**MEETING SUMMARY**

Environmental Monitoring Coalition

Tuesday, January 19, 2021

1. Roll call – see end of meeting summary.
2. Prior to roll call – Parr
	1. Before the call, a number of individuals requested to be able to sit in as guests to the EMC meetings. Those requests were conditionally approved by Jerry Parr and David Friedman.
	2. After the roll call, there was a short discussion about the inclusion of guests. The idea was approved without dissent.
3. Update on Current Activities
	1. Acrolein/Acrylonitrile Holding Time Study – Friedman
		1. The Study Plan is rather large, so it was not displayed during the meeting. The Study Plan had been sent to the members of the EMC prior to this meeting for review and comment (the Study Plan is embedded below).
		2. The Task Group has been working on various forms of the Study Plan to find one that is clear and easy to use. Friedman is waiting for any other input from the EMC members.
		3. If no comments or issues are received on the current draft, Friedman will work with the laboratories and the team to collect samples. The work can then begin.
		4. Comments on the Study Plan should be sent directly to David Friedman with comments highlighted - friedmanconsulting@outlook.com.
		 
	2. Updating of EPA Method 200.8 – Friedman
		1. Richard Burrows did a rewrite of Method 200.8 for wastewater to add collision cell language. Jerry Parr attempted to rewrite 200.8 to add that language but found that approach wasn’t working. The structure appeared to be different from 200.8.
		2. Richard Burrows replied that the rewrite was done using 200.8. After a short discussion, Parr announced that David Friedman proposed establishing a working group for this task.
		3. The working group would be comprised of about a dozen members of EMC for analysis comprised of ICP/MS manufacturers, monitoring labs, state environmental labs, wastewater and drinking water providers as well as industrial lab experts. Steve Wendelken of the EPA Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water as well as several other EPA office representatives will be asked to participate to ensure the results meet the needs of the EPA and provide sufficient data for final approval of the new Method.
		4. Friedman’s proposal - The final goal is to develop the standards that can be used by all EPA offices. EMC could start with the draft Burrows rewrite document of 200.8 and also 6020B. The work group would meet using the internet to go through the Method and see what changes are needed to ensure the new Method incorporates updated technology. Once consensus is reached, the document would be circulated to the entire EMC. EMC members would also reach out to their member laboratories for a validation study for the various matrices that need to be included. Once the final studies are completed, a final report would be circulated to EPA and the EMC. Presuming the final report meets the needs of EPA, the final report would be submitted to EPA for evaluation and acceptance.
		5. William Lipps inquired if EMC was to become a Standards Development Organization (SDO). The issue of ASTM was brought up during the discussion that followed. The various approaches were discussed from just tweaking the language to a full blown method validation study.
			1. Jerry-Parr indicated that EMC should not become an SDO and this effort should be limited to editing the existing method only.
			2. Lem Walker stated, that as far as wastewater goes, 200.8 is approved per Part 136. Use of collision cell is common throughout labs for drinking water.
			3. Steve Wendelken expressed concern that ORD has been working on the project for an extended period of time. That work has not yet been concluded. The question was raised about working cooperatively with other groups.
			4. Jack Creed (EPA ORD) has not been willing to share the work completed yet. The status of his efforts is not known.
			5. The discussion was temporarily tabled until Dan Hautman joined the call.
				1. Note: once Dan Hautman joined the call, this discussion continued.
		6. Parr provided a background for the prior discussions for Dan Hautman. In discussions, Friedman proposed a working group to rewrite the method and do a validation study. EMC is not aware of the status of this project at EPA. This issue of possibility turning things over to or working with ASTM was mentioned.
		7. Hautman mentioned that work up to last summer seemed to be moving forward on wording different sections of the method. However, there is no clear idea of the current status.
		8. Judy Brisbane stated that Jack has several proposals about moving forward. Some proposals could be complicated to the point of not moving forward. Others might include vendors providing a rewrite of software.
			1. During a discussion, it is unclear whether the software rewrite would have to come before the method or vice versa.
			2. The end-of-year holidays plus Jack testing positive for Covid-19 has derailed any further progress,
			3. Friedman asked if Jack would be willing to work with EMC on this project to find solutions. Apparently, those solutions have been submitted but writing has not been completed.
		9. A discussion about cooperative work with EMC and ASTM took place with no final decision. The idea of having a session at NEMC on this topic was raised. More discussion followed, again with no final outcome. Dan Hautman will contact Jack via email to help this issue progress forward and Jack will be invited to participate in the next EMC meeting to see if he is willing to work with the EMC.
		10. Further discussion is tabled. A discussion at NEMC is still a possibility.



* 1. Initial Demonstration of Capability – Parr
		1. After consideration, Parr reviewed the language in the TNI standard on initial demonstration capability and found that significant information is there. With the addition of statistical marginal failures, and the retest concept used by EPA OW, a draft document was developed.
		2. Sharon Mertens noted that before ELAB was dissolved, a letter was written to EPA. However, the exact status of that letter and/or response from EPA is not clear. While written, the letter may not have been sent to EPA.
		3. Adrian Hanley stated that he never saw draft language for this submitted from ELAB.
		4. This issue was raised that this language is not included in all EPA methods. The discussion continued about possibly just including the language in applicable EPA methods going forward. The language does not appear in drinking water methods. The idea for the concept came from the 1984 proposed rule for the 600 methods about a retest for failures. Hanley asked about the ideal end result of this language. Parr replied that: 1) language would be shared with each EPA office for addition to all future methods; and, 2) proposed this become part of the TNI accreditation standard requirements. This language generally applies to methods with many analytes, like methods for organics methods.
		5. After a short discussion, William Lipps and Mike Delaney agreed to review the draft guidance and bring the material back for the February 22, 2021 meeting.

.

****

1. New Topics:
	1. EMC Letterhead - Group
		1. The idea of the concept is to add formality to EMC documents.
		2. The idea of a form of letterhead was accepted by the group. After a short discussion about the design, Parr volunteered that he would work up something for discussion during the next meeting.
	2. Updating of 600 Series Method Quality Control Parameters – Parr
		1. A coalition of organizations interested in helping EPA update the QC limits in methods 608.3, 624.1 and 625.1 has been working to look at data currently being generated in the laboratory community and use such data to update these limits. The question before the EMC is should this effort become an EMC project since many of the groups involved in the study are members of the EMC.
		2. Parr asked if EMC wants to take this on as a project. Parr requested volunteers. Judy Morgan stated that Pace will participate. Richard Burrows agreed as well.
			1. There are currently about twenty labs participating. The question remains as to EMC’s involvement.
			2. After discussion, the project was approved for EMC. Jerry Parr, Judy Morgan will find a volunteer from Pace and William Lipps will assist.
	3. Collaboration with EPA letter – Friedman
		1. No comments have been received. EMC members were asked to review the letter and respond to David Friedman before the February 22, 2021 meeting.

 

* 1. PFAS Testing for Drinking Water – Parr/Delaney
		1. Beyond PFAS, there was a general discussion on the questions below.
			1. **QC Review.** Is it reasonable to expect labs to achieve results that meet all the QC requirements in 537.1? The discussion also included Item #2 below.
				1. The issue is that in some states, all data must pass. In other states, some qualified data may be submitted.
				2. Parr stated that requiring labs to always achieve QC data is a potential reason for fraud in reporting. Analysts don’t want to miss the QC for what may be considered minor issues.
				3. This speaks to the broader issue of QC failures.
				4. If there are QC failures, that could mean that the lab equipment and procedures are not in control. The requirement is a State of Massachusetts requirement and must be met. In Method 537.1, labs are required to submit information on all eighteen (18) compounds yet only seven are part of the method
				5. There also was a short discussion of MRLs.
			2. **Lab Compliance.** Is it reasonable to expect labs to only submit compliant results?
			3. **Method Validation**. Did EPA fully evaluate the QC requirements in 537.1?
				1. William Lipps observed that the QC requirements can be met but it is difficult.
			4. **Raw Water**. Should the method be expected to work fully for raw water? Can “raw water” be regarded as “drinking water” for the applicability of 537.1?
			5. **Surrogates**. One thing that MassDEP has done is to associate each surrogate with specific target analytes. Then if a surrogate fails, it only affects the associated target analytes.
	2. TNI’s White Paper on the Value of Accreditation
		1. Discussion tabled

****

**6.** Next EMC meeting is set for Monday, February 22, 2021 at 3:00 pm ET.

a. For the remainder of 2021, EMC meetings will be held the fourth Monday of each
month @ 3:00 pm ET. Notices and agendas will be sent for each meeting.

**Roll Call**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Organization**  | **Present/Absent** |
| **EMC Members** |  |  |
| Jordan Adelson | US Navy | P |
| Kristin Brown | Utah DoH | P |
| Michael Delaney | MRWA (retired) | P |
| Richard Burrows | Eurofins | P |
| David Friedman | ACIL | P |
| Jay Gandhi | Metrohm USA | P |
| Mary Johnson  | Rock River Reclamation District (WEF) | P |
| Kitty Kong | Chevron | P |
| William Lipps | Shimadzu | P |
| Sharon Mertens | Milwaukee MSD (TNI) | P |
| Judy Morgan | Pace Analytical (ACIL) | P |
| Jerry Parr  | TNI | P |
| Steven Rhode | MWRA (APHL) | P |
| David Thal | Environmental Standards | P |
| Sarah Wright | APHL | P |
|  |  |  |
| **EPA Liaison** |  |  |
| Dan Hautman | EPA/Office of Water/OGWDW | P |
|  |  |  |
| **Invited Guests** |  |  |
| Tarun Anumol | Agilent | P |
| Kathleen (Kat) Young  | Perkin Elmer | P |
| Adrian Hanley | EPA/Office of Water/OST | P |
| Craig Jones | Agilent | P |
| Patrick Simmons | Agilent | P |
| Kim Kirkland | EPA ORCR |  |
| Bradley Meadows | Babcock Laboratories | P |
| Rebecca Burket | EPA/Office of Water/OST | P |
| Judy Brisbin | EPA/Office of Water/OGWDW | P |
| Glynda Smith | EPA/Office of Water/OGWDW | P |
| Steve Wendelken  | EPA/Office of Water/OGWDW | P |
| Lemuel Walker | EPA/Office of Water/OST | P |
|  |  |  |
| **EMC Staff** |  |  |
| Carol Batterton | TNI staff | P |
| Bob Uttenweiler | ACIL Staff | P |