

**DWA Task Group on Lead  
Draft Teleconference Summary  
June 26, 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	Heumann, David – LADWP	Rick Sakaji – East Bay MUD
Tom Bowman – UL	Jeff Kempic – USEPA	Craig Selover – Masco
Mike Briggs – IAPMO	Sarah Kozanecki – NSF International	Steve Tefft – AY McDonald
George DeJarlais – Badger Meter	France Lemieux – Health Canada	Joe Wallace – AO Smith
Franco DiFolco – CSA	Tom Palkon – WQA	Bob Weed – CDA
Pete Greiner – NSF International	Sally Remedios – Delta	Kevin Wong – CWQA

S. Kozanecki read the antitrust statement and took roll call. L. Agness convened the meeting. He stated that the task group would follow the previous meeting's agenda for this teleconference.

**Review of the Joint Committee Ballot**

P. Greiner reviewed the status of the JC ballot with the task group. He stated that the responses to the negative comments had been sent and a response was requested by July 5, 2008. S. Kozanecki explained that some confusion on the ballot caused Julius Ballanco to cast a late vote, which was negative and needed a response. With his vote, 77% of the JC were in favor of the ballot. P. Greiner explained that the next step is to send an adjudication ballot to allow the Joint Committee to re-evaluate their vote in light of any of the negative votes that remain unchanged after July 5<sup>th</sup>. If the ballot still has at least a 2/3 approval, it could then move forward to the next stage of balloting at the Council of Public Health Consultants.

P. Greiner also explained that Version 9 of the Annex G was posted for review. The three changes included:

- clarification that certification to NSF/ANSI 61 would be required along with Annex G;
- removal of the reference to Richard Sykes in the example calculation; and
- addition/clarification of the rounding procedures to follow in Annex G.

**Update on Collaboration with California**

There were no updates at this time.

**Update on Vermont Legislation**

L. Agness stated that the legislation was posted to the Lead Task Group site on the NSF Online Workspace for reference. P. Greiner asked if the bill had been signed into law; L. Agness responded that it had. He added that it contained the same wording for lead content as the California law with the same effective date. It also included the requirement that anything with greater than 0.25% lead must include a warning and description of the risks of lead beginning in 2009.

**Q Statistic Update**

P. Greiner provided an update on the Q Statistic task group. He stated that F. DiFolco had pointed out that some of the geometric means of the Day 19 values for lead exceed the SPAC for lead (1.5 ug/L). This was brought to the Q statistic group as a factor to consider, but it was agreed that the Lead Task Group was a more appropriate place to discuss this.

F. DiFolco added that this means that if only the Q statistic is relied upon for lead, some products that have been found to exceed the SPAC would pass. He had previously assumed that passing the Q statistic implied that the product would prove to also pass the SPAC. However, this was not the case when data from a random sample of 65 faucets was analyzed. The data showed that 46% would fail if measured against the SPAC but are under the Q of 11; 22% would fail if only measured against the SPAC but have a Q value less than 5.

P. Greiner asked if F. DiFolco would recommend adding a requirement that, in addition to meeting the Q value maximum, the geometric mean results from the testing must also be less than the SPAC. F. DiFolco stated that

this approach is an option. He stated that alternatively, the group could review the data again to evaluate how often the Q is exceeded but the SPAC is met. P. Greiner stated that while on one hand it makes sense to try to reduce lead to the extent possible, on the other hand the group may find themselves bumping against the practical limits achievable. He stated that the task group should decide whether to pursue this given the upcoming changes and challenges that manufacturers are facing in lowering lead levels. F. DiFolco asked the task group to consider whether they are comfortable with products passing that exceed the SPAC for lead on Day 19. C. Selover stated that he was comfortable with it because it is well-known that section 9 products are the major contributors and section 9 only looks at the first draw dosage.

D. Heumann mentioned that the Lead and Copper rule is under revision. J. Kempic stated that some short-term revisions were completed in 2007 and that now the longer-term revisions are being looked at. However, there will be no immediate changes to the action levels. J. Kempic recommended keeping this issue in mind for the future. He opined that because the two methods are not a direct comparison, there is no need to revise the standard at this time. The task group generally agreed to keep an eye on this issue for the future.

### **Extraction Water Chemistries**

P. Greiner stated that the task group had met and reviewed the status of an AWWARF project and that TZW had put a proposal that addresses a number of the task group's goals. The task group will be continuing to review the progress of the project.

### **Next Steps**

- 1) Draft responses to Ballanco comments and post for additional comments
- 2) Send adjudication ballot and second revision with changes to language

**The next conference call is scheduled for August 28, 2008 from 2-3:30 pm (provided that the Annex G ballot at the CPHC is complete by that time).**