

Task Group on NSF 385
Teleconference Meeting Summary DRAFT
May 7, 2019

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it **shall not** be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.

Participating members:

Bio-Microbics, Inc.	Bell, Jim
Anua	Bishop, Colin
Salcor Inc.	Cruver, Jim
Norweco, Inc.	Meyer, Jim
Sun-Mar Corp.	Sneddon, Fraser

Participating observers:

North Carolina Div. Of Env. Health	Berkowitz, PE, Steven
NSF International	Hennig, Brad
NSF International	Popa, Nicolas
NSF International	Steiner, Sharon
Hoot Aerobic Systems	Sucheck, Ron
NSF International	Williams, Steve
Consultant - User	Wirth, Joelle
NSF International	Snider, Jason

Discussion

J. Bell welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. J. Snider took roll and read the anti-trust statement. Five of the 14 voting members were present (35%) which did not represent a quorum.

J. Bell began by reviewing the [385i1r9 straw ballot results](#) with the group and explained that S. Williams and S. Berkowitz had drafted the r9 language based on the negative comments received on the r8 ballot. S. Berkowitz explained his concerns, which were the proposed language potentially being less stringent than the existing NSF 46, as well as geometric means potentially weighting low numbers more than high numbers. He added that the r9 language was drafted to use a running 5-day geomean average and a single sample maximum that would need to conform to the standard. After the r9 straw ballot, [revised language](#) was drawn up in preparation for the teleconference. S. Williams asked how the proposed 30-day average would apply to chlorinators which have a 30-day life test, and a separate shorter test afterwards. S. Berkowitz noted that the current language would require passing the 30-day life test, and the second data set would also need to pass separately. J. Cruver noted that the 385 language required 2 tests per week, while the Washington State protocol required 3 weekly, and while the Washington State protocol used a 30 day geomean, the 385 language used a 5 day moving geomean, which provided a better indicator of the machine's performance. J. Cruver also stated that occasional "off" samples occur, and that the group should consider language accordingly.

J. Bell stressed the importance of harmonizing the pass/fail criteria between NSF 350 and the proposed NSF 385, with one relying on a percentage of samples, and one relying on a max number. S. Berkowitz agreed that the two utilized different methods but suggested that 350 should be updated to match the proposed language for 385.

After some discussion, the group agreed that a straw ballot of the TG was the logical next step. S. Berkowitz, S. Williams, and J. Bell agreed to draft the language based on the discussion

Action items

S. Berkowitz, S. Williams, and J. Bell to draft r10 language.
J. Snider to send straw ballot to TG.