VI   Issue Papers

F. Lead in schools task group update (DWA-61-2018-9)

1st Motion: Disband the current task group. M. Schock motioned; D. Heumann seconded.

Vote: All in favor.

Motion passed.

Discussion: M. Schock provided an update on the status of the DWA task group on lead in schools. This task group was formed in 2017 from an issue paper he submitted entitled “Evaluation of products used in schools” (DWA-61-2017-5). He had reported that there was a sense of urgency to address this due to school and daycare center lead sampling by many states and cities. The task group was charged with considering the implementation of a special higher-stringency certification level for products to be used in schools, day care centers, and for consumers desiring the additional level of protection. After an initial review of NSF’s data on their experience with product testing for lead release, review of the original Battelle document describing the derivation of the Q-value, and discussions on the EPA’s 3T’s sampling protocol, several possible options for tightening the current NSF/ANSI 61 section 9 protocol were considered. In November 2018 a straw poll was sent out to all task group participants for their feedback on the following proposed options:

Option 1: Maintain current NSF 61 test protocol, but lower Q criterion from 5 µg to 1 µg for all products;

Option 2: Maintain current NSF 61 test protocol and Q = 5 µg but add voluntary option for certification to lower Q = 1 µg [ for school and day care uses];

Option 3: Option to require the average Pb release of test samples to be at or below 3 µg on Day 3 for sensitive applications;

Option 4: Require compliance with both Q = 1 µg and evaluation on Day 3;

Option 5: Keep current NSF 61, and create a new standard with same test protocol but criterion of 1 µg on Day 3; or

Option 6: Favor some other specific approach and make recommendations in comments.
M. Schock stated that participants were asked to indicate whether each option was acceptable, potentially acceptable (with TG to refine language for balloting), needed more study and/or field data, or not acceptable.

M. Schock reported that most support (among voters) was for a voluntary certification to a more stringent Q value. There was a nearly even split for shortening the test to 3 days and using an intermediate Q value (3) for sensitive applications. He noted that no voter found the 3-day test with Q = 3 “Not acceptable.”

M. Schock stated that it was recognized that NSF’s data doesn’t necessarily statistically represent the distribution of products in the market, and a call was made for similar data from all other certifiers. F. Lemieux reported that despite repeated requests, no other certifier or manufacturer has brought forth data. J. Kenzdel asked for feedback from the rest of the participating certifiers. D. Heumann stated that he too, would welcome more data. J. Ballanco stated that as a consultant, he didn’t get permission to share data from his clients, even anonymously. D. Frederick stated that he had responded directly to M. Schock on UL’s information. K. Licko stated that she could not speak for WQA in this case, but to the point made during the Table 3.1 discussion, it’s an extremely labor-intensive task and will take a lot of resources to compile this information. G. Lai pointed out that certifiers may have signed a confidentially agreement, but it would possible to use the data without disclosing companies or locations. F. Lemieux agreed. She added that the task group did the best it could with the data available. It may not be entirely representative of the market, but it was a large amount of data and it’s what the JC has available to use going forward.

B. Rogers noted that when the straw poll was conducted it had to do with the Q-value that had to currently meet level of 5 µg, not 3 µg. She suggested that the task group may want to look at valves, stops, etc. as well. M. Schock agreed that it should apply to section 8 products as well to look at the whole picture.

The group discussed option 3 of the straw ballot. P. Greiner raised the question of whether this would be an additional optional requirement or mandatory. One of things that NSF did not demonstrate with the data was the fact that products that don’t exceed 3 µg on Day 3 may still fail the overall test. It can be used as an additional screening tool, however. Several members of the group stated that the way option 3 is worded is confusing. It is not clear if this proposal is meant to be an additional, but optional requirement for manufacturers who chose a higher-stringency certification level for products, or a new mandatory requirement to be added to the existing protocol. F. Lemieux stated that her understanding was that the intent was to consider an additional option for manufacturers, not a mandatory requirement. It was noted that the JC can limit the charge of the task group to consider only a new optional requirement or leave it open for the task group to come back to the JC with recommendations either way.

**2nd Motion:** Form new task group to consider option 3: an additional, optional requirement for the average lead release of test samples to be at or below 3 µg on Day 3 for sensitive applications. D. Heumann motioned; J. Ballanco seconded.

**Vote:** 24 in favor; 2 opposed (G. DeJarlais and M. Sigler)

**Motion passed.**

**TG members:** J. Ballanco (chair); K. Foster; M. Sigler; T. Reski; C. Haldiman; J. Kempic; C. McLellan; L. Muller; K. Licko; B. Rogers; T. Palkon; A. Kireta; T. Steissman; B. Bernadas; E. Betanzo; S. Chen; A. Batog; D. Tyner; B. Hatton; J. Kendzel; S. Somo

**3rd Motion:** Form a task group to consider option 2: maintain the current NSF 61 test protocol and Q = 5 µg but add a voluntary option for certification to lower Q = 1 µg for sensitive populations. M. Schock motioned; B. Bernados seconded.
**Discussion:** P. Greiner suggested that there may be overlap between the work and ultimate recommendations from the two task groups. M. Schock agreed and requested to amend his original motion to add the charge of option 2 to the task group formed to address option 3.

**Amendment to 3rd Motion:** Add the consideration of option 2 to the task group charged with investigating option 3. M. Schock motioned; B. Bernados seconded.

**Vote:** All in favor.

**Motion passed.**

**Additional TG members:** M. Schock (co-chair with J. Ballanco); R. Koch; J. Wallace; B. Hatton; G. Morgan