From: 2023wetc@kavi.iapmo.org on behalf of Taylor Duran
To: 2023wetc@kavi.iapmo.org
Subject: [EXTERNAL][2023wetc] 2022 WEStand ROP Circulation of Comments
Date: Thursday, August 4, 2022 4:16:53 PM
Attachments: image001.png
image002.png
image003.png
2022 WEStand ROP Circulation of Comments.pdf

Dear WEStand Technical Committee Members,

I have attached for your review all comments received by the initial ballot closing date. If you wish to respond, reaffirm or change your vote after reviewing the comments, you may do so by **Friday, August 12, 2022,** as this is the final date for returning all ballots. Any affirmative voters can change their vote.

If you do not wish to change your vote, there is no action required.

If you wish to vote "negative" or wish to "abstain", please include a technical reason for a negative vote and a reason statement for abstaining.

Thank you for your willingness to serve on this committee.

Best regards,

TAYLOR DURAN
Code Development Administrator
USHGC & WE-Stand Staff Liaison
Office: (909) 218-8126
Email: taylor.duran@iapmo.org
IAPMO World Headquarters
4755 E. Philadelphia Street
Ontario, CA 91761

2022 WE•Stand ROP Circulation of Comments

Ballot Name:	Item # 013	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Pape, Thomas	AFFIRMATIVE	IAPMO should consider a task group to rename and redefine water categories based up upon a variety of water qualities. "Black" and "gray" are no longer adequate to describe the various water qualities and appropriate uses. The insinuation that these terms are racist is intolerable.
Mann, David	AFFIRMATIVE	I agree with John Koeller, and furthermore, as was brought up at the T.C. meeting, should one agree with the change they are agreeing with the substantiation. The substantiation is totally WOKE!!!
Allen, Laura	AFFIRMATIVE	I agree with the need to change the terms, but I am not sure “domestic sewage” is the right word. I look forward to working on finding the best words for all the various waters in the future.
Koeller, John	AFFIRMATIVE	The proposed action is entirely outside of the scope of WE•Stand and was correctly rejected by the committee. The terms being proposed for change have stood for decades and do not warrant reconsideration.
Sovocool, Kent	AFFIRMATIVE	While I agree that the terminology here and other places needs changing, I think there is risk in doing it in piecemeal fashion in this way. Here "domestic sewage" and other revised terms may cause more problems without comprehensive development and a rollout plan for the industry.
Lenger, Markus	NEGATIVE w/comment	This is a big step in the right direction.
Klein, Gary	NEGATIVE w/comment	I think that the terminology that exists for different water sources developed in a piecemeal manner, starting with the then common understanding that there was only one water source. We are quickly running out of color choices that are clearly related to the water source. For example, why purple for municipally treated reclaimed water? I think that IAPMO and WE•Stand should form a working group to look into a comprehensive reclassification scheme.
Osann, Edward	NEGATIVE w/comment	The proposal offers a reasonable description of wastewater containing toilet waste, moving away from color coded shorthand.
Lansing, John	NEGATIVE w/comment	The proposal offers valid points for improving terminology and suggests terms that are primarily consistent with international usage, with some exceptions. I believe a working group should be set up to develop this further.
Lando, Pat	NEGATIVE w/comment	The proposal offers a reasonable understanding that color coded language in a plumbing standard is not based in science and/or is appropriate and must be resolved. The proposal identifies a sound, or at least a better solution than the redundant and colloquial nature of terms that exist in the standard.

Ballot Name:	Item # 014	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Osann, Edward	AFFIRMATIVE	The intent of the proposal is appropriate, but the substantiation lacks any description or justification of the actual definition of "sewage" in the proposal.
Sovocool, Kent	AFFIRMATIVE	While I agree that the terminology here and other places needs changing, I think there is risk in doing it in piecemeal fashion in this way. Revised terms may cause more problems without comprehensive development and a rollout plan for the industry.
Lando, Pat	NEGATIVE w/comment	The proposal offers a reasonable understanding that color coded language in a plumbing standard is not based in science and/or is appropriate and must be resolved.* The proposal identifies a sound, or at least a better solution than the redundant and colloquial nature of terms that exist in the standard. (*The substantiation is almost identical to Item #013.)

2022 WE•Stand ROP Circulation of Comments

Ballot Name:	Item # 015	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Pape, Thomas	NEGATIVE w/comment	I am not certain the definition should be restricted to potable water.

Ballot Name:	Item # 016	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Lando, Pat	NEGATIVE w/comment	The “commode” is a colloquial term for the component in a composting/pit toilet system that a person sits on. It typically does not use water.* A commode may or may not be a part of a urine reuse system. Definitions that are in succession with the plumbing code are: Toilet as approved proposal #016 Dry Toilet as approved proposal #078 Urine Diverting Dry Toilet as approved proposal #078 Urine Diverting Toilet *A commode that uses water would be a defined as toilet.

Ballot Name:	Item # 018	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Klein, Gary	AFFIRMATIVE	I think that “contamination” is a generally understood term. Defining it in WE•Stand is helpful for readers new to the space, but is not essential.
Lenger, Markus	NEGATIVE w/comment	I am in favor of the additional clarification.

Ballot Name:	Item # 019	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Koeller, John	AFFIRMATIVE	Agree with Mr. Thomas Pape's comment. This needs a small editorial change before publishing.
Pape, Thomas	NEGATIVE w/comment	Are there premises other than public or private?

Ballot Name:	Item # 020	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Kendzel, Jim	AFFIRMATIVE	There is a need for a definition for the term "effluent." However, the motion to reject approved by the Committee is appropriate. Proponent or a Committee member could submit a definition that is consistent with the use of the term in the standard.
Lenger, Markus	NEGATIVE w/comment	There is a need to define effluent.
Klein, Gary	NEGATIVE w/comment	Effluent needs to be clearly defined in WE•Stand since it is used many times, and in somewhat different contexts. The TC should establish a working group to review the uses of the word and make sure that the rules for an effluent discharge are clearly distinguished from an effluent that, after treatment, becomes a new water source.
Koeller, John	NEGATIVE w/comment	If "effluent" is used repeatedly in the document, it should be defined.

Ballot Name:	Item # 021	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Lando, Pat	AFFIRMATIVE	The term “grade” throughout the WE•Stand provisions is not related to slope but to the land. To mitigate this confusion, a public comment should be submitted which provides this distinction.

2022 WE•Stand ROP Circulation of Comments

Ballot Name:	Item # 022	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Mann, David	AFFIRMATIVE	This was rejected and should stay rejected. The reason statement by the committee is correct. Furthermore, if one accepts the proposal, they are accepting the substantiation and the substantiation is WOKE!!! It does not reflect the thinking of the entire population. If it did, then no one would be white-water rafting.
Koeller, John	AFFIRMATIVE	The proposed action to redefine a term commonly used in industry is outside of the scope of WE•Stand and was correctly rejected by the committee. The terms being proposed for change have stood for decades and do not warrant reconsideration.
Lenger, Markus	NEGATIVE w/comment	I agree with Pat Lando's argument.
Lansing, John	NEGATIVE w/comment	The term "sullage" is an accurate description of these systems and improves on the arbitrary language. The term graywater also has inconsistent use in the US industry and internationally (ex: greywater, grey water, graywater, gray-water, etc.) and standardized terminology reflective of the water quality would be valuable.
Lando, Pat	NEGATIVE w/comment	The proposal offers a reasonable understanding that color coded language in a plumbing standard is not based in science and/or is appropriate and must be resolved. The proposal identifies a sound, or at least a better solution than the colloquial nature of term that exists in the WE•Stand. Many state codes have now adopted other sequential terms such as light and dark gray water, or other spellings such as grey water that further weaken the definition of this resource. The voting membership, IAMPO and the standards that are published are part of an institution of writing rules and regulations that affect the public. Arguing that this term should remain because it has long-standing industry use is literally the definition of "institutionalized discrimination" and should be refrained from use as a substantiation. "Institutional discrimination refers to prejudicial practices and policies within institutions that result in the systematic denial of resources and opportunities to members of subordinate groups. This form of discrimination is maintained by the laws, organizational guidelines, or TRADITIONS of an institution."

Ballot Name:	Item # 023	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Klein, Gary	AFFIRMATIVE	The TC should find other sources that define groundwater and use them as a starting place for a definition that makes sense within the standard.
Koeller, John	AFFIRMATIVE	Not ALL water beneath the 'surface' is normally classified as 'groundwater,' e.g., is potable water inside a buried supply pipe legitimately classified as groundwater? Of course not.

Ballot Name:	Item # 024	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Kendzel, Jim	AFFIRMATIVE	I support the Committee's decision to reject; however, it seems the issue can be easily resolved in public comment by updating the substantiation to reflect text is consistent with the Mechanical Code. A definition for "heat exchanger" is needed since it is used in Chapter 10.
Pape, Thomas	NEGATIVE w/comment	The definition is needed despite the flaw in the substantiation.
Lenger, Markus	NEGATIVE w/comment	"Heat exchanger" needs a definition.

2022 WE•Stand ROP Circulation of Comments

Ballot Name:	Item # 027	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Koeller, John	AFFIRMATIVE	I agree with the comment by Mr. Thomas Pape on this ballot. Minor editorial changes need to be made before publication.
Lando, Pat	AFFIRMATIVE	Agreed: "There are terms used in this definition that are already defined in Chapter 2; thus, should be italicized."
Pape, Thomas	NEGATIVE w/comment	There are terms used in this definition that are already defined in Chapter 2; thus, should be italicized.

Ballot Name:	Item # 031	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Pape, Thomas	NEGATIVE w/comment	I suggest this definition is too broad. It should contain something to the effect that it is conveyed to an on-site or off-site treatment system.
Lenger, Markus	NEGATIVE w/comment	I am in favor of the definition.
Klein, Gary	NEGATIVE w/comment	A clear definition would be helpful in WE•Stand. The TC should see if there are existing definitions that are applicable. It should also do a review of how sewage is used in each context.

Ballot Name:	Item # 032	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Lenger, Markus	NEGATIVE w/comment	No need to define "should."
Lando, Pat	NEGATIVE w/comment	I do not believe that "should" needs to have a definition. It is not a term that imparts a requirement or other technical direction.
Pape, Thomas	ABSTAIN w/comment	I am uncertain that "should" belongs in any text except informative notes.
Sovocool, Kent	ABSTAIN w/comment	Agree with Thomas Pape. We "should" not have this term in the first place.

Ballot Name:	Item # 035	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Pape, Thomas	NEGATIVE w/comment	Most green codes define stormwater as rainwater that has been in contact with pervious surfaces or contaminants of impervious surfaces.
Lenger, Markus	NEGATIVE w/comment	Seems like a reasonable addition.

Ballot Name:	Item # 038	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Lansing, John	AFFIRMATIVE	Definition excludes other types of water features, such as those that do not use pool water.
Sovocool, Kent	AFFIRMATIVE	Agree with committee's rejection. Many water features don't utilize a pooling component. Think features that cascade down rocks, etc. Maybe try, “A landscape element supplied with water for principally ornamental purposes.”
Pape, Thomas	NEGATIVE w/comment	Water feature needs a definition.
Lenger, Markus	NEGATIVE w/comment	Water feature needs a definition. I agree with Thomas Pape.

Ballot Name:	Item # 039	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Kendzel, Jim	AFFIRMATIVE	The substantiation statement could be improved. As an example, marking requirements are already specified in the product standards. In addition, the standard is already clear as to the use of referenced standards and the extensive text of Section 301.2.2 provides no additional value.
Lenger, Markus	NEGATIVE w/comment	I still think this is needed.
Koeller, John	NEGATIVE w/comment	The committee statement for rejection is vague and grossly insufficient, which indicates (to me) that a decision was made in haste.

2022 WE•Stand ROP Circulation of Comments

Ballot Name:	Item # 045	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Lenger, Markus	NEGATIVE w/comment	I concur with John Koeller.
Klein, Gary	NEGATIVE w/comment	I concur with John Koeller. I would also suggest that to remedy the situation the TC should ask the IAPMO secretariat for WE•Stand prepare a note for the next TC to remind them to look at all sections that refer to Water Sense to ensure that the clauses in WE•Stand are up-to-date.
Koeller, John	NEGATIVE w/comment	Proposal to clarify and update WaterSense specifications and applications is essential to the effectiveness of WE•Stand. The rejection by the committee over a footnote was unwarranted.

Ballot Name:	Item # 046	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Mann, David	AFFIRMATIVE	There is an existing standard for testing and that should be used. The inspector may or may not pull up the spout diverter to find out is it leaks or not. The product may have zero leakage when tested but will never remain at zero. They are mechanical devices and will fail over time.
Thompson, Kyle	AFFIRMATIVE	The existing text in this section specifies a performance requirement of "zero leakage" without providing a means by which a product can demonstrate such performance. The value zero is not possible to measure with existing technology since measurement devices have an inherent limit of resolution and there are no state or federal standards upon which a manufacturer can test or certify that their diverters are truly “zero leakage.” This proposed revision addresses these limitations by including a small maximum leakage rate and a reference to the test method for verification. The standard ASME A112.18.1/CSA B125.1 specifies how a manufacturer is to test these products and Section 5.3.6 includes a leakage rate test. As noted in the proposal substantiation, the maximum leakage rate in the California Code of Regulations is 0.01 gpm for tub spout diverters which is specified in Table H-3 of 20 CCR § 1605.3.
Pape, Thomas	NEGATIVE w/comment	There is ample technology available in the marketplace to have zero leakage. It is confounding that WE•Stand allows products included, known to leak at day one. This is a stretch code not the UPC, for cripes sake, we should not bend our goals to appease a manufacturer.
Kendzel, Jim	NEGATIVE w/comment	Referencing the existing national consensus standard for bath and shower diverters is appropriate, and using a technically sound and correct leakage test referenced in the ASME standard is also appropriate. Indicating a "zero leakage" without referencing a means to test and a verifiable measurement provides no sound mandate. I do not see the referencing of the product national standard requirement as weakening the standard; it provides a requirement that is easily validated and tested during the certification/listing process.
Lenger, Markus	NEGATIVE w/comment	Zero leakage should be achievable.
Allen, Laura	NEGATIVE w/comment	I agree with Edward Osann and Thomas Pape. We should not weaken this standard.

Koeller, John	NEGATIVE w/comment	What the proponent of this proposal is attempting to do is change a provision that was debated extensively and voted upon in the previous round of WE•Stand several years ago. The "substantiation" offered here by the proponent is exactly what justifies it's rejection. OF COURSE, the current provisions in WE•Stand do not "prevent" leakage in the future. JUST AS a showerhead flow rate limitation requirement doesn't prevent a higher flow in that showerhead in the future! ...or a faucet or toilet, for that matter. What WE•Stand has provided for (and the proponent of this modification is attempting to overturn) is a specified performance WHEN NEW! That is all such a specification can provide! Furthermore, there is NO NEED to test a diverter in the "field" as the proponent inaccurately describes. The California Energy Commission already qualifies products through an independent testing process by accredited laboratories that results in a LISTING (just as is done for numerous other plumbing products). As such, the "substantiation" is irrelevant and does not fit the 'real world' situation with today's diverters, their testing, their listing, and their application as a water use efficiency provision.
Osann, Edward	NEGATIVE w/comment	This proposal is an unjustified weakening of WE•Stand. Manufacturers have provided test data to the California Energy Commission on over 10,000 models of tub spout diverters (TSDs), and over 60% of these models are listed at zero leakage. "Zero" leakage is actually far easier to verify in field inspection than trying to measure the fraction of a gallon per minute that the proposal would offer as a replacement. I agree that even more savings could come from an improved durability standard for TSDs, and invite the proponent to join in efforts to strengthen this part of the standard, rather than weakening the zero leakage at installation requirement in WE•Stand.
Lando, Pat	NEGATIVE w/comment	I agree with the comments of the other negative votes and the proposals weakening of the WE•Stand. This proposal was debated extensively in previous WE•Stand additions where it was rejected. It continues to be brought forward and rejected over its merits.
Sovocool, Kent	NEGATIVE w/comment	Agree with Commenters. Going further, having an inspector finding a leaking diverter valve in a WE•STAND installation hurts the credibility of the standard. Even worse? The customer finding it.

Ballot Name:	**Item # 047**	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Kendzel, Jim	NEGATIVE w/comment	I do not believe the current language is enforceable and is also not practical for applying at the point of manufacture or in the field. Although I agree with the intent behind the current wording, I think further discussions are required to come up with a workable solution which I am in the process of completing. Until a workable solution is developed, the current text should be deleted from the standard.
Thompson, Kyle	NEGATIVE w/comment	The existing language is unenforceable. Tags or labels as currently required are likely be discarded before the device is installed. Compliance with ASSE 1016 requires identification markings on the device and the minimum flow rates to be included on the product packaging or literature and if needed for future replacement an installer can track down the information through the products identification markings.
Barnes, Samantha	NEGATIVE w/comment	I agree with the original substantiation provided by PMI. The current language regarding marking is not enforceable and should be removed from this section. The applicable product standards address marking requirements; these standards should be reconsidered before adding additional marking requirements in WE•Stand.

2022 WE•Stand ROP Circulation of Comments

Ballot Name:	Item # 051	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Klein, Gary	AFFIRMATIVE	Reflecting on Kent Sovocool and Samantha Barnes' comments, the proposal has two issues, one about redundancy, the other about automatic shut off in non-residential occupancies. Both need to be fixed in public comment.
Sovocool, Kent	AFFIRMATIVE	In my recollection, the negative commenters' statements are not the reason the group appropriately killed this. It was the attempt to effectively remove the auto shutoff requirement for non-residential. That would have been detrimental to the water conservation value of the standard.
Barnes, Samantha	AFFIRMATIVE	It is redundant to require that a system be listed to both standards, NSF/ANSI 58 and ASSE 1086. In order for a product to be listed to ASSE 1086 it must meet all of the requirements of NSF/ANSI 58. Listing to both standards would be redundant and would only serve to drive revenue to the certification bodies, of which we are one. Secondly, ASSE 1086 is not yet supported by the industry. Currently none of the accredited certification bodies in North America have any products listed to this standard.
Kendzel, Jim	NEGATIVE w/comment	I support the comments submitted by Samantha Barnes. Duplication or redundant requirements covered in separate standards only leads to confusion in the marketplace and also increased costs to manufacturers for unneeded duplicate certifications.

Ballot Name:	Item # 052	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Osann, Edward	AFFIRMATIVE	The latest Energy Star Specification for Commercial Ovens (v. 3.0) covers more types of ovens and appears to be as rigorous, if not more so, than the current WE•Stand language. Section 407.3 should be reworked in public comment to encompass all water-using commercial ovens that are within the scope of the ES specification.

Ballot Name:	Item # 053	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Kendzel, Jim	AFFIRMATIVE	I agree with the committee decision to reject; however, it would appear that through public comment, revisions can be made to the proposal to address some of the concerns and better clarify the intent.
Klein, Gary	AFFIRMATIVE	The proposal needs to be amended to be more clear about the water efficiency benefits of the two provisions. It appears that both are related running water down the drain to cool heated discharge water. Section 407.6 talks about not using potable water to cool discharges in food service. Is something like that also relevant for Section 407.7?
Pape, Thomas	NEGATIVE w/comment	The proposal only needs to add language that the purpose is to avoid tempering water at discharge.
Lenger, Markus	NEGATIVE w/comment	The proposal has merit.
Koeller, John	NEGATIVE w/comment	The so-called "substantiation" offered by the committee for rejection is FALSE. By controlling the temperature of water waste and prohibiting a venturi-type vacuum system DOES provide a water efficiency benefit. It appears that the committee again acted in haste to reject a legitimate proposal.
Sovocool, Kent	NEGATIVE w/comment	Agree with John Koeller. To add further detail on his second point, the venturi requires a constantly running source due to the physics of how a venturi vacuum works. This should not have been rejected.

2022 WE•Stand ROP Circulation of Comments

Ballot Name:	Item # 054	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Sovocool, Kent	AFFIRMATIVE	While I agree with the negative voters' points, this is still better than the "sprinkler" that is currently in there.
Pape, Thomas	NEGATIVE w/comment	The term fire "suppression" (instead of "protection") is used more commonly. I am also unsure "isolate" is the correct term to use. It might be better clarified to say the device cannot restrict the flow of water to fire suppression systems.
Lenger, Markus	NEGATIVE w/comment	Fire suppression is more common.
Lando, Pat	ABSTAIN w/comment	"Fire suppression" is the more common term and should be revised in the public comment period.
Barnes, Samantha	ABSTAIN w/comment	I agree with the comments that "fire suppression" is a more common term and that this proposal could be revised through public comment.

Ballot Name:	Item # 055	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Thompson, Kyle	AFFIRMATIVE	It can take several years for manufacturers and third party certifiers to shift the listing of products to a newer standard like IAPMO Z1349. The committee's amendment to include all the applicable standards in this proposal provides the most viable option for this situation type. Where the code is developed on a 3-year cycle and the new standard has recently been published. Since it will provide the best direction to users of the code. The term "isolate" is in the current text of the WE•Stand and there is no suggestion to change or alter this part of the text in this proposal. I don't see the benefits of rejecting the proposal based on this concern as it is not part of the proposed change.
Pape, Thomas	NEGATIVE w/comment	The term "isolate" is not clear. It would be clearer to say the device shall not be installed where it could restrict the flow . . . . Also, I usually hear this referred to as fire SUPPRESSION system, rather than fire protection systems.
Kendzel, Jim	NEGATIVE w/comment	I am concerned about the comments made by Kent Sovocool related to lack of industry participation in the development of the standard. Until there can be verification that there was significant participation from the manufacturers currently in the marketplace, I will not be able to support this proposal.
Lenger, Markus	NEGATIVE w/comment	Agree with Thomas Pape.
Lando, Pat	NEGATIVE w/comment	I agree with Thomas Pape's comments.
Sovocool, Kent	NEGATIVE w/comment	Almost no product is labeled yet for that very new Z134 standard. My opinion is that one manufacturer dominated the development of that standard and happens to have the only product that aligns with it. This is just too early in the development of leak detection devices to be used in this way.

Ballot Name:	Item # 056	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Kendzel, Jim	NEGATIVE w/comment	I voted negative based on my meeting notes indicating that more work on the text was needed by the Task Group. Unfortunately, my notes are not complete as to what additional clarity is needed so I am hoping other Committee members may remember issue discussed at the meeting. The modification did not fully address the concerns discussed.

2022 WE•Stand ROP Circulation of Comments

Ballot Name:	Item # 059	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Lando, Pat	ABSTAIN w/comment	The proposal is dividing traditional landscape areas into "Landscape" and "Landscape, Vegetated" which I understand for the purpose of the WE•Stand. However, it is unclear as to where a permeable hardscape surface would fall under. I suggest that this is clarified during the public comment period. FYI - The typical approach to city planning and stormwater management requirements are to make areas outside of the building envelope into permeable and non-permeable areas. The permeable areas are then further divided by living and non-living elements. My hope would be that future WE•Stand editions of this section could better align with what planning departments are already doing.

Ballot Name:	Item # 064	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Lenger, Markus	NEGATIVE w/comment	On-site sensor may have maintenance issues such as battery replacements etc. AI and other means can be as effective and should not be excluded.
Klein, Gary	NEGATIVE w/comment	I concur with Markus Lenger. Also, apparently the TC had no issues with the reference to EPA WaterSense in this proposal, but we did in a previous one.

Ballot Name:	Item # 074	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Kendzel, Jim	AFFIRMATIVE	As the Chair of the Premise Water Supply System Design Task Group and proponent of the proposal, I support the Committee's suggestions and will bring them to the Task Group for consideration during the public comment period.
Lenger, Markus	NEGATIVE w/comment	Although some minor corrections are needed the merit of this proposal is sound and needed.
Koeller, John	NEGATIVE w/comment	As noted on the committee statement, "has identified this as the only reason for rejection" and that reason can be remedied. Therefore, I don't believe this very comprehensive proposal should be rejected due only to a few charts.
Thompson, Kyle	NEGATIVE w/comment	Addition of this text to include the Water Demand Calculator is beneficial to users of the code. It should be accepted and brought back during the public comment period with the additional improvements indicated in the committee statement.

Ballot Name:	Item # 079	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Mann, David	AFFIRMATIVE	The substantiation states that there is "little risk"; that is enough to warrant an inspection.
Kendzel, Jim	NEGATIVE w/comment	Support the comments already provided in support of rejecting the Committee’s decision.
Lenger, Markus	NEGATIVE w/comment	Disagree with committee’s findings. No regulation should be applied.
Klein, Gary	NEGATIVE w/comment	I think that this proposal is close but not quite there. Using urine on a residential occupancy happens regularly, but it is difficult to get everyone to pee on the right places at the right times. Diverting urine from a composting toilet makes a great deal of sense as it would seem to be much easier to manage its beneficial use. So, it should be allowed. The use of “whereas” in the second sentence seems very odd.
Allen, Laura	NEGATIVE w/comment	I agree with John Koeller. This is low risk situation and inline with many other permit exempt situations that are allowed across the country.

Koeller, John	NEGATIVE w/comment	Do not agree with the committee statement that ALL such systems need regulation. First of all, urine is sterile. Second, why prohibit someone from using urine for fertilizing by setting onerous permitting requirements (which is what would happen!) that would result in 'bootleg' systems subject to local fines or other charges. This proposal was a reasonable accommodation to single-family residential properties and forestalled what would otherwise become more unnecessary government regulation.
Lansing, John	NEGATIVE w/comment	Exempting this from jurisdictional oversight for single-family applications is reasonable, low risk, and will likely promote further adoption.
Lando, Pat	NEGATIVE w/comment	An established minimum amount of urine for beneficial use should be allowed outright within the WE•Stand. At what point is someone to urinate on their property for beneficial use?! This is the same argument that rainwater reuse had on its inception into the plumbing code.
Barnes, Samantha	NEGATIVE w/comment	I agree with many of the negative comments provided. There is minimal risk to health and safety in such small-scale applications when considering the risks of using other common methods, such as animal manure or conventional fertilizers. The benefits of urine reuse in single-family property applications outweigh the risks, and requiring permits would only serve to impede those benefits.

Ballot Name:	**Item # 081**	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Kendzel, Jim	NEGATIVE w/comment	Transferring the manual to new owners is not enforceable.

Ballot Name:	**Item # 082**	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Lando, Pat	ABSTAIN w/comment	I reject the use of the term grey water.

Ballot Name:	**Item # 086**	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Kendzel, Jim	AFFIRMATIVE	I agree with Edward Osann that the proposal has merit. However, the main issue appears to be related to the device not complying with the existing UPC. Perhaps this can be better addressed by updating the UPC.
Allen, Laura	AFFIRMATIVE	I agree with Edward Osann's comment.
Osann, Edward	AFFIRMATIVE	The proposal has merit. More precise wording should be submitted via public comment to respond to the Committee's objections.
Lenger, Markus	NEGATIVE w/comment	I agree with Pat Lando.
Lando, Pat	NEGATIVE w/comment	The committee's statement is not correct in part because there was a lot of confusion in the room which I believe stemmed from a lack of understanding and joking about "commodes" and the different terms for ecological sanitation toilets. The Committee statement should have only referenced the confusion over if the trap could be installed "according to plumbing code" OR [with] "a backflow seal." -The discussion over the [struvite] blockage issues was how a backflow seal performed better than a trap seal system. This supports the proposal. -The lack of specificity referencing "use by a waterless urinal" in the committee's statement was not relevant since this trap could apply to fixtures approved under Chapter 5, such as urinals, waterless urinals or urine diverting dry toilets. Listing the specific fixture here would not be in practice with the WE•Stand format and not complete in practice.

2022 WE•Stand ROP Circulation of Comments

Ballot Name:	Item # 087	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Allen, Laura	AFFIRMATIVE	I support much of the proposal and look forward to seeing it revised in public comment. I think the committee needs more justification for the 55 gallons size.
Osann, Edward	AFFIRMATIVE	I agree that the proposed exemption for tanks of 55 gallons or less is not justified. However, the remainder appears to have merit. The proponent should return with a public comment to respond or rebut the points raised by the committee.
Lansing, John	NEGATIVE w/comment	I agree with the proposal, including the exception of 55 gal tanks.
Lando, Pat	NEGATIVE w/comment	Urine reuse for beneficial use needs to establish a minimum amount of storage that is safe and practical. The proposal references the support for a 55 gallon minimum storage tank by the +100 member Gold Ribbon Commission for Urine Reuse. This 55-gallon volume was found to be aligned with practices and regulations over a single family residential property.

Ballot Name:	Item # 089	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Lando, Pat	AFFIRMATIVE	Proposal #90 added a key component to add into this proposal: Section 506.12.5 Above grade storage tanks shall be "structurally designed to withstand all anticipated" freezing conditions, or shall be provided with an adequate means of freeze protection.

Ballot Name:	Item # 092	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Allen, Laura	AFFIRMATIVE	I agree with John Koeller, a few edits will fix this one.
Koeller, John	AFFIRMATIVE	A bit of minor editing will fix this one.
Lando, Pat	ABSTAIN w/comment	The proposal should be revised "one or more of the following" cleaning products.

Ballot Name:	Item # 093	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Allen, Laura	AFFIRMATIVE	John Koeller and Thomas Pape's comments are relevant to the entire table, which is unenforceable, not the proposed changes to the table. Since the table is currently in WE•Stand, I think we should accept this proposal and make the table better. If people want to propose to remove the entire table in the future because it's unenforceable, then we could have that conversation at that time.
Pape, Thomas	NEGATIVE w/comment	This is unenforceable. The inspector cannot make regular visits to the premise to assure maintenance performance.
Koeller, John	NEGATIVE w/comment	Agree with Mr. Thomas Pape's comment.
Sovocool, Kent	ABSTAIN w/comment	I'm not certain I have the background or certainty level to support this, but if the committee feels comfortable going this direction I won't stand in the way.

Ballot Name:	Item # 103	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Kendzel, Jim	AFFIRMATIVE	I do have concern that we are rejecting text that is similar to what is in the Uniform Plumbing Code. Perhaps the Committee should consider the submittal of a proposal to update the text currently in the UPC.

2022 WE•Stand ROP Circulation of Comments

Ballot Name:	Item # 106	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Pape, Thomas	NEGATIVE w/comment	The requirement should be that the water meets Safe Drinking Water requirements to allow for reclaimed water. Reclaimed water is sanitized and meets all Safe Drinking Water standards, but is not listed as potable water.
Lenger, Markus	NEGATIVE w/comment	Don't like the requirement language of "potable."
Lando, Pat	NEGATIVE w/comment	The requirement should be that the water meets Safe Drinking Water requirements to allow for reclaimed water. Reclaimed water is sanitized and meets all Safe Drinking Water standards, but is not listed as potable water.
Sovocool, Kent	NEGATIVE w/comment	In addition to agreeing with the other negative voters, I just think we are begging to erode savings by having another, probably full pressure, connection at the toilet that is potable. When it is time to replace the toilet the temptation to use that potable one will be high. If it was for a low pressure connection this might be a more tenable proposal, but I can't support it as is.
Barnes, Samantha	ABSTAIN w/comment	I agree with the comments that use of the term "potable" unnecessarily limits the water source and that use of any water meeting safe drinking water standards should be considered.

Ballot Name:	Item # 107	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Pape, Thomas	NEGATIVE w/comment	The use of log reductions for water quality requirements is completely useless unless it is used with pre-treatment water quality requirements. It ignores that fact that black water and rainwater will have radically different resulting qualities while both meet these log reductions. Stop this insanity!!
Braband, Steven	NEGATIVE w/comment	Concur with Thomas Pape.
Lenger, Markus	NEGATIVE w/comment	Scientifically inaccurate - comparing apples to oranges.
Koeller, John	NEGATIVE w/comment	Concur with Mr. Thomas Pape's comments.

Ballot Name:	Item # 108	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Sovocool, Kent	NEGATIVE w/comment	I think the author is probably right in recognizing that more detail on what to do for abandonment will help water purveyors have more comfort with going this direction.

Ballot Name:	Item # 110	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Kendzel, Jim	NEGATIVE w/comment	The Committee substantiation goes against the basic philosophy of model codes and the use of national product consensus standards and third-party verification. Rainwater storage tanks are a critical component of rainwater catchment systems, and it is important to have nationally accepted standards that provide minimum requirements and third-party validation of those requirements. The thought that there are already products in the field performing well does not seem to provide justification for not requiring listing to minimum design and performance standards.

Ballot Name:	Item # 111	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Kendzel, Jim	AFFIRMATIVE	I am in support of the Committee's decision to reject based on the fact there appears to already exist product standards covering these products that are applicable for rainwater systems. I would suggest that the existing standards be added to WE•Stand since, I believe, it is important to reference the applicable national product standards when they exist.

2022 WE•Stand ROP Circulation of Comments

Ballot Name:	Item # 120	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Kendzel, Jim	AFFIRMATIVE	I am torn on this issue. The type of testing being added, as an example, is not typically asked for private well systems. However, the contamination attempting to be addressed is more related to surface waters. Perhaps we should look at routine verification of disinfection levels of the system.
Allen, Laura	AFFIRMATIVE	It is extremely impractical (impossible) to test broadly for unspecified types of viruses and protozoan cysts. And if the standard doesn't specify which to test for it would by default prohibit any potable rainwater system since it's impossible to test for them all. And, as a side note, many are not harmful to humans.
Koeller, John	AFFIRMATIVE	The word "exception" is not used correctly.
Osann, Edward	AFFIRMATIVE	This proposal appears to have merit for the protection of public health. One of the most common waterborne pathogens is giardia, a protozoa. The committee contends that testing for viruses and protozoan cysts is expensive and impractical. The proponent should return with a public comment that addresses the testing cost issue. With the current WE•Stand language requiring testing for fecal coliform and turbidity every three months, the addition of a test for protozoan cysts and viruses every 12 months does not appear impractical, so it comes down to cost. Also, the word "Exception" in the proposal is unnecessary.

Ballot Name:	Item # 121	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Pape, Thomas	NEGATIVE w/comment	Agree with all prior comments.
Braband, Steven	NEGATIVE w/comment	Confusing language.
Lenger, Markus	NEGATIVE w/comment	Confusing language not achieving clarification.
Koeller, John	NEGATIVE w/comment	Agree with the comments by Mr. Edward Osann and Mr. Pat Lando.
Osann, Edward	NEGATIVE w/comment	This proposal leaves the amended paragraph with garbled syntax. The substantiation claims the changes improve clarity and enforceability, but the effect is the opposite. This proposal needs to be corrected in public comment.
Lando, Pat	NEGATIVE w/comment	The proposed language is more confusing than the existing language.
Sovocool, Kent	NEGATIVE w/comment	I agree. It no longer reads properly.

Ballot Name:	Item # 123	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Pape, Thomas	NEGATIVE w/comment	Agree with John Koeller.
Koeller, John	NEGATIVE w/comment	Rejection of this entire proposal because of one minor item of figure placement ("has identified this as the only reason for rejection") is unwarranted, when recommended modifications could have readily been made by the Technical Committee when originally considered.

Ballot Name:	Item # 124	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Pape, Thomas	NEGATIVE w/comment	Agree with John Koeller's statement.
Kendzel, Jim	NEGATIVE w/comment	It is understood that Appendices to WE•Stand can be considered for adoption at the local level. This proposal is not ready to be published as an Appendix written on code language. The consideration of adopting the onsite treatment of wastewater for direct potable water use requires a significant more amount of work and involvement of the appropriate government agencies to ensure all public health aspects have been fully considered before any appendix of this nature is published.

Koeller, John	NEGATIVE w/comment	I do not agree that substitution of the word "family" for the word "residential" is appropriate. We all KNOW what a residential dwelling is, but it appears that we will now be required to actually define the word "family!" Furthermore, the committee's statement that there are "varying interpretations of what is considered a one- or two-unit residential building" is not explained. What "interpretations" are being referred to? Will the change to "family" INCREASE the number of "misinterpretations?"

Ballot Name:	**Item # 125**	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Kendzel, Jim	NEGATIVE w/comment	It is understood that Appendices to WE•Stand can be considered for adoption at the local level. This proposal is not ready to be published as an Appendix written on code language. The consideration of adopting the onsite treatment of wastewater for direct potable water use requires a significant more amount of work and involvement of the appropriate government agencies to ensure all public health aspects have been fully considered before any appendix of this nature is published.

Ballot Name:	**Item # 126**	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Kendzel, Jim	NEGATIVE w/comment	It is understood that Appendices to WE•Stand can be considered for adoption at the local level. This proposal is not ready to be published as an Appendix written on code language. The consideration of adopting the onsite treatment of wastewater for direct potable water use requires a significant more amount of work and involvement of the appropriate government agencies to ensure all public health aspects have been fully considered before any appendix of this nature is published.

Ballot Name:	**Item # 127**	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Kendzel, Jim	NEGATIVE w/comment	It is understood that Appendices to WE•Stand can be considered for adoption at the local level. This proposal is not ready to be published as an Appendix written on code language. The consideration of adopting the onsite treatment of wastewater for direct potable water use requires a significant more amount of work and involvement of the appropriate government agencies to ensure all public health aspects have been fully considered before any appendix of this nature is published.
Allen, Laura	NEGATIVE w/comment	I support the intent of this proposal and had voted affirmative. However, it's come to my attention that the listed product standards for the RO section conflict with the quality of incoming water. This seems like an easy fix for public comment. Standard 58 section 1.2: “The point-of-use (POU) RO drinking water treatment systems addressed by this standard are designed to be used for the reduction of specific substances that may be present in drinking water (public or private) considered to be microbiologically safe and of known quality”. From 1086: “Residential Reverse Osmosis (RO) systems are used to treat drinking water.”

Barnes, Samantha	NEGATIVE w/comment	I support the intent of this proposal however I cannot support it as written. Products certified to the referenced standards (NSF 55, 58 and 1086) are intended to be used on a potable water source. The following are quotes directly from those standards: NSF/ANSI 58 section 1.2: "The point-of-use (POU) RO drinking water treatment systems addressed by this standard are designed to be used for the reduction of specific substances that may be present in drinking water (public or private) considered to be microbiologically safe and of known quality" ASSE 1086: "Residential Reverse Osmosis (RO) systems are used to treat drinking water." NSF/ANSI 55: "Systems covered by this standard are not intended for the treatment of water that has an obvious contamination or intentional source, such as raw sewage, nor are systems intended to convert wastewater to drinking water. The systems are intended to be installed on visually clear water (not colored, cloudy, or turbid)." The quality of water that will result from the primary treatment stage defined in this proposal will not meet potable water standards and therefore it would be inappropriate to apply the above listed standards to this application. Products certified to these standards may not perform as expected in the proposed wastewater treatment application.

Ballot Name:	**Item # 128**	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Kendzel, Jim	NEGATIVE w/comment	It is understood that Appendices to WE•Stand can be considered for adoption at the local level. This proposal is not ready to be published as an Appendix written on code language. The consideration of adopting the onsite treatment of wastewater for direct potable water use requires a significant more amount of work and involvement of the appropriate government agencies to ensure all public health aspects have been fully considered before any appendix of this nature is published.

Ballot Name:	**Item # 129**	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Klein, Gary	NEGATIVE w/comment	I am confused. This section is only about gray water ready collection piping. What about the gray water use piping? At a minimum something about the connections that need to be made ready where the gray water collection piping comes together before entering the sewer piping. This proposal needs to be amended.

Ballot Name:	**Item # 132**	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Allen, Laura	AFFIRMATIVE	As the proponent, I plan to check back in with the task group and incorporate the concerns I heard at the TC meeting, for example, not calling-out specific pipe material in the images. I think the images are important to include in the appendix as they turn the concept of graywater ready plumbing into what a builder would actually need to do to comply with it.

2022 WE•Stand ROP Circulation of Comments

Ballot Name:	Item # 133	
Voter Name	**Vote**	**Comments**
Kendzel, Jim	AFFIRMATIVE	I am in support of the amendment to the proposal. Based on the concerns raised by the WQA representative during the meeting, I believe the proponent of the proposal needs to provide a sound technical justification for penalizing water softeners used in homes based on a limit of 10 grains of hardness per gallon as well as the potential impact of this limitation on both the industry and the consumer. The RESNET standard provides an equation on this issue but the proponent of the proposal 131 provides no technical rational for the use of the 10 gpg. Until this issue is resolved I am uncomfortable not having an exception for water softeners in the proposal, as approved by the Committee at our June meeting. I am comfortable in having an exception for one of the three Water Efficiency programs for water heaters since there are two other options available.
Barnes, Samantha	AFFIRMATIVE	The amendment to the proposal in necessary as the RESNET/ICC 850 efficiency rating system restricts softening below 10 grains of hardness per gallon of water (gpg) which is inconsistent with long established North American Standards. The current definition of soft water and softening established within North American Standards is based on removing hardness down to <1gpg. Multiple industries rely upon these North American Standards for product design and warranties. Therefore, using the RESNET/ICC rating system on homes that include a water softener will have unintended consequences for many American homeowners and other stakeholders.
Pape, Thomas	NEGATIVE w/comment	The proposed committee action would preclude the ANSI/RESNET/ICC 850 water efficiency rating system in any home with a water softener. The assertion that North American standards are "contradicted" by the use of Standard 850 is unfounded. If Standard 850 actually contradicted any established standard, it should be taken up with ANSI. Instead, with this proposal, a trade association seeks to foster the marketing of water softeners in locations without significantly hard water. Standard 850 does not penalize homes with water softeners, but rather it properly accounts for water softener water use in locations without hard water.
Lenger, Markus	NEGATIVE w/comment	Agree with all arguments.
Klein, Gary	NEGATIVE w/comment	I agree with the proposal, but not the amendment. In most cases, water used for drinking should not be softened, but in most retrofit systems all of the water is softened because the system is installed on all of the piping to the building. In addition, the recommended level of softening is too much. And, the sizing of the softeners is based on very unrealistic amounts of water use. The RESNET standard was heavily debated, and its recommendation should stand, perhaps even strengthened.
Allen, Laura	NEGATIVE w/comment	I agree with the other comments. I support the original proposal but not the amendment.
Koeller, John	NEGATIVE w/comment	The proposed committee action would preclude the ANSI/RESNET/ICC 850 water efficiency rating system in any home with a water softener. The assertion that North American standards are "contradicted" by the use of Standard 850 is unfounded. If Standard 850 actually contradicted any established standard, it should be taken up with ANSI. Instead, with this proposal, a trade association seeks to foster the marketing of water softeners in locations without significantly hard water. Standard 850 does not penalize homes with water softeners, but rather it properly accounts for water softener water use in locations without hard water.

Osann, Edward	NEGATIVE w/comment	The proposed committee action would preclude the ANSI/RESNET/ICC 850 water efficiency rating system in any home with a water softener. The assertion that North American standards are "contradicted" by the use of Standard 850 is unfounded. If Standard 850 actually contradicted any established standard, it should be taken up with ANSI. Instead, with this proposal, a trade association seeks to foster the marketing of water softeners in locations without significantly hard water. Standard 850 does not penalize homes with water softeners, but rather it properly accounts for water softener water use in locations without hard water.
Lando, Pat	NEGATIVE w/comment	The proposed committee action would preclude the ANSI/RESNET/ICC 850 water efficiency rating system in any home with a water softener. The assertion that North American standards are "contradicted" by the use of Standard 850 is unfounded. If Standard 850 actually contradicted any established standard, it should be taken up with ANSI. Instead, with this proposal, a trade association seeks to foster the marketing of water softeners in locations without significantly hard water. Standard 850 does not penalize homes with water softeners, but rather it properly accounts for water softener water use in locations without hard water.
Sovocool, Kent	NEGATIVE w/comment	Agree with the others and urge all to vote negative on this now with this change (acknowledgement: this was originally from the workgroup I chaired). It is unfortunate this single issue derailed ANSI/RESNET/ICC 850 cross-incorporation.