Task Group on NSF 385

Teleconference Meeting Summary DRAFT

April 2, 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
LBC Manufacturing	Braden, Mike
Water Quality Association	Bruursema, Tom
Texas On-Site Wastewater Association	Chelette, Randall
Salcor Inc.	Cruver, Jim
Norweco, Inc.	Meyer, Jim

Participating observers:

NSF International	Hennig, Brad
NSF International	Popa, Nicolas
NSF International	Snider, Jason
NSF International	Williams, Steve
Consultant - User	Joelle Wirth

Discussion

J. Bell welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. J. Snider took roll and read the anti-trust statement. Seven of the 14 voting members were present (50%) which did not represent a quorum.

J. Bell began by reviewing the 385i1r8 ballot results with the group, and reviewed a discussion he had with S. Berkowitz regarding his negative comments. S. Berkowitz's comment requested adding language that not only the geomean of the samples had to pass, but that 80% of all individual grab samples should pass as well. J. Bell asked S. Berkowitz to provide data supporting the 80% number, and rationale for not using language similar to NSF/ANSI 350. S. Berkowitz was unable to attend this call.

J. Snider explained potential next steps for either adjudicating comments and proceeding with the r8 version or balloting a r9 version.

T. Bruursema asked what methodology for E. Coli was used in NSF/ANSI 46. J. Bell confirmed it was less than 200 organisms / 100 ml. M. Braden stressed the need to use geomean data for samples to accommodate random spikes.

The group considered adjudicating the comment and moving forward with the r8 language. J. Meyer noted that if the negative vote carried, the CPHC ballot may draw negative votes. The group agreed that this was a possibility. The group agreed that geometric mean sampling helped to "level out" random spikes. T. Bruursema asked where the current language came from, and J. Bell confirmed that it was drawn from Standard 46. T. Bruursema suggested including this as a rationale if the ballot were adjudicated.

S. Williams informed the group that he thought S. Berkowitz's negative vote was based on the idea that a system could have half of its days be rated under 1, and the other half at 1000, and still have a geometric mean within the parameters set by the current language.

Action items

J. Bell to contact S. Berkowitz to discuss the discussion from this call.
J. Bell to contact B. Bastian for input on geometric mean data.
Next Task Group call: May 7, 2019 2:00 pm Eastern