

Attendance (33)

- 7 Council Members (7): Paul Junio (Chair), Jennifer Buchholz (Vice Chair), Brenda Anderson, Craig Obry, Christine LesCamela, Matt Schmeichel, Tad Schwartzhoff
- 7 DNR Staff (7): Steve Geis, Tom Trainor, Autumn Farrell, Patty Doerflinger, Janelle Nehs, Zana Sijan, Brandy Baker-Muhich
- Guests (19): Sharon Mertens (Milw MSD), Alfredo Sotomayor (Milw MSD), RT Krueger (NLS), Brooke Klingbeil (WRWA), Camille Danielson (WSLH), Erin Mani (WSLH), Amanda Kordus (Badger), Jon Larson (Badger), Steve Heraly (Badger), Mary Powers (Madison MSD), Jessica McCammon (Madison MSD), Julie Klimek (Davy), Alex Zenner (Medford), Andrea Moore (AgSource), Meredith Bowers (AgSource), Rebecca Grover (AgSource), Jon Anderson (AgSource), Ronessa Strozier (PH Madison/Dane Co), Kevin Freber (Oconomowoc)

Agenda repair and approval of last meeting minutes

- Agenda repair: None.
- The last meeting minutes were approved.

Outstanding issues from last meeting

- Tom provided the reporting requirements when using SM 2540D for TSS. Minimum residue capture is 2.5 mg unless 1000 mL of sample volume is used. The reporting limit for 1000 mL will change to 2.5 mg/L. We are waiting to hear from the wastewater program before a decision is made on when these changes will be required.
- SM 2540D-2015 has new QC requirements compared to the previous versions. If a lab is using this method version it shall include a sample duplicate per batch up to 20 samples, a method blank per batch up to 20 samples, and an LCS per batch up to 20 samples. Once NR 219 is updated to match 40 CFR Part 136, this QC will be required if using SM 2540D.
- Tom said that an alternative to SM 2540D is USGS-I-3765-85. If a lab changes to this method, the same requirements they are using today will still apply (i.e., no method blank, no LCS, and no duplicate required, 500 mL of sample filtered is acceptable, and a 2.0 mg/L reporting limit is acceptable).
- Tom indicated that for BOD the program will no longer cite labs if they analyze three GGA standards and use the average to assess acceptability. If only two GGA standards are used, both must be assessed individually and pass, or the data must be qualified. The program will no longer cite labs if they analyze inhibited GGAs if they use the uninhibited GGA limits specified in the method.
- Tom indicated how the program will handle EPA 1664A/B QC requirements.
 - The program will not require the method defined significant figures as a LIMS is generally not flexible enough to meet those requirements. See EPA 1664A/B (12.3).
 - If a method blank fails, all associated samples must be re-extracted if extra sample is available. For samples that can't be re-extracted, the results must be reported with the qualifier, "results shall not be used for compliance." See EPA 1664A/B (9.4.2), (12.3.3).
 - If the LCS fails, all associated samples must be re-extracted if extra sample is available. For samples that can't be re-extracted, the results must be reported with the qualifier, "results shall not be used for compliance." See EPA 1664A/B (9.6.2), (12.3.3).
 - If the MS fails and there is no leftover parent sample to re-extract, the parent sample results must be reported with the qualifier, "results shall not be used for compliance." See EPA 1664A/B (9.3.4.1), (9.3.4.2), (12.3.3).
 - The program will not require labs to perform method modifications to achieve a passing MS when an MS fails as this concept conflicts with method defined parameters. See EPA 1664A/B (9.3.4.1).
 - Based on feedback from the meeting and internal discussions, the program decided that labs can report these failures with the qualifier, "results shall not be used for compliance." The program's initial position was not to allow labs to report the results, but after discussion, it was determined that reporting results to the department was a permittee issue, and not a lab issue.

Program metrics report

Large-scale lab metrics: July 2023 – December 2023 (FY 2024 partial)

- To date completed: Audited = 100%, Reports Issued = 89%, Closed = 83%, Revised Application Audits = 10.
- Backlog of labs = 2.
- Reports issued within 60 days = 100%.
- Audits not closed over 1 year from report date = 2.
- Active labs = 112.
- New labs applied to program since last meeting = 0.
- Labs dropped from program since the last meeting = 0.

Small-scale labs: July 2023 – December 2023 (FY 2024 partial)

- To date completed: Audited = 74%, Reports Issued = 76%, Closed = 71%, Revised Application Audits = 2.
- Backlog of labs = 5.
- Reports issued within 30 days = 92%.
- Audits not closed over 1 year from report date = 1.
- Active labs = 211.
- New labs applied to program since last meeting = 0.
- Labs dropped from program since last meeting = 1.

Other business items

- Steve Geis indicated that his last day is Friday, and that Zana Sijan is taking over as Certification Services Program Manager. Steve also indicated that Janelle Nehs was leaving and that this was her last week. The program will be advertising for her replacement soon.
- Tom presented the final proposed FY25 budget for the program. Notable changes were that the “Salary and Fringe” total is ~29k higher this year because of staff raises, and the “Supplies and Services” total is ~20k less because the program won’t use a contract auditor. Total RVUs were down 319. The resulting cost per RVU is proposed at \$80.50, which is a 5.2% (\$4.00) increase from the previous year. Nothing in the proposed budget changed from the last meeting. The Council approved the proposed budget. Tom will send the resolution document to Paul for signature.
- Annual council elections were held. Christine was elected Chair, Craig was elected Vice Chair, and Brenda was elected Secretary. Paul’s membership term was expiring so the demonstrated interest position was open. Brooke Klingbeil indicated that she was interested in that position. Jennifer indicated that she would be leaving Davy labs so her commercial laboratory position was open. Jon Anderson and Amanda Kordus both indicated that they were interested. Jennifer indicated that she is going to be working for a septage company, and she asked if she could take the Solid and Hazardous Waste Disposal position. No one could think of a reason why not. The newly elected officials will take over at the next meeting in April. Zana will send out an email to the people interested in taking over the vacated member positions to get the information we need to send to DOA.
- Annual variance review was conducted. There are two active variances. WSLH and SRN have variances. Both are to provide a non-aqueous PT in lieu of an aqueous PT because the laboratories do not perform the aqueous testing. These variances are justified and are allowed to continue.

Program updates

- **Public and private water programs rewrite of manual data entry screen.** Zana explained what was being done. Paul asked if the changes include matching the lab slip order to the screen order. Zana said the programs received several comments along that line and are planning to implement that request the best they can. The goal is to complete the project by June 30, 2023. Public and private water programs are working together to try and have as similar approaches as they can. Kevin Freber asked if this rewrite will address the need to do a spreadsheet upload for river samples. Zana said not at this time, but it is on our wish list.
- **TCLP leaching.** We received a question from a lab as to what the leachate filtering requirements are after the tumbling is completed. We reached out to Troy Strock at the EPA and the following was his position on the matter.
 - If a waste is 100% solid, as defined in Method 1311 (i.e., no 1st filtrate is generated), the lab only needs to filter enough volume of the 2nd filtrate (from leaching) to perform all the required tests.
 - If a waste is not 100% solid, the sample must be filtered (1st and 2nd filtrates) until no more liquid is collected over a two-minute period at 50 psi.
 - If miscible, the entire 1st and 2nd filtrates would be needed so they can be combined and analyzed.
 - If immiscible, the entire 1st and 2nd filtrates would be needed so their respective volumes can be determined, and their separately analyzed concentrations can be mathematically combined.
 - We are checking with Troy to see if the lab can filter less than the entire filtrate as long as they ratio the initial filtrate accordingly. We will report back once we have this information.

- **EPA methods 180.1, 335.4, 353.2 calibrations.** The question was posed to Lab Cert by a lab as to whether an initial calibration was required on each day of analysis for these methods or if a continuing calibration standard was sufficient. The language in question is “boiler plate” language (listed below) that is provided in many of the EPA methods.

*9.3.4 Instrument Performance Check Solution (IPC) -- For all determinations, the laboratory must analyze the IPC (a mid-range check standard) and a calibration blank **immediately following daily calibration**, after every tenth sample (or more frequently, if required), and at the end of the sample run. Analysis of the IPC solution and calibration blank immediately following calibration must verify that the instrument is within $\pm 10\%$ of calibration. Subsequent analyses of the IPC solution must verify the calibration is still within $\pm 10\%$.*

When the EPA was asked about this, their reply was that this was written as an expectation, not a requirement. As a result, the program will not require an initial calibration when this language exists in the method with no other language supporting the need to perform an initial calibration with each analysis. Further proof that initial calibration is not required on each analysis day is that these other methods all have the exact same language, and an initial calibration is not required every analysis: EPA 300.0, 350.1, 351.2, 365.1, 375.2, 410.4, 420.4.

- **Total toxic organics (TTO).** Analysis of these compounds is typically reserved for wastewater pretreatment compliance. TTO is a special list of volatiles, semi-volatiles, organochlorine pesticides, PCBs, and 2,3,7,8-TCDD. The complete list can be found in 40 CFR 413.02 (i). Detection limits of 10 ug/L or less must be met for all parameters in the list. Sharon said that sometimes analysis can be avoided if one can show that the influent is unlikely to contain these contaminants.
- **Auditors check for operator certification during audits.** Wastewater has asked Lab Cert to check each WWTP lab that we audit to ensure that at least one operator has the correct laboratory subclass certification. If we find they do not, we will let water quality know – we do not cite. Alex asked what the requirement is for an advanced facility. If a facility is advanced, at least one person who works at the facility must have an advanced laboratory subclass wastewater operator certification.

Council member issues

- Paul asked what the program would require if a lab received a sample frozen when the preservation requirements are “none.” Tom indicated that he was unaware of a regulation that provides guidance on this and the Program will not take a position on receiving frozen samples when the preservation requirement is “none” for temperature. RT indicated that for UCMR5, samples they received were frozen, and the EPA directed them to thaw them and analyze them.

Checkout and next meeting date

- The next meeting is scheduled for April 16, 2024, at 9 AM. An in-person and virtual meeting option will be available.