DWA Task Group on Lead
Draft Teleconference Summary
December 20, 2007

Participants

Lance Agness – Ford Meter Box	Pete Greiner – NSF International	Rick Sakaji – East Bay MUD
Jeff Baldwin – T&S Brass	Jeff Hebenstreit – UL	Mike Schock – EPA
Brian Bernados – CDPH	Dave Heumann – LADWP	Craig Selover – Masco
Jason Bourque – CIPH	Jeff Kempic – USEPA	Richard Sykes – East Bay MUD
Mike Briggs – IAPMO	Sarah Kozanecki – NSF International	Steve Tefft – AY McDonald
Nate Buzard – Viega	France Lemieux – Health Canada	Joe Wallace – AO Smith
Bill Chapin – CASH ACME	Shawn Martin – PMI	Bob Weed – CDA
Franco DiFolco – CSA	Clif McLellan – NSF International	Kevin Wong – CWQA
Merritt Gillilland – NSF International	Tom Palkon – WQA	Stu Yang – Kohler

S. Kozanecki read the antitrust statement and took roll call. L. Agness welcomed the new members. S. Kozanecki also reminded those who had been unable up to that point to log in to the new online balloting system to contact her for help logging in.

The task group reviewed the November meeting summary. L. Agness asked if there were any changes, but none were offered. The meeting summary was approved as written.

Q Statistic

P. Greiner gave a brief update of the sub-task group's progress. He stated that Leonora Marro (biostatistician, Health Canada) did an analysis of the Q statistic, which was reviewed at the last meeting. The analysis concluded that the Q statistic is effective in doing what it was designed to do; however, if nothing else changes, the number of samples required to demonstrate that a product line will meet the standard will need to increase. F. DiFolco has also submitted some additional data from an analysis done at CSA. The next meeting was not yet scheduled at that time.

Variability

C. McLellan asked the task group for approval to send to ballot the proposal that was discussed at the JC meeting in November. The ballot would change the following: in sections 4 and 8, for products with nominal diameter less than 3 inches, for metals testing at pH 10, triplicate samples will be required, which shall be pooled for analysis. L. Agness questioned why this was not also proposed for tests at pH 5. C. McLellan explained that pH 10 is usually the worst case for lead leaching, however M. Briggs suggested that pH 10 is not always the worst case, and therefore it would be prudent to also require triplicate for pH 5 and 8.

F. Lemieux asked why the water should be pooled for analysis. C. McLellan explained that if they were not pooled it would have to be decided whether all three must pass or if a geometric mean would be taken. If the latter, then he posed the question of what the advantage would be in doing three times the required analysis. M. Briggs added that it is statistically advantageous to use multiple samples. F. Lemiuex then asked if it was appropriate to test multiple samples of meters since they are typically only used once in a system. The group discussed whether product types that are only used once should remain tested as currently written.

The task group decided that: 1) the same proposal should apply also to pH 5 testing, and 2) the three products tested should be pooled for analysis.

C. McLellan was instructed to go forward with this ballot.

Acid Washed

C. Selover stated that there were no updates from this task group. He explained that there may be an issue related to the annex G proposal, but that he would wait to bring that up during the later discussion.

Extraction Water Chemistry - RFP

P. Greiner explained that a Request for Proposals (RFP) had been written to obtain data to help understand water chemistries across the U. S. in order to provide support for maintaining or changing the formula for the buffers used for testing to the standard. He stated that it had been finalized and has been sent to a water chemistry expert to be reviewed for practicality and to get an estimate on the cost. B. Weed explained that the analysis of the RFP was expected back in January. At that time, it will be reviewed again by the LTG.

Annex G

L. Agness reviewed the new charge to the task group, which was to review the new annex for low lead products and provide language to be balloted by June 30, 2008. He prefaced the discussion by saying that the goal was not to come up with any solutions today, but rather to outline the course of action and identify the factors that need to be discussed. He suggested that the first step was to define what the final outcome should be. The group agreed that they would begin using R. Sykes's proposal as a place to begin.

C. Selover informed the group that he had spoken with R. Sykes and R. Sakaji at East Bay MUD and had made some revisions to the proposed annex. This included language to address coatings, as he had been charged with addressing at the November LTG conference call. He explained that the language read such that permanent coatings would be considered the wetted surface if the durability of the coating is proven for the life of the product. He suggested that an accelerated test be constructed to test coatings, understanding that each coating may vary and be susceptible to different challenges such as waters with differing alkalinities or pHs. F. Lemieux asked if there were any existing protocols for testing the life of a coating, to which C. Selover responded that several protocols exist for plastic pipe where they are tested under extreme temperatures and pressures. He suggested that this might be a starting point. S. Kozanecki agreed to make C. Selover's proposal available to the task group online. B. Bernados questioned whether such a proposal would meet the needs of the California legislation, as there is no credence now given to coatings. He suggested that if read strictly, the addition of a coating does not change the lead content of the product. He also agreed to find out what the position of CDPH is on coatings.

L. Agness asked the group to determine whether any additional people were needed to be involved in the task group. R. Sykes suggested first identifying the issues that need to be discussed before determining who the right players are.

After some discussion, the group identified the following key points to facilitate further discussions as needed:

- calculation (origin, etc)
- where the percentage Pb information comes from
- barrier coatings and liners (inclusion or exclusion)
- acid-washing (inclusion or exclusion)
- references to product types inclusion/exclusion criteria
- location of annex (in NSF 61 or other)
- recruitment of additional members if needed
- marking requirements
- link to legislation
- nonmetal materials

The group then discussed whether any additional participants were needed. B. Bernados clarified his role at the CDPH for the benefit of the task group. He stated that he is part of the technical branch of CDPH, but was willing to be the liaison to get questions about legislation answered. L. Agness agreed that this would be helpful, as the LTG wants assurance that the work they are doing will be acceptable to the CDPH.

S. Martin raised the question of jurisdiction of the CDPH versus the California Building Commission (CBC). B. Bernados reiterated that the CDPH's jurisdiction does end at the meter box, and that the CBC are involved beyond that. He explained that he attempted to reach a contact at the CBC, but was told that if what the task group proposes agrees with the legislation, it would be accepted. S. Martin asked if B. Bernados's contact could participate or provide a letter stating this. B. Bernados was charged with recruiting someone from CBC to participate or to provide written assurance that the CBC will follow with what the CDPH finds acceptable. S. Martin

and R. Sykes agreed to help provide a contact at CBC. S. Martin suggested also contact Lynn Simnick from the Building Standards Commission.

The group began discussing whether the annex should be incorporated into NSF 61 or stand alone. B. Bernados reminded the task group that the California legislation references the CA Waterworks Standards, which in turn reference NSF 61. L. Agness also suggested that the task group keep in mind that NSF 61 is a national standard. R. Sykes stated that he proposed language that California would adopt whatever form of a document this task group puts forth.

When asked whether representatives from other states should be included, it was agreed that this would not be necessary unless other states began to adopt lead content standards. S. Martin stated that he would prefer not to encourage other states to do so, since this performance standard is already the best way of protecting public health.

C. Selover suggested a face-to-face meeting for the task group in the near future. L. Agness suggested one additional conference call prior to scheduling a face-to-face meeting. The next conference call was scheduled for January 9, 2008 from 2-3:30 pm EST.

Review of Action Items

- All task group members were encouraged to review C. Selover's proposal and make any comments on it before the next conference call.
- B. Bernados is to 1) determine CDPH's position on coatings, 2) recruit someone from the CBC or obtain written assurance of their agreement with the LTG approach.
- S. Kozanecki and C. McLellan are to ballot the proposal to address variability in testing at pH 10.