# Task Group on NSF 385

**Teleconference Meeting Summary DRAFT**

February 22, 2021



**Participating members:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Bio-Microbics, Inc. | Bell, Jim |
| Anua | Bishop, Colin |
| Salcor Inc. | Cruver, Jim |
| Pro Flo Aerobic Systems | Jumper, David |
| Norweco, Inc. | Meyer, Jim |
| Florida Department of Health | Roeder, Eberhard |
| SeptiTech, Inc. | Sherman, Kevin |
| Sun-Mar Corp. | Sneddon, Fraser |

**Participating observers:**

| | |
|---|---|
| North Carolina Div. Of Env. Health | Berkowitz, PE, Steven |
| NSF International | Hennig, Brad |
| NSF International | Stark, Blake |
| NSF International | Steiner, Sharon |
| 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. Eight of the 12 voting members were present (67%) which did not represent a quorum.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Motion by J. Cruver** | Accept the WWT TG on NSF 385 Meeting summary 1-21-21 |
| **Second:** | S. Williams |
| **Discussion:** | None |
| **Vote:** | All in favor |
| **Motion:** | Carries |

The first agenda item was a discussion of the 385i2r1 – flow rate ballot results. After a quick discussion, C. Bishop agreed to withdrawal his comment and proceed with the language as balloted.

Next the group discussed the 385i3r1 straw ballot. The group reviewed the 385i3r1- UVT straw ballot results. J. Meyer explained that he voted negative because he had not seen testing performed at the 30-40% UVT range and expressed concerns that testing at that low of a UVT was an unknown. J. Cruver agreed that 30% was probably too low but suggested 40% was a better lower end of the range. He noted that many peat systems operated at 30%. The group discussed how this would factor in to the fecal coliform range suggested. J. Bell suggested the test being incorporated as a stress test at the end of the test, or perhaps as an optional test after the end of the pass/fail testing. J. Cruver noted that changes here would potentially affect the discussion around photoreactivation testing. J. Cruver suggested adjusting the UVT range to 40-55%. S. Williams added that with some preliminary testing done at the Waco test center, adjusting the range wasn't too difficult. The group discussed adding the test as an optional test, and whether the test should be a pass / fail test or just reporting the log reduction at the lower UVT.

The group agreed to draft language for an informative annex. C. Bishop offered to write a paragraph explaining the rationale of organic material affecting the UVT.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Motion by J. Cruver** | Adjust the UVT range in Table 1.1 from 50-75% to 40-55% and send language to JC ballot. |
| **Second:** | J. Meyer |
| **Discussion:** | None |
| **Vote:** | All in favor |
| **Motion:** | Carries |

# Task Group on NSF 385

**Teleconference Meeting Summary DRAFT**

February 22, 2021



J. Bell asked that the language be shared with M. Belanger to ensure it satisfied her concerns presented in the initial issue paper. The group agreed to include the informative annex in this ballot when it is sent to the JC for approval.

The group next resumed the photorepair discussion. J. Cruver and provided a review of the Water disinfection by UV irradation testing, and suggested the group consider a test similar to this instead of a minimum dosage test, which could be costly. J. Cruver explained how the test could be run concurrently to the testing in the standard already. S. Williams stated that the lab could build a test box with a light mimicking a specified illumination, such as a cloudy day. The group discussed whether the results of the test should be informative, or part of the pass / fail criteria. J. Cruver suggested the test be part of the pass / fail criteria due to use in direct discharge systems. S. Williams asked if the light box in the test should be refrigerated, and the group discussed the test frequency, settling on 3 times during the testing. J. Cruver offered to draft the language and send to S. Williams for review.

The next agenda item was the discussion of the Ozone portion of the issue paper. J. Bell noted that standard 46 did have a minimum ozone requirement in section 13.6.4 and provided a testing location. J. Bell suggested that this language was not copied over from 46 in the drafting of 385. S. Williams noted that the standard 46 testing was continuous, which could prove costly. B. Hennig noted the ozone testing in 385 suggested taking 3 readings throughout the test instead of continual monitoring. J. Bell added that the test was in 385 but did not have the 5 ppm limit that standard 46 did. J. Bell offered to compare the 46 and 385 tests and report back to the group. S. Williams said that wind could play a factor in the testing. Jim Bell pointed out that most of these tanks would not be open tanks, but would most probably be a septic tank which is buried and has appropriate covers.

**Action items**

C. Bishop to draft scope paragraph for UVT optional testing.
J. Cruver to draft photorepair testing language and send to S. Williams for review.
J. Bell to compare ozone testing in Standards 46 and 385.
J. Snider to send doodle poll for next teleconference, week of April 5th