Task Group on Water Quality Testing Devices
Teleconference Meeting Summary
February 15, 2007

Participants

Bacon, Steve – *Taylor Technologies*
Campbell, Suzie – *Oklahoma City-County Health Dept.*
Choe, Sung – *NSF International*
Costanzo, Mary – *Bio Lab, Inc.*
Fitzgerald, Pat – *Taylor Technologies*
Jaunakais, Lea – *Industrial Test Systems, Inc.*
Kiefer, Adolph – *Adolph Kiefer & Assoc.*
Kozanecki, Sarah – *NSF International*
Martin, Rich – *NSF International*
Metzbower, Tom – *Taylor Technologies*
Miller, David – *Palintest USA*
Purkiss, Dave – *NSF International*
Richards, Mike – *NSF International*
Riggs, David – *Natl. Conference of Local EH Admin* - CHAIR
Sweazy, Joe – *Hach Company*
Tanner, Jim - *Siemens Water Technologies*

Sarah Kozanecki took roll call and read the antitrust statement, all agreed. Dave Riggs opened the meeting.

The task group reviewed the meeting summary from October 2006. Pat Fitzgerald stated that Tom Metzbower was not present at the last call; instead, Steve Bacon was present for Taylor Technologies. Sarah Kozanecki agreed to make the change and send an updated meeting summary. Sarah Kozanecki agreed to make this change.

Rich Martin stated that an updated draft had been circulated to the task group prior to the conference call. The task group walked through the proposed draft languages. The following is a summary of the changes and points of clarification discussed.

- Section 17, #3 - Operation/Use Instructions: There was some question about whether these are for the evaluation of the test kit or for the purchaser. Rich Martin clarified that the instructions for the product end-user are the same that would be provided to the certification agency. The group discussed this, and Rich informed the task group that Section 17 was not all-inclusive, but more details (i. e., testing waters, method, acceptable tolerances) were provided in the Annex.

- Section 17, #4 – Product Marking: The draft standard suggested a shelf life, a born on or expiration date may be appropriate for certain products/technologies. Some manufacturers do provide these, but it is optional. It was argued that shelf life is not as important as the storage conditions, especially for treatment chemicals. It was agreed that both are important factors for ensuring optimal performance. Regulators and manufacturers agreed that it is general practice that all reagents should be replaced annually. Some manufacturers were tentative to share production origination date codes with purchasers, but were amenable to providing such details only to a certification agency for certification/inspection purposes. This seemed to meet the needs of all present, and therefore it was determined that instead of requiring a production date, a “best before”-type date may be more appropriate for certain product types.

- Annex: Rich Martin reviewed the intent of the Annex, which is to provide a background for water quality parameters and identify analytes. In past conference calls, the assigned ranges have been discussed and were incorporated.

    - Chemical Generators: Suzie Campbell expressed concern over the level set (0 to 50). She asked if there should not be a higher TDS level. The group discussed this, and concluded that the level set at approximately 1100ppm NaCl was sufficient, at least for the initial pH and Cl testing.

    - Total Free Chlorine: Mike Richards explained the test procedure for this parameter and the experiences he had with free chlorine breakthrough. The group discussed this, and concluded that if combined chlorine is accurate in testing up to 0.5 ppm and validated as such, it would meet the needs of the regulatory officials and users since it is unacceptable to have higher levels. Therefore, testing may not need to be run at levels above approximately 0.75 ppm combined chlorine. Some noted that there would be value in knowing high levels of combined chlorine to help remediate the situation. However, if a high free chlorine or total chlorine is present, combined/chloramine breakthrough would skew the results of total/combined chlorine versus free chlorine. Total chlorine is most often accurate, but the combined chlorine reading breaks through into the free chlorine reading, skewing the apparent result.

- Air Temperature: Requiring WQTD testing at pool and/or spa water temps was acceptable as noted above. The air temperature (temperature of testing room and equipment) was discussed, but noted as not being considered worth specifying other than requiring conducting testing in a room that is 23C +/-4C.

- Accuracy Testing: Under “Accuracy levels for Chlorine, total, free, and combined”, for L2 and L3, the range should be 0.25 for 0-1 instead of 0.2. For the other analytes (# 6-11), manufacturers and users were asked to send in their recommended for L1, L2, L3 water challenge levels and acceptable accuracy tolerances.

Please send any other comments or suggestions to the Sarah Kozanecki for discussion or incorporation into the next draft. Any other comments regarding the parameters in the draft proposal can be emailed to Dave Riggs c/o Sarah Kozanecki (kozanecki@nsf.org).