

**DWA Task Group on Lead
Draft Teleconference Summary
February 20, 2008**

This document is part of the NSF International Standards process and is for NSF Committee uses only. It shall not be reproduced, or circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF activities, except with the approval of NSF.

Participants

Lance Agness – Ford Meter Box – CHAIR	David Heumann – LADWP	Craig Selover – Masco
Jeff Baldwin – T&S Brass	Jeff Kempic – USEPA	Richard Sykes – East Bay MUD
Brian Bernados – CDPH	Sarah Kozanecki – NSF International	Steve Tefft – AY McDonald
Mike Briggs – IAPMO	France Lemieux – Health Canada	Jim Wailes – AWWA
Nate Buzard – Viega	Shawn Martin – PMI	Joe Wallace – AO Smith
Bill Chapin – CASH ACME	Lee Mercer – Moen	Bob Weed – CDA
Franco DiFolco – CSA	Tom Palkon – WQA	Kevin Wong – CWQA
Larry Gillanders – ACE DuraFlo	Sally Remedios – Delta	Gary Yamamoto – CDPH
Pete Greiner – NSF International	Rick Sakaji – East Bay MUD	
Jeff Hebenstreit – UL	Mike Schock – USEPA	

S. Kozanecki read the antitrust statement and took roll call. L. Agness convened the meeting.

Extraction Water Chemistry

P. Greiner stated that the analysis of the RFP by HDR had been received with comments and a cost analysis along with options on how to proceed. He stated that the subtask group aims to meet later to discuss the analysis.

Water Erosion Report

L. Agness pointed out that at the last meeting, the group had not had time to discuss the water erosion report provided by S. Tefft. S. Tefft stated that he provided the report as a follow-up to a conversation the task group had had on the effects of debris on pumps and pipes. The report was intended to be a reference. The results reported were from a test run with 2% sand by weight using a 10-gpm pump. He explained that figure 3 in the report showed the results after 10 minutes. Figure 4 shows the effects on the intake of the brass housing.

P. Greiner stated while that this demonstrates the removal of the surface coating, it is difficult to put into the correct perspective. Based on the material loss reported, the stainless steel shaft would entirely abrade away in less than one day. Pete confirmed that durability tests are important, but felt they need to be designed with requirements that meet the intent.

Lead Content Criteria (Annex G)

C. Selover had posted a document giving rationale for coating durability testing. He stated that he is looking for comments or questions from the task group. None were offered.

L. Agness stated that many comments were submitted regarding the location of the lead content criteria. R. Sakaji questioned whether it was the task group's decision to make. L. Agness clarified that ultimately the JC would make the decision; however, the task group is to make a recommendation to the JC. L. Agness explained that there was significant support for including the criteria outside of NSF/ANSI 61; however, the task group had heard from California DPH that it would not serve California outside of the standard.

Gary Yamamoto confirmed this position. He stated that while CDPH did not sponsor the legislation, it is now the law and California must comply by 2010. Several issues had been brought up by individual companies requesting guidance on how to meet the law. G. Yamamoto explained that the quickest solution is through NSF/ANSI 61 as was proposed. He also explained that the CDPH does not have the authority to write regulations for products beyond the water meters. If the regulatory channels were used to solve the issue at hand, he explained that the process would take on a similar shape as it is now taking, but would be more difficult to get in place. He also confirmed for the group that if the document that this group develops does not conflict with the law, it would be acceptable.

S. Martin reiterated that additional assurance of California's support would be needed for PMI's comfort level to be increased, especially from the California Building Standards Commission (BSC), who has the jurisdiction over products downstream from the water meter. C. Selover offered that he was making forward progress with getting a representative from the BSC to participate in the task group and added that he hoped the individual would be able to join on the next conference call. The group discussed the information transfer between CDPH and BSC in California.

G. Yamamoto explained that CDPH is under obligation to forward the standard to BSC when adopted, and it is expected that whatever is addressed in Annex G will be included in that information. P. Greiner stated that the group had been previously told that if any questions on public health arose and the appropriateness of the standard questioned, input from CDPH would be sought. He suggested that it might be beneficial to be proactive and make an endorsement up front.

The prospect of developing the lead content criteria into a separate standard was then brought up. C. Selover stated that he had concern about separating these criteria due to the familiarity of NSF/ANSI 61. S. Martin pointed out that it is the current responsibility of plumbing inspectors to stay updated on markings and standards. C. Selover explained that there are also bills in VT, MA, and WA proposing similar laws. G. Yamamoto pointed out that both the existing performance requirements of NSF/ANSI 61 and the lead content criteria would be needed, so the question was whether the new standard would have to duplicate those performance criteria. M. Schock stated that he had envisioned NSF/ANSI 61 required across the board and only where needed would the composition standard be used in addition.

G. Yamamoto posited that if the requirements were put in another standard, the utilities would not be any closer to a solution since the water works standards currently require compliance with NSF/ANSI 61. S. Martin argued that the water works standards would still need to be updated since Annex G would have to be specified. He stated that the latest version of the standard referenced by the water works standards is the 2005 publication. P. Greiner added that the important thing to realize is that a recognizable mechanism that is needed.

The question was also asked of the California DPH whether there would be any problem with the acceptance of Annex G since it is proposed to be an informative, rather than a normative, annex. G. Yamamoto stated that he was not aware of any problem with the informative nature of the standard. He also informed the task group that if/when Annex G is incorporated, CDPH will pass that along as a recommendation to BSC to incorporate. He was unaware of any history of the BSC rejecting a CDPH recommendation. When asked if the group could get a letter in writing, G. Yamamoto agreed to look into doing so, but cautioned that it may be difficult because of the nature of working within the governmental processes.

S. Martin mentioned that the group had previously discussed whether the JC's input would be valuable to the process of deciding where the content criteria should be included. C. Selover posited that the task group should try to make a recommendation since it was charged to the group to do so. A poll was taken of the task group members present: the group was asked whether, based on the conversation so far and the pro/con arguments provided by task group members, they would vote to include the lead content requirements as part of NSF/ANSI 61. Of the TG members who were voting members on the JC at that time, only one out of 9 said no, and one abstained. When the rest of the task group was polled, there were 11 in favor and 11 opposed with 4 abstentions. L. Agness clarified that although he voted against including the requirements in NSF/ANSI 61, he still felt it was important to do. Others agreed. G. Yamamoto stated that if it were agreed that this would not be included in NSF/ANSI 61, he would need to discuss the other possibilities with NSF.

The next meeting was scheduled for March 10, 2008 from 2-3:30 pm EST.