

Table: Preliminary data on 12 water heaters at 10 child care centers

Year of Manufacture	City, State	LSL present?	Initial results (ppb)†	Post-flush (#1) results (ppb)†	Post-flush (#2) results (ppb)†
2003	Starkville, MS	Not likely	184 - 2,680	68.2	32.2 - 84.2
2010	Cincinnati, OH	Yes	294 - 774	4.2 – 8.9	N/A
2000	Chicago, IL	No	5 - 320	16	N/A
2007	Chicago, IL	Not likely	18 - 270	Data pending	N/A
2016-7?	Grand Rapids, MI	Not likely	37.2 - 127	15.2 - 61.2	4.3 - 8.2*
2011	Chicago, IL	Not likely	18 - 120	12 - 18	N/A
2017	Tunica, MS	Not likely	14.1 - 61	15.2 – 70.9	N/A
?	Cincinnati, OH	Not likely	5.58 - 24.3	<1 – 1.8	N/A
?	Cincinnati, OH	Not likely	9.46 - 23.2	11.5 – 21.3	N/A
2008	Cincinnati, OH	Not likely	3.73 - 19.1	<1	N/A
2002	Grand Rapids, MI	Not likely	7.8 - 10.7**	N/A	N/A
2007	Grand Rapids, MI	Not likely	6.6 - 8.1**	N/A	N/A
2016	Chicago, IL	Not likely	3 - 6	7 - 9	N/A
2012	Cincinnati, OH	Not likely	1.1 - 2.6	N/A	N/A

† The following data is provided in this table:

- *Initial results:* Following an overnight stagnation, range of lead level detected (excluding water setting in the drain).
- *Post-flush (#1) results:* Following a full flush of the water heater and an overnight stagnation, range of lead level detected (excluding water setting in the drain).
- *Post-flush (#2) results:* Following a second full flush of the water heater and an overnight stagnation, range lead levels detected (excluding water setting in the drain).

* We retested again 2.5 months later and levels increased to 24.1 ppb.

** Flushing these water heaters was not possible given their placement and the lack of a drain.

Read the full blog [here](#).