

**DWA Task Group on Lead
Draft Teleconference Summary
January 9, 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	Jeff Hebenstreit – UL	Rick Sakaji – East Bay MUD
Jeff Baldwin – T&S Brass	Dave Heumann – LADWP	Craig Selover – Masco
Brian Bernados – CDPH	Jeff Kempic – USEPA	Richard Sykes – East Bay MUD
Jason Bourque – CIPH	Sarah Kozanecki – NSF International	Steve Tefft – AY McDonald
Mike Briggs – IAPMO	France Lemieux – Health Canada	Joe Wallace – AO Smith
Nate Buzard – Viega	Shawn Martin – PMI	Jim Wailes – AWWA
Bill Chapin – CASH ACME	Clif McLellan – NSF International	Bob Weed – CDA
Franco DiFolco – CSA	Lee Mercer – Moen	Kevin Wong – CWQA
Pete Greiner – NSF International	Tom Palkon – WQA	

S. Kozanecki read the antitrust statement and took roll call. L. Agness convened the meeting. He asked the task group if there were any changes for the December meeting summary, and none were offered. The December meeting summary was approved as written.

Q Statistic

P. Greiner stated that the Q statistic had not met since the December meeting due to the holidays. A meeting will likely be scheduled during the last two weeks of January.

Variability

There was no update on this issue. S. Kozanecki reminded the group that they had approved the language for ballot during the last meeting. It will likely be sent to the Joint Committee in January.

Extraction Water Chemistry - RFP

P. Greiner explained that the analysis on the Request for Proposals (RFP) has not been completed, but is expected during the month. When it is received, it will again be brought to the task group for additional follow up.

Annex G

L. Agness asked C. Selover to review his proposal with the task group. C. Selover explained that he added a few changes to the proposal as originally submitted by East Bay MUD to address inclusion/exclusion issues as well as coatings. The first addition of language was to section 3, which came from the statute. He expressed concern about products not included in Annex G (because they were not included in the statute). To address this, he suggested that these types of products should not be required to meet the requirements of NSF/ANSI 61. He added a reference to Annex G in sections 4, 8, and 9 to clarify this. R. Sykes indicated that he was concerned over the term “weighted average,” which he proposed deleting from the revision. It was agreed that this could be removed without changing the intended meaning.

C. Selover explained that there was some concern from plumbing manufacturers about the language in G.2, Scope, in requiring a product with no lead to be certified to this lead content requirement. P. Greiner asked why any specific products should be specified since there is no authoritative source (the statute is silent on product types). He argued that from a certifier's standpoint, that was not necessary. As a solution, he proposed language to be added to section 3 to note that products being evaluated to a lead content standard should be evaluated to Annex G (in replacement of the individual points in sections 4, 8, and 9 that specify this). B. Bernados and B. Chapin agreed that this was a good approach. C. Selover also agreed that this was appropriate. The group discussed whether addressing this point in the certifiers' policies was sufficient.

C. Selover explained that even those products that are assumed to have no lead will still be required to meet the extraction requirements of NSF 61, and therefore the formulation information would be disclosed. He stated that his hope was that if it is verified that there is no lead in a product it would not be required to go through the lead content calculation as proposed in Annex G. P. Greiner suggested that if regulators or users it could be assured that non-metallic products certified to NSF 61 did not have lead, then that may alleviate the need for evaluation (and marking) for compliance with this annex. To achieve this, he proposed that the standard be updated to

include a requirement restricting the use of lead as an “intentional additive”. P. Greiner explained that products with lead as an intentional additive would be excluded at the formulation review stage; therefore, if this requirement were added to the standard, it would simplify the concern about non-metallic products since it would be assured that product of this type did not contain lead simply by the fact that it is certified. Products are still tested under NSF 61 to verify compliance with of lead extractions requirements. P. Greiner suggested that this lead restriction requirement be added to Section 3 of NSF 61 and that the language in G.2 be rephrased so that it only applies to metallic products. He also stated that this is in line with NSF certification policies in place for several decades so it should not affect any manufacturers certified with NSF. C. Selover asked for confirmation from the other product certifiers that this would be reasonable. There were no objections. The representatives from California also agreed that this met their need. P. Greiner agreed to update the draft language to reflect this change.

The group was reminded that they were still looking for someone from the California Building Standards Commission (BSC) to get involved in the task group’s activities. M. Briggs pointed out that they have adopted the UPC, which does specify that products must comply with NSF 61. However, C. Selover stated that the question is whether they will still stand by it after these changes are made. R. Sykes agreed to try to communicate with someone from the BSC and share the draft with them. S. Martin stated that it would be best if someone from the BSC could be involved on the task group. R. Sykes, R. Sakaji, B. Bernados, M. Briggs, K. Wong, and S. Martin all agreed to try to find a contact that could be recruited to participate. P. Greiner agreed to make the changes to the draft by the week’s end so that it could be provided to the BSC.

C. Selover stated that the issue of coatings still needed resolution. He pointed out that he added some language pertaining to coatings as they relate to this requirement. Prior to the meeting, he circulated additional background information supporting the use of coatings. B. Bernados asked how the 15-20 year faucet life was determined. C. Selover answered that the National Association of Home Builders (NAHB) conducted a survey with the largest U. S. faucet manufacturers to get that information. He agreed to provide a copy of that to the task group. P. Greiner stated that it would be desirable to provide as much specificity on how to determine the durability of a coating as possible. C. Selover stated that he made a suggestion in another document (on coatings) based on the research done by M. Schock in 1988. He stated that the question is whether those water chemistries evaluated are still valid representatives. He suggested that some testing might be in order; however, he pointed out that this could be a continuing action item that would not have to hold up the progress of the remainder of the proposal. The group discussed some of the potential testing that could be done, from accelerated flow to lifecycle, and challenges to the barriers. P. Greiner asked if it seemed practical to limit the amount of surface area permitted to be coated. B. Chapin stated that brass is itself is relatively corrosion resistant material and coatings are not normally needed or used (at least for valves). C. Selover confirmed that they are used in Section 9 devices. C. McLellan stated that he has seen some products come for testing where the entire interior was coated.

The group then discussed the issue of acid washing. L. Mercer posited that acid washing is equally effective to coatings and should be permitted. He pointed out that testing could be done to verify that the removal process was effective over the life a product. R. Sykes stated that it was not the intent to allow acid washing and that he would rather not presume that this is a viable way to meet annex G. He stated that he was more comfortable with eliminating the contaminant so that the concern about leaching is also eliminated. L. Mercer pointed out that this logic would also exclude coatings. However, R. Sykes stated that he was more comfortable with the level of quality control to assure the effectiveness of coatings. He stated that the law interpreted literally would preclude acid washing. S. Martin pointed out that the law assumes that the metal products are homogenous, which is not the case. B. Bernados could only comment that the CDPH did not have a position on coatings at the time. Discussion continued on both coatings and acid washing. It was reiterated that regardless of what technologies were included, all products would also have to meet the extraction requirements of NSF 61. It was expressed that coatings, platings, and acid washes are being used to meet lower lead requirements. However, no agreement or conclusion was reached about the effectiveness of any of these technologies or whether they should be allowed under annex G.

Review of Action Items

- Recruit a participant from the California BSC. (R. Sykes, R. Sakaji, B. Bernados, M. Briggs, K. Wong, S. Martin)
- P. Greiner – revise draft language.
- C. Selover – circulate NAHB study to task group.
- Circulate the 1988 Mike Schock research on extraction waters.

The group agreed to meet again before scheduling a face-to-face meeting. The next conference call is scheduled for January 16th from 2-3:30 pm EST.

