and discussed other exposure factors besides ingestion such as inhalation or transdermal. K. Cox offered to provide the slide that were presented at a previous meeting which showed how the 10 ppb level was reached. S. Randall asked the group if the topic was worth pursuing at this time. K. Cox asked for data on other potential exposures to help determine what the new threshold should be, noting that the exposure amount for pools is likely less than drinking water. E. Meyer described the complications that can arise when evaluating things at the 10 ppb level. The group decided to table the issue for the time being, with K. Cox and E. Meyer agreeing to discuss the matter to determine if additional information could be provided.

The next agenda item was RWF-2019-8 – Chemical Scope. The group reviewed the recent 50i164r1 straw ballot results. B. Hamil expressed concern that deck chemicals can end up in the pool water. P. Escobedo agreed with this concern and asked if regulations were requiring that deck chemicals be certified. S. Randall responded that he was unaware of any regulations like this. S. Randall explained that the rationale for excluding the deck cleaning chemicals from the scope was the fact that the dosage is unable to be determined, as they are added unintentionally. He stated that he would like to see a methodology for chemicals that are incidentally added developed, but until that methodology is developed, they should be excluded. S. Campbell noted that local codes call for deck cleaners to be discharged away from the pool. The group discussed misuse of product and how to account for that within the scope of the standard. The group revised the language based on this discussion. M. Costanzo asked if those in the public health interest category had feedback on language for intentional application use versus indirect application. E. Meyer suggested another certification scheme based on indirect applications. The group discussed the need for clarity in the language to ensure a level playing field. S. Randall suggested the group first remove incidental contact chemicals from the scope, then develop the methodology to evaluate them, then determine which sorts of chemicals fall into the category of incidental contact. P. Escobedo cautioned that excluding chemicals from the scope may create a false sense of security.
Action items

J. Snider to prep straw ballot revision 2 ballot based on discussion of RWF-2019-8 – Chemical Scope.