

**DWA Task Group on Lead
Draft Teleconference Summary
March 10, 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	Tim Stessman – Kohler
Jeff Baldwin – T&S Brass	Sarah Kozanecki – NSF International	Steve Tefft – AY McDonald
Brian Bernados – CDPH	France Lemieux – Health Canada	Jim Wailes – AWWA
Jason Bourque – CIPH	Shawn Martin – PMI	Joe Wallace – AO Smith
Mike Briggs – IAPMO	Lee Mercer – Moen	Bob Weed – CDA
Nate Buzard – Viega	Tom Palkon – WQA	Kevin Wong – CWQA
Bill Chapin – CASH ACME	Sally Remedios – Delta	Gary Yamamoto – CDPH
Lisa Donahue – EPA	Mike Schock – USEPA	Stu Yang – Kohler
David Dunn – Cohesant	Craig Selover – Masco	
Pete Greiner – NSF International	Richard Sykes – East Bay MUD	

S. Kozanecki read the antitrust statement and took roll call.

P. Greiner stated that based on a request at the last meeting, copy of AB1953 and SB 1334 were placed on the task group's NSF Online Workspace (NOW). Also since the last meeting, R. Sykes provided a letter to the task group stating EBMUD's position on the use of coatings and acid washing. P. Greiner asked R. Sykes if he'd like to take a moment to explain the position.

R. Sykes explained that EBMUD was not of the opinion that AB1953 as enacted allowed for acid-washing or coatings to be considered in meeting requirements. He said that was the opinion of their legal department and was based in part by the bills language which includes "...the lead content within each component that comes into contact with water..." (key being the term "within each component"). He also indicated that this interpretation was shared with CDPH and that the opinion could be made available if the task group wished to see it. It was suggested that obtaining a written position from CDPH would help, especially in working with the California Building Standards Commission. B. Bernados explained again that to get something in writing from CDPH could take some time.

C. Selover stated that it seemed unreasonable to him that coatings would not be allowed as an option. R. Sykes explained that the issue is that it will take significant time to come up with reasonable evidence that coatings are effective. He suggested that the task group move forward with what they have as a short-term solution that will help everyone, and in the meantime, continue toward working on the inclusion of coatings. The group discussed whether they should move forward with what they have. K. Wong asked if there would be a placeholder in the language for coatings and acid-washes. P. Greiner read draft text he'd written that could be added as such a note. C. Selover opined that note language like that is better not in the standard, rather it should just contain items that pertain to the requirements currently in place. It was suggested that the proposed annex be updated without the draft requirements or placeholder text for this version. C. Selover and R. Sykes showed support for that idea.

S. Martin stated that EBMUD's interpretation was just that. He stated that there needed to be some definition by someone with authority from California. As he reminded the group, CDPH only has authority to the meter. Bill Chapin stated that the law is open for interpretation, but that it does not include performance requirements for durability of coatings. This will take an investment of time and effort to develop. M. Schock stated that these tertiary issues are, in his opinion, further argument for keeping the annex out of NSF/ANSI 61. S. Martin agreed and added that this should be added to the memo that will go to the Joint Committee for the straw ballot.

L. Mercer asked if the group had identified requirements for product identification and marking and all of the other things that the group previously identified that needed to be addressed. The group reviewed the list and the marking requirements was the only thing not yet addressed. P. Greiner pointed out that it was noted in G.1 that compliance to Annex G would be noted in the certification listings and should be discernable on the product marking. L. Mercer asked if a certificate of compliance would meet that requirement. Based on the response of the group, P. Greiner stated that he would revise the language in Annex G, Section G.1 to strike the second half of the sentence in that section.

C. Selover provided an update on contacting the BSC. He stated that they have a meeting scheduled for May 21, 2008, and that the lead content standard would be an issue on the agenda for the meeting. He also recommended putting a list of questions that the task group would like discussed, including what is acceptable to show compliance from a product-marking standpoint. He stated that it would also be beneficial to provide them with the history of this

issue. S. Martin added that they should be asked for their opinion on coatings and certification frequency. L. Mercer clarified that certification frequency was dependent upon the certification policies of the certifying agency, not the Standard.

The group then discussed the straw ballot, which will be used to get a sense of the JC's opinion on what the location of the content of Annex G should be. The contents will include the issue paper, draft language as it is written, and a note that the task group is divided on the issue. S. Martin suggested that the memo be explicit about where the task group has not reached consensus (coatings/acid-washes). P. Greiner assured the group that this would all be included. He asked if there were any comments on the cover memo language he had proposed. B. Bernados suggested a clarification to the third point to point out that NSF/ANSI 61 is currently referred to in the waterworks standards as this was incorporated the day prior to the meeting. He also suggested deleting the first sentence in that point. P. Greiner agreed to update the memo to state that the California waterworks standards refer to NSF/ANSI—2005 as of March 9, 2008.

The task group briefly discussed the issue of coatings. B. Bernados asked about using chlorine versus chloramine in the coatings test. C. Selover explained that different water chemistries would be variably aggressive for different coatings. B. Bernados expressed that rationale for how to pick test water would be helpful.

Action Items:

- C. Selover to actively pursue the involvement of BSC
- All: email questions/recommendation for the straw ballot cover memorandum to Pete (greinerp@nsf.org) or Sarah (kozanecki@nsf.org).
- C. Selover and S. Martin to work on task group/issue history and questions for BSC
- P. Greiner to update Annex G with changes as discussed

The next call was scheduled for April 8, 2008 from 2-3:30 pm EDT. At that time, the straw ballot period would be closed at the JC and the group will discuss the results.