

ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

September 19, 2013

MINUTES

Members Present

Matthew Rexing
*Nancy Turner
*Kurt Novy
Laura McCasland
Garry N. Brussels
Rick Amalfi
Brian Sitko
Barbara Escobar
Randy Gottler
Trina Spangle
Jim Williams
Cynthia Garcia

Members Absent

Mary Tyer
Evelyn Dawson
Michael Dew
Elizabeth Baker
Elizabeth Proffitt

Guests Present

Anupa Jain
Brittaney Dempster
Kerri Keller
Robert Vertefeuille
*Terri Garcia
*Dawn Weyer
*Leanne Nieukirk
Jennifer Calles
Gail Adams
Emily Vanaskey
Jennifer Ausland
Karen Walters
Mary McReynolds
Bobbi Nissen
Kurt Ill
Gary Shipley

SLS Staff

Prabha Acharya
Steve Baker
Galan Larson
Frank Martinez
David McKay
Kathryn Wangsness
Isaac Robert
Jena Losch

ADEQ Staff

*by phone

CALL TO ORDER

WELCOME/INTRODUCTION

Matt Rexing called the meeting to order at 10.01 AM. Everyone introduced themselves including the attendees from Tucson and Flagstaff via the phone.

Steve Baker welcomed everyone and thanked them for coming.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from June 20, 2013 meeting was approved as written.

ADEQ UPDATE

Becky Soter was not present; there was no update.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

Electronic Signatures:

Barbara Escobar: The electronic signatures for the final report is being used for a long time; she wondered if it could be used for Chain of Custody forms; Recently TNI had a presentation on the use of electronics- in the field for data entering, COC and so on; She just wondered when will ADHS approve its' use in the COC? Pima County would like to transition to electronics as much as possible.

Steve Baker: there are only 3 places in the rules the signatures are specified; application, QAP and the final reports; Rules do not address COC, so the labs should be able to back up their procedure if it is scientifically valid and defensible; he was not against moving towards electronics but there was no guidance from the rules. Larger labs perhaps have a good procedure set up; He might have to decide on a case by case basis.

Prabha added that she consulted Standard Methods- they had no problem using it for COC; MICE had no problem either- CLP has been using it for a long time; DW and WW did not respond. She added that labs are allowed to save the raw data electronically, there is no need to save the hard copies and signatures fall under that data anyway.

Steve added that ADHS is concerned about holding time, preservation and not really that concerned about the security of the samples; after some discussion, Steve okayed the use of electronic signatures in COC forms. He warned that the approval was only for the state regulation.

Standard methods Edition Update:

Steve: he was not planning to change the SM edition that is approved in the rules. It would be a nightmare to keep track of methods if another edition is approved; he has been trying to get a memo from EPA saying that

Arizona is in noncompliance and by a certain date the newer promulgated versions must be implemented; but so far he has not heard from them; with that there was a slight chance of getting approval for the new rules from the governor's office; he added that he would like the lab community to draft a letter to the director about the problems encountered with the newer regulations and the permission to update the rules must be granted.

The problem with having multiple editions approved is not so much the methods, it is to determine which QA/QC chapters are applicable to which methods? It was also discussed that having 2 different editions approved for DW and WW would cause a lot of problems to the labs, most of the time the clients are not sure which program the samples belong to. Prabha brought up the table generated by EPA, which identifies the methods that are approved in different SM editions and Randy Gottler added that SM website links the methods to the QA/QC chapters. It was decided that Prabha would email the methods table and the labs could comment on them.

ALA UPDATE:

Method 1664B-Water Removal Step:

Garry Brussels: He wanted to know where the ADHS stand as for as the sodium sulfate filtration is concerned; in the last ELAC meeting it was decided that if the labs switched over to the 1664B version, the sodium sulfate step could be eliminated; but since then the ADHS stance has changed.

Steve: since the last ELAC meeting, they have received a stern email from EPA stating that water removal step cannot be eliminated; since Oil and Grease is an AzPDES parameter, ADHS cannot make any modifications either; labs would have to get a letter from Region IX that water removal step can be eliminated.

Prabha: She read the 1664B method again, it is quite complicated; there is a large section devoted to the methanol rinse which is done before the hexane extract is filtered through, it doesn't even come in contact with the hexane extract, how can it remove water from the extract? Subsequently she sent an email to Horizon asking what the role of methanol rinse is. Horizon responded that they contacted the federal liaison for ATP wastewater after the Information Update 117 was published and they were told that water removal step is required even with the methanol rinse. Prabha could forward the Horizon email to the labs.

In response to a question, Prabha added that SP paper is used in 2 places in 1664B; to break emulsions and to remove water from hexane extracts and it can be used in place of sodium sulfate; this information was in the Update 117 and the Update info was final. SP paper is different from SPE; Steve suggested calling Prabha if labs had any further questions.

MALA Update:

There was nothing to report.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS:

Training:

Matt Rexing gave an update: Field sampling workshop date has been set for 11/19, 20 and 21st of November; Only the first 45 people can register since there is a limit to the class which includes a field demo on GW and

ELAC Minutes
September 19, 2013

SW on 2 afternoons; Fees is \$200, can register on AZwater.org, credit card is taken and there will be no onsite registration, there is already a waitlist from last year and if interested to register soon..

DMRQA:

Kathryn: Marty and herself have been receiving quite a few reports and corrective actions from the plants; EPA had lots of problems with mailing; lots of complaints were received mostly from smaller utilities; EPA is seriously considering mailing the packets by email to reduce the cost; She will have a better update in the next meeting.

SET NEXT MEETING DATE & ADJOURNMENT:

The next meeting was scheduled for December 12, 2013; the meeting was adjourned.

NEW BUSINESS:

There was none.