

Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Expert Committee Meeting Summary
October 16, 2019 1:00 pm Eastern

1. Welcome and Announcements

Rami welcomed everyone to the meeting. Attendance is recorded in Attachment 1, below. The minutes of September 18 were approved unanimously.

2. Updates

SETAC Workshop – No one involved with planning for this workshop was on the call, but Sarah indicated that they expect 16 people on-site, with another 34 individuals requesting to participate remotely, for the November 1 event in Toronto.

PT Issues – Ginger, Katie and Rami will draft a request for data out of TNI's PT database (in its early stages, but will have a year's worth of data for us, at least), and Katie volunteered with Rami to assist. Additional volunteers are still welcome.

Outline for Training – Natalie sent a basic outline to Teresa for her input, but the document is not ready for wider distribution yet. The focus will be on data interpretation, rather than the basic statistical calculations and components as was initially proposed, but those aspects will definitely be included in the syllabus.

3. Revising the Standard

After the September meeting, Rami reached out to the AB representatives on the committee, asking whether they could support the paradigm that grew out of the WET session in Jacksonville, as documented in those minutes and further clarified in the September minutes. Feedback was less than clear from at least one AB, so more follow-up is needed, but there was no outright opposition by these AB representatives.

This meeting's discussion began with language suggested by Elizabeth in an email, as an explanation of the proposed approach. This text is quoted below.

The nature of toxicity testing is such that, for some methods, individual analysts are not able to perform even one entire analysis, and therefore the traditional chemistry demonstrations of capability (DOCs) are not appropriate for toxicity testing.

Laboratories must define task/skill set training and DOCs for each method. An analyst need not have mastered all the tasks in a set of skills required for a chronic method in order to participate in the analysis. However, successful mastery of each skill/task that the analyst performs unsupervised must have been documented. The documentation of skills must be defined in the laboratory quality system and encompass all skills needed to perform each accredited method.

Participants noted that it is important to convey that laboratory DOCs (both initial and ongoing) will still be required, but that the exhaustive, previously required (by most assessors) analyst DOCs will be replaced by clearly defined and documented training, and also that the language in the standard must be crystal clear about separating analyst and laboratory DOCs.

The “work cell” terminology will not be used, but rather the “team” approach will be incorporated. This difference is important for two reasons: first, the composition of the team will likely vary for each test, even the same methods, according to work schedules and other assignments, and second, team member task assignments may vary at different times, with the restriction that each team member needs to have completed training in his or her assigned tasks/skills, with documentation of that training and successful performance of the task/skills.

Further discussion brought out the concept that, because skill sets needed are the same or similar across multiple test methods, the skills themselves can be treated in a fashion that is parallel to how technologies are treated in chemistry labs. Participants envisioned a table or matrix, with methods and associated skills defined, and with an individual being “checked off” for training (demonstration of competency) for each skill. This can occur without the analyst having to perform a particular skill while running each possible method.

Lynn interrupted the discussion to explain the standards development process, that the next step for the WET module will be to publish an “outline of proposed changes”, with or without an actual draft module, and this will allow for feedback from the lab and assessor communities (and other interested parties, of course) that will help us clarify the explanation(s) and details for the final version.

Discussion resumed with Rami proposing that the group refine Elizabeth’s proposed language (above) as a way of clarifying our own thoughts as well as enhancing that draft with additional concepts. The following is the result of that extended discussion, paragraphs describing the nature of toxicity testing.

The nature of toxicity testing is such that, for methods lasting multiple days, individual analysts are not able to perform an entire test. The tests are typically performed by multiple laboratory analysts over the course of the test duration, who can perform multiple tasks within the test on a given day. Many of these daily tasks are common to other methods. Therefore, the traditional analyst demonstrations of capability (DOCs) based on successful completion of each method are not applicable for performing toxicity testing.

Laboratories must define task/skill set training and individual analyst DOCs for each method task. An analyst need not have mastered all the tasks in a set of skills required for a toxicity method in order to participate in the test. However, successful mastery of each skill/task that the analyst performs unsupervised must be documented prior to approval to perform that task. The documentation of skills must be defined in the laboratory quality system and encompass all skills needed to perform each accredited method.

Continuing demonstration of skills for individual analysts are documented through participation in on-going laboratory SRTs, PTs, or other laboratory defined ways unless State specific or other regulatory requirements exist.

Rami then noted that we will also need to decide whether to discuss the decision to abandon the work cell concept in the draft outline of proposed changes, and how to do so.

4. Next Meeting

The next teleconference meeting will be on Wednesday, November 20, 2019, at 1 pm Eastern. An agenda and any needed documents will be sent in advance.

Attachment 1

WET Expert Committee Membership

Member	Affiliation	Email	Category	Term Expiration	Present
Ginger Briggs	Bio-Analytical Laboratories	bal@bioanalyticallabs.com	Lab	Dec. 2020 (2)	No
Chris Burbage	Hampton Roads Sanitation District	cburbage@hrsd.com	Lab	Dec. 2020 (2)	No
Kari Fleming	WI DNR	kari.fleming@wisconsin.gov	AB	Dec. 2020 (2)	Yes
Amy Hackman	Penn. Dept. Environ. Protection	ahackman@pa.gov	AB	Dec. 2020 (2)	No
Sarah Hughes	Shell Oil Co.	s.hughes@shell.com	Other	Dec. 2021 (1)	Yes
Pete De Lisle (Vice Chair)	Coastal Bioanalysts Inc.	pfd@coastalbio.com	Lab	Dec. 2020 (2)	Yes
VelRey Lozano	USEPA Region 8	Lozano.VelRey@epa.gov	Other (Affiliate)	Dec 2020 (1)	No
Rami Naddy (Chair)	TRE Env. Strat. LLC	naddyrb.tre@gmail.com	Lab	Dec. 2020 (2)	Yes
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@apaienv.com	Other	Dec. 2020 (2)	No
Michael Pfeil	Texas Comm. Environ. Quality	Michael.pfeil@tceq.texas.gov	AB	Dec. 2020 (2)	Yes
Michele Potter	New Jersey Dept. of Environ Protect.	Michele.Potter@dep.nj.gov	AB	Dec. 2020 (2)	No but commenting via email
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)	No
Elizabeth West	LA DEQ LELAP	elizabeth.west@la.gov	AB	Dec. 2020 (2)	Yes
Associate Members					
Silvia Bogdan	EPA R6	Bogdan.silvia@epa.gov	Other (Assoc.)		No

Steve Boggs	CA ELAP	steve.boggs@waterboards.ca.gov	Other (Assoc.)		No
Thekkekalathil "Chandra" Chandrasekhar	FL DEP	Thekkekalathil.Chandrasekhar@dep.state.fl.us	Lab (Assoc.)		Yes
Michael Chanov	EA Eng., Sci. &Tech.	mchanov@eaest.com	Lab (Assoc.)	--	Yes
Stephen 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
Nicole Fortin	Honolulu City Lab	nfortin@honolulu.gov	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
Natalie Love	GEI Consultants	nlove@geiconsultants.com	Lab (Assoc.)		Yes
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.)		Yes
Christina Pottios	Los Angeles Cty Sanitation Districts	cpottios@lacsds.org	Lab (Assoc.)		No
Greg Savitske	US EPA OECA	Savitske.gregory@epa.gov	Other (Assoc.)		No
Justin Scott	Cove Sciences	justin@covesciences.com	Lab (Assoc.)		No
Jordan Thorngren	Eurofins (Horsham, PA)	jordanthorngren@eurofinsUS.com	Lab (Assoc.)		No
Lem Walker	USEPA OW/OST	Walker.lemuel@epa.gov	Other (Assoc.)		No
Craig Watts	Hydrosphere Research	cwatts@hydrosphere.net	Lab (Assoc.)		Yes
Bruce Weckworth	HRSD	Bruce.weckworth@hrsd.com	Lab (Assoc.)		Yes
Tom Widera	ERA	twidera@eraqc.com	Other (Assoc.)		Yes
Lynn Bradley	TNI Program Administrator	Lynn.Bradley@nelac-institute.org			Yes

