

**TNI Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee  
Meeting Summary  
March 10, 2009**

1. Roll call and Meeting Minutes:

Co-Chair Carl Kircher called the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee to order on March 10, 2009, at 11am EST. Attendance is recorded in Attachment A. Carl had to leave the meeting early (prior to review of Jeff's comments) and Jeff stepped in to lead the remainder of the meeting.

Minutes from the February 3, 2009 and February 24, 2009 meetings were reviewed. A motion to approve both sets of minutes was made by Eric and seconded by Dan. The minutes were approved and will be posted.

2. DRAFT Chemistry FoPT Tables

- The subcommittee continued the review of comments submitted by Jeff Lowry. The subcommittee's comments are in italics.
- At the last meeting the following response was prepared:

**4) Acids who wants Dinoseb? Drop it no accreditation need.** *Florida has labs accredited for 8270 Dinoseb, so Carl feels there is a need. Eric does not feel there is a need. Dinoseb would be on both the BNA and 8151 lists. If it were removed, should it be removed from both? Most labs use 8151 to analyze it. NY does not even offer accreditation by 8270 for this analyte. It was decided that the ABs would be e-mailed to determine the need for this analyte.*

Jeff Lowry commented that he does not have an objection to adding Dinoseb.

- Carl needed to leave the call and asked Jeff to take the lead in finishing up review of the comments.
- Jeff Lowry's Comments:

## Non-Potable Waters

1) The order of the analytes added needs to be in alphabetical order. *See above (DW Question #3.)*

2) GRO can be done with both P&T and Extraction. Place Petroleum HC back together and footnote GRO.

*See above for SCM as well (SCM Question #3.)*

*Jeff is talking about another type of extraction – it is the earlier method versions A&B.*

3) Pet. HC - Should add n-Hexane Extractable and Non-Polar extractable then drop TPH just like SCM table.

*Agree.*

4) Minerals include Bromide - move to minerals.

*Agree. It is currently listed under miscellaneous analytes. Dan noted that the list is getting big for minerals. May need to consider this later on.*

5) Pesticides - Hexachlorobenzene and Hexachlorocyclopentadiene. I've never had anyone ask for this. I don't see the accreditation need.

*Similar to last meeting. See SCM response to #5,6,7.*

6) Herbicides - Disulfoton is a OPP move to Pesticides.

*Agree. Jeff is concerned that there may not be enough data to keep this. It was an experimental analyte. We'll have to look at data.*

7) I would suggest you split the pesticides into Organochlorine and Organophosphorous for clarity.

*Agree.*

- DW #2 comments: Jeff noted we now need to address this question. There are analytes we need to consider. Eric noted that we have limits that were set on the previous experimental table ... these limits were transferred to the new table

when the experimental PTs were moved over. Jeff: The acceptance criteria that were on the previous Experimental PT tables can not simply be moved over.

Eric will input 3 std deviations for all the experimental analytes that have been added to the tables. Eric will also add a note to the tables to explain where the limits come from. Even though this will be explained in the SOP, the group felt that this comment needs to stay in place because it is different than what people are familiar with. Also want to add something about the 10% in the note. Eric will prepare a DRAFT note and pass it around for comment.

- Follow-up Questions from Eric:

- From 2/3/09: Eric asked the subcommittee if the term “new analyte” should be used instead of “new experimental analyte”. A final decision was not reached and this will be revisited at the next teleconference.

The group discussed this. It was decided that the term “experimental” should be deleted to prevent confusion. Eric will continue to use colors. Red analytes = previous experimental analytes. Blue = new analytes. This is for our purposes to make sure we know what they are when we are working on the tables. This will not be used on the final table. We will determine how to handle the final table when we are at that point. Jeff suggested that all new analytes to the table be colored to make it easier for users to use the new tables. Footnotes can be used to distinguish what makes them different.

- From 2/3/09: DW #4 Question: Footnote #7 – Needs to be removed from regulated and unregulated for DBCP, EDB and 1,2,3-TCP. Footnote #17 – All 3 analytes would be run under ECD technology for DW?

Jeff asked: Do DBCP and EDB also need to be under the regulated volatiles for P&T also? Dan looked at table on the EPA website and could not find 1,2,3-TCP. For EDB and DBCP he only saw 504 and 551 as methods for these analytes. He did not see 524, but Jeff said he has labs reporting these by 524. Dan does not think these analytes should be listed under the VOC method. This will be brought up again for discussion in the next meeting. Dan asked why these people would be reporting by 524. Is there any additional insight available?

- We want to update the tables after each meeting and attach them to the minutes each week. That way we can be sure everyone is working off the same table. Eric will make the edits to the table from the last 3 conference calls and distribute to subcommittee.

### 3. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee will be March 24, 2009, at 11AM EST.

Action Items are included in Attachment B and Attachment C includes a listing of reminders.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 PM EST.

**Attachment A**

**Participants  
TNI  
Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee**

<b>Members</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Contact Information</b>
Carl Kircher, Co-Chair <b>Present – First Part</b>	Florida DOH	904-791-1574 <a href="mailto:carl_kircher@doh.state.fl.us">carl_kircher@doh.state.fl.us</a>
Brian Boling, Co-Chair <b>Absent</b>	Oregon DEQ	<a href="mailto:Boling.Brian@deq.state.or.us">Boling.Brian@deq.state.or.us</a>
Amy Doupe <b>Absent</b>	Lancaster Laboratories, Inc.	717-656-2300 x1812 <a href="mailto:aldoupe@lancasterlabs.com">aldoupe@lancasterlabs.com</a>
Jeff Lowry (Mike Blades) <b>Present</b>	ERA	303-431-8454 <a href="mailto:jlowry@eraqc.com">jlowry@eraqc.com</a>
Chuck Wibby <b>Absent</b>	Wibby Environmental	303-940 -0033 <a href="mailto:cwibby@wibby.com">cwibby@wibby.com</a>
Eric Smith <b>Present</b>	TestAmerica	615-726-0177 x1238 <a href="mailto:eric.smith@testamericainc.com">eric.smith@testamericainc.com</a>
Dan Tholen <b>Absent</b>	A2LA	231-929-1721 <a href="mailto:Tholen.dan@gmail.com">Tholen.dan@gmail.com</a>
Stephen Arpie <b>Absent</b>	Absolute Standards, Inc.	203-281-2917 <a href="mailto:stephenarpie@mac.com">stephenarpie@mac.com</a>
Dan Dickinson <b>Present</b>	New York, DOH	518-485-5570 <a href="mailto:dmd15@health.state.ny.us">dmd15@health.state.ny.us</a>
Stacey Fry <b>Present</b>	E.S. BABCOCK & Sons, Inc.	951-653-3351 x238 <a href="mailto:sfry@babcocklabs.com">sfry@babcocklabs.com</a>
Ilona Taunton, Program Administrator <b>Present</b>	TNI	828-712-9242 <a href="mailto:tauntoni@msn.com">tauntoni@msn.com</a>

## Attachment B

### Action Items – Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee

	<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Expected Completion</b>	<b>Actual Completion</b>
11.	Continue to send comments regarding Chem FoPT Tables to Eric.	All	On-going	
13.	Prepare letter to ABs to find out their needs on analytes that may be under consideration for deletion.	TBD	TBD	
14.	Contact PT Board to discuss potential delays in getting out tables for July implementation.	TBD	TBD	
15.	Prepare a DRAFT 10% note for the FoPT tables and distribute to subcommittee for comment.	Eric	3/24/09	

**Attachment C**

**Backburner / Reminders – Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee**

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Meeting Reference</b>	<b>Comments</b>
1	Review summary data to see if it supports a change in the acceptance criteria for DW analytes (For example, VOA, 30% instead of 20%). If data is supportive, Jeff Lowry will approach ELAB.	10-30-08	3/10/09 - Jeff has approached ELAB. They would be happy to put it in a work group – and pass it along with a letter to EPA. We need to provide them with the data.
2	Reminder: Look at what the minimum “n” should be once we start getting data from the PT providers. Take a few studies and run some comparisons. Also, look to see if the unacceptable rates are higher in smaller studies.	12-16-08	
3			
4			
5			