

Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Expert Committee Meeting Summary

August 7, 2018 Environmental Measurement Symposium, New Orleans, LA

1. Welcome and Announcements

Elizabeth West led the session, and welcomed everyone to the meeting. Attendance is recorded in Attachment 1, below.

Ginger Briggs presented a brief background on WET testing, and participants were invited to inspect Ginger's gift to Lynn, a vial of *Ceriodaphnia dubia*, one of the more common WET testing organisms.

Lynn provided an update on interactions with ELAB. While no meeting occurred between the WET committee and any ELAB or EPA representatives, there was passing mention of WET PT testing in the ELAB meeting. It appears that ELAB will take no further action, although the WET committee will continue conversations with Greg Savitske, the DMR-QA Coordinator in the Office of Compliance. Appendix 2 contains a brief description of how Henry Liebovitz, past chair of ELAB, described the two preferred ways of using PT samples, along with his recommendation which may help the committee use this characterization to move forward in the coming months.

2. Committee Activities and Accomplishments

"Understanding WET Testing", the webinar produced after the Orange County conference Assessment Forum, is available on the TNI website, in the training section, for a nominal fee.

LAMS now has links to the individual methods on the EPA website as well as a link to the Q/QC errata from the most recent Method Update Rule. In LAMS, click on TNI Codes, choose "Methods" and then click on the particular method you wish to view.

The committee continues efforts to improve the data comparability of WETT PTs. We have worked with ELAB and are now working with the PT Program Executive Committee (PTPEC), as well as EPA program and enforcement staff, towards this end.

Elizabeth is working with NEFAP and the Field Activities Committee as they revise the FSMO (NEFAP) Standard to ensure consistency with requirements of EPA-promulgated methods.

The committee is also working with TNI's Database Administrator and the PTPEC to determine the optimum way to apply FoPT Analyte Codes to the variety of method variations that can be utilized for PT samples. A tentative decision to minimize the number of codes for each reported sample, is the likely outcome, rather than a different code for each temperature and reported endpoint for each of the various methods.

Rami and several committee members are creating a session on WET accreditation for the SETAC Meeting in Sacramento, November, 2018.

3. Revising the WET Module of the TNI Standard (V1M7)

Chemistry QA/QC – Beth presented the draft final language agreed upon within the committee. A lively discussion followed, about whether WET chemistry support measurements should be required to meet all the requirements of compliance chemistry measurements. "It's still chemistry," but the point is that the data need to be "fit for purpose" – ensuring optimum lifespan of the test organisms -- rather than compliance reporting.

A brief discussion about QA of the test organisms followed, along with some consideration of how the “support equipment” sections of the QA Module (V1M2) relate to WET testing.

DOC/IDOC – Ginger discussed the current sentiment of the WET committee that flexibility to accommodate “work cells” and the sometimes-extended test durations of WET tests need to be somehow written into the standard. It harms labs to be unable to have a new employee (performing Initial Demonstration of Competency) work independently at “some” test portions while they await “complete” training on each and every aspect of a WET test, since the tests are broken into clearly separate processes. The challenge is how to segment the successful-completion-of-training for the individual analyst’s training records, and how to write this into the standard.

There was very little feedback from participants, on this topic.

Scope of the Module – whether and how to include sediment and soils testing was briefly raised, but again, there was minimal feedback from participants.

4. Next Meeting

The next teleconference meeting will be at 1 pm Eastern on September 19, 2018. An agenda and documents will be sent before the meeting.

Attachment 1

Committee Membership

Member	Affiliation	Email	Category	Term Expiration	Present
Ginger Briggs	Bio-Analytical Laboratories	bioanalytical@wildblue.net	Lab	Dec. 2020 (2)	Yes
Chris Burbage	Hampton Roads Sanitation District	cburbage@hrsdc.com	Lab	Dec. 2020 (2)	No
Kari Fleming	WI DNR	kari.fleming@wisconsin.gov	AB	Dec. 2020 (2)	No
Amy Hackman	Penn. Dept. Environ. Protection	ahackman@pa.gov	AB	Dec. 2020 (2)	No
Pete De Lisle (Vice Chair)	Coastal Bioanalysts Inc.	pfd@coastalbio.com	Lab	Dec. 2020 (2)	No
VelRey Lozano	USEPA Region 8	Lozano.VelRey@epa.gov	Other (EPA)	Dec 2020 (1)	No
Rami Naddy (Chair)	TRE Env. Strat. LLC	naddyrb.tre@gmail.com	Lab	Dec. 2020 (2)	No
Teresa Norberg-King	USEPA	norberg-king.teresa@epa.gov	Other (Affiliate)	Dec. 2020 (2)	No
John Overbey	American Interplex Corp.	joverbey@americaninterplex.com	Lab	Dec 2020 (1)	No
Chris Pasch	Alan Plummer Associates, Inc.	cpasch@apainv.com	Other	Dec. 2020 (2)	No
Michael Pfeil	Texas Comm. Environ. Quality	Michael.pfeil@tceq.texas.gov	AB	Dec. 2020 (2)	No
Michele Potter	New Jersey Dept. of Environ Protect.	Michele.Potter@dep.nj.gov	AB	Dec. 2020 (2)	No
Steven Rewa	Environmental Resources Management	steven.rewa@erm.com	Lab	Dec. 2020 (2)	No
Beth Thompson	Shealy Consulting	bthompson@shealyconsulting.net	Lab	Dec 2020 (1)	Yes
Elizabeth West	LA DEQ LELAP	elizabeth.west@la.gov	AB	Dec. 2020 (2)	Yes

Associate Members					
Debmalya Bhattacharyya	NE OH Regional Sewer District	bhattacharyyad@neorsd.org	Lab (Assoc.)		No
Silvia Bogdan	EPA R6	Bogdan.silvia@epa.gov	Other (Assoc.)		No
Steve Boggs	CA ELAP	steve.boggs@waterboards.ca.gov	Other (Assoc.)		Yes
Michael Chanov	EA Eng., Sci. &Tech.	mchanov@eaest.com	Lab (Assoc.)	--	Yes
Steven Clark	Pacific EcoRisk	slclark@pacificecorisk.com	Lab (Assoc.)		No
Erin Consuegra	ERA LAB	econsuegra@eralab.com	Lab (Assoc.)		No
Kevin Dischler	Element Materials Technology	Kevin.dischler@element.com	Lab (Assoc.)	---	No
Monica Eues	CK Associates	Monica.eues@c-ka.com	Lab (Assoc.)		No
Marshall Faircloth	FL DEP	joseph.faircloth@dep.state.fl.us	Lab (Assoc.)		No
Nicole Fortin	Honolulu City Lab	nfortin@honolulu.gov	Lab (Assoc.)		Yes
Katie Fox	ATC Group Services	Katie.Fox@atcgs.com	Lab (Assoc.)		No
Christina Henderson	Bio-Aquatic Testing, Inc.	chenderson@bio-aquatic.com	Lab (Assoc.)		No
David Johnston	Valero Refining Co - Benecia	david.johnston@valero.com	Lab (Assoc.)		No
Linda Nemeth	Northwestern Aquatic Sciences	lnemeth@tds.net	Lab (Assoc.)		No
Mark O'Neil	Environmental Enterprises USA, Inc.	moneil@eeusa.com	Lab (Assoc.)	---	Yes
Katie Payne	Nautilus Environmental	katie@nautilusenvironmental.com	Lab (Assoc.)		No
Christina Pottios	Los Angeles Cty Sanitation Districts	cpottios@lacsds.org	Lab (Assoc.)		No
Shain Schmitt	ESC Lab Sciences	sschmitt@esclabsciences.com	Lab (Assoc.)		No
Greg Savitske	US EPA OECA	Savitske.gregory@epa.gov	Other (Assoc.)		No
Thekkekalathil "Chandra"	FL DEP	Thekkekalathil.Chandrasekhar@dep.state.fl.us	Lab (Assoc.)		Yes

Chandrasekhar					
Jordan Thorngren	Eurofins (Horsham, PA)	jordanthorngren@eurofinsUS.com	Lab (Assoc.)		Yes
Tom Widera	ERA	twidera@eraqc.com	Other (Assoc.)		No
Lynn Bradley	TNI Program Administrator	Lynn.Bradley@nelac-institute.org			Yes

Appendix 2

During the ELAB session at conference, Henry Liebovitz described the two stances on use of PT samples this way. The italics are added.

- All WET laboratories should use the same set of conditions specified in the PT instructions so that WET PT sample results within a PT study are comparable. (*true PT samples*)
- All WET laboratories should use the conditions specified in their wastewater treatment permit to analyze WET PT samples so that they are the same conditions used for routine WET testing. (*QC samples*)

The language Dr. Liebovitz recommends that the WET committee use, going forward in our efforts, is as follows:

WET laboratories should adopt the practice of analyzing a blind Quality Control Sample(s) (QCS) periodically according the test conditions required for the permit associated the testing. The QCS results will be indicative of how the WET laboratory performs using its own procedure to analyze the QCS sample under the permit's WET conditions. The QCS process provides valuable information which is different from the WET PT study information which is dependent on laboratories following one set of specific WET conditions and instructions. I recognize the value of both the PT study and QCS approaches as I have described them. Clearly each has its purpose. There does not have to be an "either or debate" if WET laboratories adopt the practice of analyzing a QCS periodically and WET PT study instructions are standardized as is the practice for all PT studies in environmental testing.