

## ISSC COMMITTEE REPORT

---

### Depuration/Wet Storage Committee

Date: August 3, 2003

Chair: Bob Croonenberghs

---

#### August 2003 Committee Meeting Attendees:

Bob Croonenberghs, Lori Howell, Walter Canzonier, Austin Doctor, Dan Leonard, John Mullem, Joe Murphy, Gary Wolfe,, FDA, Al Rainosek, NOAA

#### 2001 – 2003 Committee Charges:

1. Provide recommendations to the 2003 Task Force II in Portland, Oregon on Proposal 01-206 Depuration Process Verification.
2. Provide recommendations to the 2003 Task Force II in Portland, Oregon on Proposal 01-220 UV Bulb Change in Recirculating Wet Storage (moved from Processing and Handling).
3. Provide recommendations to the 2003 Task Force II in Portland, Oregon on Proposal 01-221 Wet Storage Quality in Artificial Bodies of Water.

#### Charge 1:

Proposal 01-206

Findings: (Opinion of the Committee as to the validity of the problem.)

- 1a. The committee had mixed opinions as to whether there was a problem. The discussion addressed a number of interrelated issues. It was mentioned that there are other controls in place to assure that the approved area shellfish are not contaminated by the system itself. It was also noted that the risk assessment done by the previous depuration/wet storage committee did not identify shellfish from approved areas as a hazard and therefore are not a critical control point. There was discussion about the line between product enhancement, wet storage and depuration.

Conclusions: (Opinion of the Committee as to whether the proposed action is appropriate.)

- 1b. The committee essentially did not reach consensus, as the vote was four for the proposal and four against it. The chair cast the deciding vote.

Recommendations: (Include recommended language of submitter or amended languages of the committee, no action, or other action deemed appropriate by the committee.)

- 1a. NO ACTION. The issue is already adequately addressed in the Model Ordinance in Chapter XV .02 L (1) and XV.03 L (2).

#### Charge 2:

Proposal 01-220

Findings: (Opinion of the Committee as to the validity of the problem.)

- 2a. The committee agreed that requiring four sets of tests when the UV bulbs are changed could serve as a disincentive to proper maintenance; that new bulbs are rarely defective; that generally bulb replacement leads to added public health protection and should be encouraged.

Conclusions: (Opinion of the Committee as to whether the proposed action is appropriate.)

- 2a. The requested action is appropriate.

Recommendations: (Include recommended language of submitter or amended languages of the committee, no action, or other action deemed appropriate by the committee.)

- 2a. Adopt the proposal as written.
- 2b. Consider a new issue that may address any issues raised by single bulb systems.

**Charge 3:**

Proposal 01-221

Findings: (Opinion of the Committee as to the validity of the problem.)

- 3a. Several states have experienced questions regarding the status of shellstock that have been in process when bacteriological testing shows the presence of coliform. The Model Ordinance is silent as to the status and disposition of such shellstock.

Conclusions: (Opinion of the Committee as to whether the proposed action is appropriate.)

- 3a. The proposal, as submitted, was not adequate to address the problem. The committee had a lengthy discussion regarding the issue and developed an amended proposal reflecting a minor wording change and a decision tree.

Recommendations: (Include recommended language of submitter or amended languages of the committee, no action, or other action deemed appropriate by the committee.)

- 3a. Adopt proposal as amended. See attached.
- 3b. Request that attachment be adopted as interim guidance with an implementation date of October 1, 2003.

---

**Recorder: Lori Howell**

**Report Approved By: Bob Croonenberghs**