DWA Task Group on Lead
Draft Teleconference Summary
January 16, 2008

Participants

Jeff Baldwin – T&S Brass	Lisa Donahue – EPA	Shawn Martin – PMI
Brian Bernados – CDPH	Pete Greiner – NSF International	Clif McLellan – NSF International
Jason Bourque – CIPH	Jeff Hebenstreit – UL	Sally Remedios – Delta
Mike Briggs – IAPMO	Dave Heumann – LADWP	Craig Selover – Masco
Nate Buzard – Viega	Jeff Kempic – USEPA	Richard Sykes – East Bay MUD
Bill Chapin – CASH ACME	Sarah Kozanecki – NSF International	Steve Tefft – AY McDonald
Franco DiFolco – CSA	France Lemieux – Health Canada	Kevin Wong – CWQA

S. Kozanecki read the antitrust statement and took roll call. P. Greiner convened the meeting on behalf of task group chair L. Agness, who could not make the call.

Review of Lead Content Proposal (Annex G)

P. Greiner stated that he created two revisions, both posted to the Standards Workspace. He explained that the first one contained the revisions that were discussed during the last meeting (v2) and the other included those and some additional changes (v3). The changes were highlighted by the meeting agenda.

P. Greiner walked the group through the proposed changes in the v2 noting first that it was not his intention to eliminate any of the requirements in section 3.2 rather, simplify the document being drafted by only including the areas of text being changed (question had been posed by C. Selover on this). He went on to explained the three exceptions to the disallowance of lead as an intentional additive in section 3.5, which were 1) brass/bronze products, 2) where trace amounts are present as functional additives in probes, and 3) where the diluted surface area is less than 0.0001 in^2/L. J. Kempic commented that the reference to the Safe Drinking Water Act did not need the 1986 revision reference.

P. Greiner then walked the group through the proposed changes in the third revision. He asked that the group review the formula for the calculation he added to the annex. He also stated that he added a new section (G.4) to initiate discussion on determining the lead content of materials. The proposal included the following points:

1) If a range for lead content was given, the calculation would be done using the material maximum specification.

This was agreed to by the group. There were some suggestions that if the manufacturer demonstrates that the material they are using is produced to a lower maximum than normally specified for an alloy then that maximum should be able to be used. It was also asked if the lead percentage was to be determined by chemical testing or by the material specification. P. Greiner stated that it was his understanding that the proponents were anticipating that it would not require testing, rather the percent lead would be determined by the specification. Richard Sykes confirmed that was their intent and that questions about the material used in actual production be addressed through the normal QA at the production facility and confirmation by the certifier on an ongoing basis. Relative to the maximum lead content of a material, C. Selover pointed out that information provided in section 3.2 is used here and that if this there were a restricted alloy content then the right maximum lead content should simply be stated there. S. Martin asked if the lead content pertained to the alloy or the finished part (and where on the finished part). He asked that this be addressed and not left to certifiers, which could result in substantial variation.

2) Addressed use of liners and coatings.

S. Martin stated that liners is a broad term that could include coatings and sleeves, which can be adhered or sealed to the inside of a product. The group discussed what the requirements should be for sealing and agreed that since the idea is that the liner prevents water contact with the leaded material, 100% of water contact must be prevented. R. Sykes suggested that the language read something to the effect of “sealed with a liner preventing water contact.” P. Greiner agreed to add this to the next revision. S. Martin asked why coatings and liners are being treated independently. He argued that if something prevents water contact from the leaded material, there should only be one set of requirements. If left in this manner, certifiers could determine

whether permanence and/or lifetime efficacy needs to be addressed. P. Greiner stated that he believes liners are of lower concern, and R. Sykes agreed.

During the discussion of coatings, it was noted that the evaluation approach and criteria for evaluating durability might not be appropriate for all products covered by the annex. Based on having only received input to date on plumbing products it was suggested that the criteria would be relevant only to faucets. C. McLellan stated that he often does see coatings and platings used on products outside of Section 9. He again questioned whether platings were considered coatings. R. Sykes pointed out that products outside of section 9 have long lives, and therefore coatings may not be a plausible solution. P. Greiner suggested the protocol could also cover Section 8 "inline devices" typically installed downstream of the water meter which was agreeable to a number in the group. P. Greiner further suggested that a note or section be added stating that the requirements for establishing durability of the other product types covered by the annex needs to be established prior to taking into consideration coatings used on them. This would need someone to champion if there is interest in developing it. A suggestion was made to surveying section 8 product manufacturers regarding their interest. P. Greiner stated that he would draft something and make it available to other certifiers as well for this purpose.

P. Greiner stated that C. Selover had made a proposal for G.4.2 that could replace what he had drafted. C. Selover explained his proposal. B. Bernados asked for further explanation of the table. P. Greiner stated that the table was not complete as shown, as it did not include the details of the buffer solutions used to make up the waters and agreed to insert the full table in its place. The group continued discussing the scope of the section pertaining to coatings. It was determined that additional work was needed on a durability test protocol.

3) Placeholder to address the issue of lead removal technologies

P. Greiner stated that he had inserted some language as a placeholder only. R. Sykes stated that he would prefer only the first paragraph of the proposal. For now, it was agreed that this needed further development, but would be left until someone could address the issue with more expertise. B. Bernados reminded the group that this is not addressed by the statute and is therefore a gray area.

B. Bernados asked about the AWWA Journal article that discussed the extraction water chemistry used by NSF 61. P. Greiner noted that this had been the topic of several conference calls both before and after the article was published. This had also been discussed at the JC.

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 by week's end.
- All – review calendars relative to setting a date for a potential face-to-face meeting in Sacramento.

The group agreed to meet again before scheduling a face-to-face meeting. The next conference call is scheduled for January 25th from 2-3:30 pm EST.