Task Group on Water Quality Testing Devices

Teleconference Meeting Summary DRAFT

July 8, 2021

Participating members:

Town of Flower Mound, Texas	Vyles, Tom
Industrial Test Systems, Inc.	Bailey, George
Consultant - Public Health/Regulatory	Campbell, Suzie
LaMotte Co.	Egan, Jim
Richard Falk	Falk, Richard
NSF International	Pattison, Megan

Participating observers:

LaMotte	Maisano, Joe
Taylor Technologies	Ivusich, Wayne
Oklahoma City-County Health Department	Li, Chris
RAM Consulting Services	Martin, Richard
NSF International	Snider, Jason

Discussion

T. Vyles welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. J. Snider took roll and read the anti-trust statement. Six of the 10 voting members were present (60%) which did represent a quorum.

The group began with a review of the 50i172r1 – Sensor WQTD straw ballot results. The group spent time reviewing K. Schaefer's comments first. J. Egan asked if the ranges for the ORP accuracy (precision) table were achievable. K. Schaefer offered to look through past data to see what the ranges were. J. Egan asked if there was a disconnect between what was achievable for the ORP sensors and what was needed for water quality. R. Falk referenced a study conducted in 2008 and offered to share with the group. The group agreed to remove the term "accuracy" from the title of N-11.12.10. J. Egan asked what the driver for the ORP testing to be included in the Annex. T. Vyles answered that there was a need for regulators to have verification that a manufacturer's claims were accurate with water quality testing devices. S. Campbell asked if the ORP testing was with or without cyanuric acid. K. Schaefer stated that the current methods do not use cyanuric acid. R. Falk noted that the study he mentioned would help clarify this. K. Schafer reminded the group that the ORP test would be optional, and that manufacturers were currently making claims that were not being verified and adding this language would provide a method for verification of those claims. It was asked if other parameters, such as iron, were being considered to be included. T. Vyles responded that they could be, if an issue paper were submitted.

The group ran out of time for discussion, and it was decided to try to incorporate the comments received on both the 50i172r1 – Sensor WQTD straw ballot results and 50i173r2.1 -- straw ballot results into a new draft, with the goal of straw balloting the revisions before the group's next call. Additionally, the RWF-2019-11 – Shelf life would be on the agenda.

Action items

K. Schaefer and S. Choe to revise sensor based WQTD language based on comments received and discussion with goal of being ready for straw ballot before the next teleconference.
R. Falk and J. Egan to revise WQTD accuracy language based on comments received with goal of being ready for straw ballot before the next teleconference.
Next teleconference date August 10, 2021.