



The AARST Consortium on National Radon Standards

standards@aarst.org

Fax: 1-913-780-2090

Call to Order:

Chair called meeting to order 1:05 p.m.

Note – These minutes are not intended to capture discussions in explicit detail.

In generic summary:

Discussion:

Chair - This meeting is in follow up to our last discussion. At hand today, is if we are going to move forward with the mitigation documents as it is from the MIT committee. Or, are we going to send it back to the committee for changes.

Gary – Reviewed Teller’s report. Vote did pass. We can also do a recirculation ballot. First, maybe we should discuss the no-vote comments.

Chair – We need to resolve any negative votes. We either will confirm publication if no resolution is obtained. Or, if the discussion changes any yes votes,

Chair gave floor to Chrys Kelley to expand on no vote. (Adoption of standard concerns)
My position has not changed since the last meeting. She wonders if any other members have changed their vote. My concern is contractors aren’t aware of the new requirement. It’s an optional item on low-income contracts. There hasn’t been any outreach to contractors, they haven’t been told where to buy them or enough education about it. I am keeping my vote a no.

Chair – Asked what solution she would suggest.

C. Kelley - She is concerned availability, but main concern is about educating contractors about alarm requirements and when it would be enforced.

Chair opened floor to Patrick Daniels to expand on no vote. (Intent of standard concerns)

Patrick Daniels: His position is still a no vote. MN enforces ANSI-AARST Standards, so that’s why this has become an issue. He doesn’t think licensing statements will follow this part of the standard and may write exceptions to it. His problem with the standard, you can meet the requirements of the standard without meeting the intent of the standard. It’s going to tell you the alarm loses power, if the house loses power.

Patrick Daniels: Full Alarm – Some are using this and the only way to silence the alarm is to remove the battery. Then, the homeowner would have to remember to put the batteries back in. This adds another maintenance item to the system. It’s similar to a carbon monoxide detector. He thinks a hush function would be a better option. There also needs to be a way to make sure the homeowner knows it has failed. He thinks this requirement needs to be sent back to committee. The alarm will only notify that there is no power going to the system, not whether or not there is an actual issue with the fan.



The AARST Consortium on National Radon Standards

standards@aarst.org Fax: 1-913-780-2090

Opened floor for discussion.

J. Kerber – Question to P. Daniels – Longevity concerns, how do we get past that? Do we need 10 years of data showing that the alarms last 10 years. Would like to hear from D. Grammer on how long alarms last for his systems. The national electrical code change for January 2021 requires GFCI protection for any exterior receptacle. We will have issues with receptacles getting tripped. An alarm would have helped notify homeowners that the fan is not working.

G. Grammer – P. Daniels made good valid points. With the electrical flow alarm, once the electrical flow stops, the alarm lights up. The battery can go dead, homeowners can remove alarm as well. The best thing it does, is it prompts the homeowner to contact the mitigator from the fan label. This prompts communication between homeowner and mitigator. Their alarm failure rates are most frequent when there is a power outage or if there was a mistake during installation. The alarm allowed us to go and correct the mistakes. He encourages customers to obtain annual service on their mitigation system. He thinks the homeowner is the one who suffers by not implementing this requirement. Education does need to be improved on this requirement.

J. Kerber – Can we get together a list of available alarms that contractors can currently use?

Chair – I have seen one list and would be happy to make that available.

K. Stewart – On December 18 I sent out an email to the committee to make a case that there was enough evidence to move forward with the requirement. This provision, given its history of being on the books since 2017, comes to head two years later. Another aspect that needs consideration is how people informed about when changes are made to standards. There are good reasons to move forward with this.

Chair to K. Stewart – You indicate you would support a roll-out of this requirement.

K. Stewart - Maybe the language could be tightened up and address issues that need to be addressed. We know that one contractor has had some success implementing this requirement and that is compelling. I am not inclined to delay this more than one year.

P. Daniels – We're voting whether or not to send the current revised standard back to committee, correct? The requirement has been in the standards since 2017 and nobody is following it. The only reason this is coming up is because MN is enforcing the ANSI-AARST standards. Manufacturers haven't stepped up to make better options. The best mitigators offer this as an option to their clients. There should be a hush option on the alarm.

G. Hodgden – Since 2017, training courses started training to all three national standards (EPA, ASTM and AARST standards). This is the reason the requirements haven't been clear in the training.



The AARST Consortium on National Radon Standards

standards@aarst.org

Fax: 1-913-780-2090

C. Koke – I am in favor of systems with alarms. It's important to look carefully at the language and ensure that the requirement is reasonably available and speaks to the intent and not exceed the scope of the standard. I hope we don't delay implementation. Alarms are necessary today.

D. Grammer – Wondered if modifying the details of this requirement the way P. Daniels described could be implemented as part of ongoing maintenance of the standard.

J. Kerber – Instead of pushing the standards to the next level, could we make it part of ongoing maintenance. I don't want there to be another delay. For those dissenting voters, since requirement is already out there, doing nothing doesn't change anything. What if we asked the committee to address this issue ASAP, would that alter your vote to abstention?

P. Daniels – That would not change my vote. This committee exists to roll out new standards. Until people start enforcing this requirement, manufacturers aren't going to create what is needed. We need to fix the requirement that is already published.

Chair – Do any voting members, have any issue with the standard, other than the alarm notification requirement?

P. Daniels – I believe a lot more people are going to look at the new standard if it's put back out for public review again.

Chair – Option A – publish rest of standard and send alarm section back to committee for continuous maintenance. Option B – Send entire standard to committee for revision and send out for public review again.

G. Hodgden – This is encouraging people to make more comments and delaying standard by potentially another 18 months. People can comment on standards at any time, not only during public review.

D. Grammer – Aren't we just voting on harmonization between the three standards?

G. Hodgden – Three sections of the standards have been harmonized. This is just the first part of the harmonization. We can even send out line items for public review. There are more technical sections to review.

K Stewart – I could support a change: ESC committee approves all substantive content and harmonization, but keep the alarm language the same, but remand to the committee to specifically address that issue. This allows harmonization to continue and address this specific issue. We shouldn't set precedent of sending back changes that have been worked on for 1 to 1-1/2 years, when people had the opportunity to review it already.

C. Kelley – I would not change my vote, as J. Kerber had asked.

G. Hodgden – We can put forward a motion to publish as is and direct the committee to work on alarm requirement ASAP. We could recirculate the ballot or do a restart ballot.



The AARST Consortium on National Radon Standards

standards@aarst.org

Fax: 1-913-780-2090

Chair – The motion already carries as is. Before we recirculate or restart a ballot, we need to know what the rest of the committee wants to do. Does anyone want to change their vote.

Aaron Berndt – I support what Kevin stated.

S. Price – The changes we are auditing, we could send back to the committee. If we can go back and make 2017 wording better, that is how this process works.

S. Swallow – I am in a regulated state. Regulated states have to enforce AARST-ANSI standards. Moving forward with the majority is the right thing to do, but I would be for changes that address the intent of this requirement.

D. Grammer- This harmonization is what we are really voting on, but we focused on the alarms. So much work has already been done and this doesn't really change what's currently required on alarms. I think it should move forward as it is.

C, Koke – I think we can move forward as it is. There is opportunity for ongoing maintenance and improvements.

Chair – Committee doesn't feel a new ballot is needed, but alarm requirement can be looked at again.

D. Jones – In regard to public communication on the alarm issue, is it suitable to change the motion with an addendum to go back and work on the alarm issue? Could that be added to the ballot? Or another motion right after this to address alarm issue?

G. Hodgden – We can make a position statement to direct committee on further improvement. This would take precedence over other activities. It would not require a ballot. We either publish what is there or we send it back to committee and don't publish what is there.

P. Daniels – I don't intend to change my vote on this. Push forward with the harmonization but show people that you are taking a second look at this requirement.

C. Kelley – Concurred with P. Daniels.

S. Price – I think making a formal directive from the committee to this would help define scope and requirements of alarms. This would help Dallas to show people that their concerns are being addressed.

G. Hodgden – I would like input via email from ESC to achieve changes that are needed. I would like something more concrete to take to the committee. Education also needs addressing.

Chair – the original motion carries. ESC will develop a formal directive to circulate among ESC members and provided to Dallas before sending back to the MIT committee.

C. Kelley – Changing standards and notifying people out in the field still needs to be addressed in general.



The AARST Consortium on National Radon Standards

standards@aarst.org

Fax: 1-913-780-2090

G. Hodgden – There will be a recirculation ballot so that everyone is given opportunity to change their vote.

P. Daniels – Moved to recirculate ballot.

Chair – Notifications are sent out to the public on standards changes, but we will address improvements to this process.

P. Daniels – suggested motion to say ESC is going to review alarm requirements. This would calm down some issues.

J. Kerber – Made motion: ESC resolves to direct the mitigation committee to review the requirements for active alert monitors and address as appropriate. In addition, the ESC committee resolves to review and refine its notification process to ensure such that all stakeholders receive ample notification for implementation of standards revisions.

C. Kelley – Seconded the motion.

G. Hodgden – Took preliminary vote from ESC members. Ballot will be sent out via email.

Voting deadline – January 15, 2021.

Adjournment The next ESC committee meeting is to be determined.

Kyle Hoylman adjourned the meeting at 3:05 p.m. EST.

Minutes were respectfully rendered by Marilyn Patrick.

Corrections: Please forward any corrections to these minutes as soon as possible.

Notice of right to appeal (see Operating Procedures for Appeals): (2.1) Persons or representatives who have materially affected interests and who have been or will be adversely affected by any substantive or procedural action or inaction by AARST nation Radon Standards Committee(s), Committee Participant(s), or AARST have the right to appeal; (3.1) Appeals shall first be directed to the Committee responsible for the action or inaction.

Notice regarding unresolved objections: While the Committee seeks to resolve objections, please notify the Chair if you desire to recirculate any unresolved objections to the Committee for further consideration.