

RWF Task Group on Safety Surfacing

Teleconference Meeting Summary **DRAFT**

August 9, 2022

This document is the property of 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:

AQUATIC DESIGN GROUP	Berkshire, Dennis
Canadian Playground Advisory Inc.	Huber, Rolf
NSF International	Schaefer, Kevin

Participating observers:

National Recreation and Park Association	Boland, Julie
IAPMO	Choe, Sung
Consultant	Hamil, Elizabeth
NSF International	Snider, Jason

Discussion

J. Keller welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. J. Snider took roll and read the anti-trust statement. Three of the 11 voting members were present (27%) which did not represent a quorum.

The group began with a review of the [Draft language / comments](#) that J. Keller had drafted to address both the charge the group received at [last year's Joint Committee meeting](#) (conducting an in-depth evaluation of injury risk on Interactive Waterplay Features and making recommendations to the Joint Committee regarding impact attenuation revisions) as well as looking ahead to issue papers submitted by R. Huber that would be presented at this year's Joint Committee meeting. J. Keller provided an overview of the areas with potential revisions, which included:

1. Review of the term "safety surfacing" – would another term be better suited? J. Keller suggested the group consider "Aquatic play surfacing" as a starting point for discussion.
2. Review of the warranty information required by the standard compared to other surfacing standards.
3. Review of UV stability requirements – should they apply only to outdoor products?
4. Creating the option to test impact attenuation at greater heights – should this be any height requested by the manufacturer or a set height?
5. Creating language that would allow for surfaces that do not to meet the slip resistance requirement to meet a higher impact attenuation requirement instead.

R. Huber suggested the group consider not using the term "critical fall height", as it could be misleading. The group discussed the potential language that would allow a surface to not meet the slip resistance. D. Berkshire expressed concerns that this could create confusion on what requirements a surface is certified to meet. K. Schaefer suggested that if this were implemented, it would need to be very clearly stated in the standard. The group spent some time discussing how changes to the section would impact existing codes that reference standard 50. J. Boland stressed the need for underserved communities to not be adversely affected by changes to the standard. D. Berkshire suggested the group consider an approach similar to how Standard 50 handles UV disinfection, with secondary and supplemental levels. R. Huber asked if the language should require being "certified" to the standard or "meeting the requirements of" the standard. K. Schaefer noted that with certification comes assured continued compliance. The group next discussed field testing and whether there was a need to add language around it. S. Choe noted that nothing in the standard currently prohibited field testing, as long as the testing were performed according to the standard by an accredited certification body. There was also discussion about follow up testing – should there be a way to ensure the surface still met the requirements of the standard after for example, 5 years? J. Keller suggested this be considered for an informative annex. As the group was out of time, J. Keller suggested language providing the option to test at higher fall heights be straw balloted, and the group meet again after the Joint Committee meeting to discuss the results and any issue papers assigned to it.

Action items

Language for the option to test impact attenuation at an increased fall height to be drafted and sent to Task Group Straw ballot.