

STEERING COMMITTEE TELECONFERENCE MEETING SUMMARY
ETV DRINKING WATER SYSTEMS CENTER
February 16, 2005

A Steering Committee (SC) teleconference was held on Wednesday, February 16, 2005 to discuss two proposed future initiatives of the Environmental Technology Verification (ETV) Drinking Water Systems (DWS) Center. Guidance from SC members was requested during the teleconference meeting. The meeting commenced at 10:05 AM EST. Bruce Bartley, the DWS Center Manager, began by welcoming the group and thanked everyone for their participation in the ETV DWS Center over the last ten years. Below is a list of attendees:

Attendees:

Adams, Jeff – U.S. EPA/Office of Research and Development (ORD)
Bartley, Bruce – NSF International
Beach, Angela – NSF International
Bielanski, Jenny – U.S. EPA/Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water (OGWDW)
Blumenstein, Michael – NSF International
Brown, Kevin – Utah Department of Environment Quality (DEQ)
Corson, Matt – Association of State Drinking Water Administrators (ASDWA)
Dyson, John – Ondeo Degremont and Water and Wastewater Equipment Manufacturers Association (WWEMA)
Jacangelo, Joe – MWH (company formerly known as Montgomery Watson Harza)
Logsdon, Gary – formerly of Black & Veatch
Pearson, David – PCI Membrane Systems Ltd. (ITT Aqueous)
Pistorious, Rick – Smith & Loveless, Inc.
Wilhelm, Kristie – NSF International

To begin the call, Bruce requested each attendee's opinions on the two initiatives identified in the attached concept paper emailed to the group last week, which included:

- Privatization of ETV by NSF through the use of a Cooperative Research and Development Agreement (CRADA) or through a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the EPA.
- Providing NSF Equipment Performance Reports that include a compilation of existing (historical) data and QA/QC reviews of the data.

The attendees were given an opportunity to share their thoughts based on the order of joining the conference call.

David Pearson: ETV has been a lever for PCI to install at least five new treatment systems based on the ETV report generated about five years ago from verification testing in Barrow, Alaska. Mr. Pearson felt that the end-user [the state] was 'more relaxed' about site specific testing when ETV data was available. These installations have generated over \$1M in sales for PCI over the last four years and given the cost of ETV testing (~\$25,000), has been a good return on their investment.

Two drawbacks of ETV testing include the fact that not all states fully accept ETV reports and that the cost of verification testing can be high. The use of existing data in the ETV reports could also have an added benefit.

Jenny Bielanski: This was Ms. Bielanski's first meeting as a new member of the Steering Committee. The concept paper provided a good overview of the DWS Center and she is pleased with the focus and effort of the DWS Center. From her perspective, there needs to be a continued effort to help support and

fund testing of treatment systems for small systems. She agrees with the proposed initiatives and would like to help to work toward continued support from the U.S. EPA's ORD.

Rick Pistorious : Mr. Pistorious filled in for Jim Bell for the conference call. Mr. Pistorious was in agreement with the comments made by Mr. Pearson and added that Smith & Loveless is a small company with limited funds for extensive verification testing. He added that existing data reviews would be a great asset to them and to other small companies, if costs were kept at a minimum.

Matt Corson: This was Mr. Corson's first meeting with the Steering Committee; he replaced Bridget O'Grady. ASDWA recently performed an informal survey of the states to obtain their thoughts and opinions of possible future initiatives of the DWS Center. Over half of the states replied to the survey and almost every state felt that the ETV program had been and would continue to be 'useful' or 'somewhat useful' and would be disappointed if the program were to fold. Most states also felt that continuation of verification testing could reduce states costs and activities for states, especially for small systems. He added that the states wanted to see more unbiased data about equipment limitations or failures.

Gary Logsdon: The drawbacks of the testing costs are understandable; however, the nature of field verification testing is expensive and the cost of ETV testing is not higher than other typical field tests. The use of existing data could be one way to possibly reduce testing costs. Another opportunity would be to use existing installations and the data submitted to the state for regulatory compliance; however, raw water data may be lacking in that case. A secondary source could be the use of a third party (e.g., consulting firms) to collect raw water data and to review QA/QC data. He puts most of his hopes in the use of existing installations that are reporting compliance data to the states, for the NSF equipment performance reports.

Joe Jacangelo: The success of ETV has been varied to different participants; some involved in the program have found ETV very useful while others have expressed limitations and the need for more site-specific tests. Testing costs have always been an issue and the use of existing data could be most helpful in terms of reducing the costs. What is the cost of evaluating existing data? Mr. Jacangelo suggested the use of an ad hoc mechanism for review of historical data to reduce upfront, overhead costs and so that a formal working procedure could then be set up after determining the level of interest in the program.

Kevin Brown: Mr. Brown agreed with the comments made, including those by Mr. Logsdon and finds the idea of looking at current installations of great value, if source water data could also be obtained. He added that the new presidential budget has cut funding to the states and wondered if there were other organizations (e.g., AWWA, NRWA) that had available funding to support the initiatives.

John Dyson: Since his involvement from the beginning of the ETV Program, cost has always been the biggest hurdle to vendors. When supporting funds were available, vendors were more willing to participate. However, there seems to be a lack of state buy-in of ETV usefulness. In addition, it has also been a personal disappointment that existing data has not been used in ETV reports over the last ten years. Using existing installations would be beneficial to ETV so that a return on the vendor's investment is feasible and worthwhile. More manufacturers would probably want to use existing data because of the cost value.

After listening to the group's opinions on the proposed initiatives, Bruce Bartley followed-up by explaining that the DWS Center has heard about the limitations of one-time verification tests and the large costs (to vendors, as well as the EPA), as well as the need for the use of existing data. However, NSF has been unsuccessful in the attempts to influence the ETV policy on existing data. He expressed to Ms. Bielanski the need for the EPA to internally consider using existing installations and current compliance data for verification purposes. With the NSF report concept, it may be possible to gain support of other EPA groups (e.g., ORD, OGWDW, etc.) to provide a more inclusive report with existing data. It is also

possible for NSF to do audits, analyze raw water samples, and to provide QA/QC recommendations to current tests, as NSF currently is with Sandia National Lab.

Mr. Bartley then asked for any final thoughts about the initiatives. Everyone agreed with the comments made and a few additional comments were provided:

David Pearson: When looking into historical/existing data, international data is also available, in addition to U.S. data.

Jenny Bielanski: Ms. Bielanski added that she is willing to do some research internally at the U.S. EPA to encourage the use of existing installation data. The approval of an MOU would be a management call, but she is also willing to help initiate the discussion of an MOU.

Jeff Adams: In addition to other initiatives, existing data was addressed at levels in the U.S. EPA above the DWS Center and it was not able to be decided on a program level. Mr. Adams is willing to work with Mr. Bartley and Ms. Bielanski to see what programs or agreements can be worked out.

Gary Logsdon: Mr. Logsdon liked the idea of working with NRW to help with existing installation data collection because they have field personnel available to work directly with utilities. Bruce Bartley indicated that he would follow up with Jerry Biberstine on that front.

David Pearson also added that if there were more funding contributed by states, there would be more assurance and buy-in from vendors knowing that the states were in support of the program. Kevin Brown responded that due to state budget cuts, it would be better for NSF to seek alternative funding rather than seek funding from the states.

Bruce indicated that since the committee was in agreement with the two new initiatives, NSF will move forward with them. He indicated that the work NSF is doing with Sandia National Labs is a good learning opportunity for future work. In addition, NSF likes the idea of using an ad hoc mechanism to begin the initiative toward reviewing existing data and may provide some proposals to the group for review.

Bruce will be following up with Jeff Adams and Jenny Bielanski to discuss other means to have more EPA involvement in the NSF equipment evaluation report process.

Bruce thanked the group for participating and expressed hope that the attendees would continue to participate in the future.

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 AM.