Ballot Name: Approval of 50i168r4 - polymeric media straw ballot
Ballot URL: http://standards.nsf.org/apps/org/workgroup/rwf_tg_filters/ballot.php?id=7980
Ballot Status: Ballot has closed.
Total Votes: 6

Vote Summary

Option	Count	Percent
Affirmative	5	83.33%
Negative w/comment	1	16.67%
Abstain	0	

Voter Name	Company Name	Vote	Comments	Response	Other
Andrews, Steve	Custom Molded Products	Affirmative			
Bartley, Clayton	Bartley Water Associates LLC	Affirmative	I would like to have seen a validation of the proposed test methods to assure they are representative of actual performance. That may not be feasible so thus I voted affirmative expecting future revisions.		
Berkshire, Dennis	AQUATIC DESIGN GROUP	Affirmative			
George, Ron	Neptune-Benson, Inc.	Affirmative			
Vyles, Tom	Town of Flower Mound, Texas	Affirmative			
Tessitore, Joe	Hayward Pool Products, Inc.	Negative w/comment	13.3.1 Definition of FAC. This is not defined in the section or in the definitions standard of NSF 50.	(KSM) - While the acronym "FAC" is not specifically define, it is commonly known in the industry to be "Free Available Chlorine". A search of the NSF/ANSI/CAN 50 - 2020 yields no less than 20 References to "Free Available Chlorine" **Propose adding the following text: *"FAC" Definition: Free Available Chlorine, hereafter "FAC"***	§19.3 - Monitor Display (pg 63) §19.5.1 Operating Conditions Table 19.1 (pg 63) §21..9 - Data Plate (pg. 76) §25..11.4 - Instrumentation (pg. 93) §27.5.2 - Approved standard evaluation levels (STELs) - Table 27.1 (pg. 108) §N-2.7.3(c) - Dosing (pg. 143) §N-2.9.2.2 - Challenge Water (pg. 147) §N-2.9.3.2 - Challenge Water (pg. 149) §N-8.1.3 - Specific test waters (pg. 197) §N-8.4.6 - Test Waters (pg. 210) §N-10.2.3.2.2(a) - Controller output accuracy (pg. 221) §N-10.2.3.2.2(c) - Controller output accuracy (pg. 221) Table N-11.1 - pH testing chart (pg. 235) Table N-11.2 - Free chlorine (pg. 236) Table N-11.3 - Combined chlorine (pg. 236) Table N-11.5 - Hardness testing (pg. 237) Table N-11.6 - Total alkalinity (pg. 238) Table N-11.7 - Cyanuric acid (pg. 239) Table N-11.8 - TDS testing (pg. 239) Table N-11.9 - Salinity testing (pg. 240)
			13.3.2.3 Why are four test filters being proposed? Testing in most other sections requires 1 or 3 samples.	§13.3.2.3 – Number of samples submitted. In attempt to limit lab-to-lab variation in testing. Larger sample sizes will buffer the output so that it will be more representative while small sample sizes have the potential for more variation. Without specifying the size and number of samples to be obtained, different labs could obtain different results for the same sample. **Propose: changing the number to *two (2) samples***	
			13.3.2.12 Passing criteria for media migration is not defined in this section or in any other section. There should be passing criteria defined.	**Propose: to leave this section §13.3.2.12 as is, with the intention *to use the fiber count as an indicator of, but not a pass/fail of media integrity.***	§13.3.2 - Fiber Migration: The Ad Hoc polymeric media committee thought there was to much variation in the mass measurement and that the labs known to committee members (at that time) did not currently run them. So it was decided unanimously, as I recall, *to use the fiber count as an indicator of, but not a pass/fail of media integrity* . That said, as the group conversation continued; degradation of granular and cartridge media can also be at issue, but are not measured, monitored or recorded: e.g. what percentage, if any, zeo-sand, sand, anthracite, walnut shell, etc. being eliminated during a backwash cycle renders the media bed less or non-effective, or at what point are cartridge filters rendered ineffective based on blinding off from body oils (baby oil in testing granular medias)? Q: None of the above are monitored or tested, so why is polymeric media being tested to this level of detail? Meeting note from a Zoom/Teams call in Dec 2020: *OMIT 12.3.2 in its entirety – [Media integrity is a non-destructive test that has been correlated to bacteria retention and validates the performance of the filter. What this section should be looking at is fiber migration, or the loss of fiber over a specific period of time. A filter construction integrity test might be appropriate if any other filter media currently undergoes a similar integrity testing procedure and a precedence is set somewhere as to acceptable loss.]*
			13.3.5.9 Acceptance criteria says turbidity reduction after 6 tank volumes. The standard is to use 5 tank turnovers.	(KSM) re" §13.3.5.9- **Changed sixth to fifth / six to five**	
Bergstrom, Kenneth	Filtrex, Inc.	Did not vote			
Bunger, Pete	Zeo Inc.	Did not vote			
Campbell, Suzie	Consultant - Public Health/Regulatory	Did not vote			
Meyer, Ellen	Solenis	Did not vote			
Nehlen, Paul	AquaRevival	Did not vote			
Palkon, Thomas	IAPMO	Did not vote			
Schaefer, Kevin	NSF	Public Comment	All other filter and media types are required to pass the turbidity reduction requirements after 5 turnovers. Why does §13.3.5.9 allow polymeric media to have a 6th turnover? Submitter Proposed Solution Propose changing the requirement to 5 turnovers like the remainder of the standard	(KSM) re" §13.3.5.9- **Changed sixth to fifth / six to five**	
			What is the performance issue that is being addressed by the fiber media migration section §13.3.2 that is not already addressed by the health effects requirements of NSF 50 section 4? Additionally, there is no pass/fail acceptance criteria being proposed, so the current language would require the detailed testing but then have no criteria for if the result is acceptable. Submitter Proposed Solution Proposed solution would be to remove section 13.3.2	**Propose: to leave this section §13.3.2.12 as is, with the intention *to use the fiber count as an indicator of, but not a pass/fail of media integrity.***	