

ELAB Monitoring Work Group

Meeting minutes January 10, 2013

Attendees

Patsy Root
Michael Wichman
Patty Carvajal
Ruth Forman
Absent: Robert Miller

1. **Meeting day/time:** moved to the first Thursday of the month at 8:30 EST starting in February 2013; Patsy will send out meeting planners
2. **Recreational water criteria and EPA Method 1611 Enterococcus qPCR:**
 - a. WG to develop a recommendation letter for the ELAB Board to review and send to the Agency, which would cover the Work Group recommendations on training both labs and auditors on qPCR EPA Method 1611
 - b. Work Group members will reach out to colleagues who may have more experience in qPCR methods for input
 - c. Input from WG members and colleagues will be collected in time for the February meeting
3. **Review of EPA Methods 624 and 625**
 - a. Group agreed we should ask Lem Walker for an expected time for feedback and comments on these methods: Patsy
 - b. Some of the items to check in Version A of each method include: the use of capillary columns, 625 extraction, helium as the carrier gas
 - c. Group agreed that we should be able to have comments and any suggested edits or questions on these method summarized in 2 months (March meeting) to send to the Board
 - d. WG will send comments to the Board, which will then get sent to the Agency for consideration
4. **Review of the technical aspects of switching helium to hydrogen in various detection methods**
 - a. Patsy to talk with the LM WG (Michelle Wade) to see what their agenda and timeline is for their portion of this topic
 - b. Ruth has started her assessment review and will share this at the February meeting
 - c. Michael stated that APHL has asked for community feedback on this topic and he will share the comments and blog with the WG
 - d. Patty sent an email to the WG, which included comments from her contacts and we can review via email and in February's meeting
 - e. There was an Agency communication that we recall stated that, as long as the DW method criteria were met and the procedure could be validated, then labs could use Hydrogen. Patty pointed out that Assessors will have to look at more/slightly different data and that means Assessors will have to be very familiar with the methods to understand the data.

5. Patsy had forwarded the Agency Invitation to an EPA Recreational Water Quality webinar session on the January 30th , which we signed up to attend.
<https://www2.gotomeeting.com/join/417023834/106308287>
6. Michael suggested that, in the next face-to-face meeting, we set aside an hour or two for our WG to meet; Patsy will attempt to arrange this for San Antonio

ELAB Monitoring Work Group

Meeting minutes December 17, 2012

Attendees

Patsy Root
Michael Wichman
Patty Carvajal
Ruth Forman
Absent: Robert Miller

7. **WG Chair:** Michael moved, Ruth seconded nomination of Patsy to chair the WG;, vote was 3 ayes, 1 abstention (Patsy); Patsy Accepted nomination
8. **Meeting day/time:** second Thursday of the month at 8:30 EST starting in January 2013; Patsy will send out meeting planners
 - a. Patsy gave an overview of why the WG was looking into this topic and what had already been discussed, both in the group and with the Agency. Also reviewed what the Work Group expected outcomes would be:
 - i. Recommendation letter we would provide to the ELAB Board, which would cover the Work Group recommendations on training labs and auditors on qPCR EPA Method 1611 (training includes appropriate QA/QC).
 - ii. The letter should include an invitation to the Agency to continue our dialog on training
 - b. The group decided to list training aspects that would be important and appropriate for qPCR, which would be discussed with the Agency; work to be done via email
 - i. Patsy to write an outline of proposed training that the group will complete
 - ii. Each Work Group member can reach out to colleagues who may have more experience in qPCR methods for input
 - iii. Review of this list will be done at the next Work Group meeting; goal is to share this list as an attachment to the letter the Board would send to the Agency
9. **Review of EPA Methods 624 and 625**
 - c. The group decided to review each method individually and send comments, by section, to Patsy
 - d. Patsy will collate comments
 - e. Group will discuss our position on each comment by email
 - f. Patsy will write up a draft of the group's recommendations and send to the Board for review
 - g. If the Board agrees, then a letter, with the proposed changes attached, could be sent to the Agency (Lem Walker)

10. Review of the technical aspects of switching helium to hydrogen in various detection methods

- h. Switching from helium to hydrogen as a carrier gas impacts several methods, the group decided to look at this as an overall impact by technique and not method-specific
- i. Ruth will draft an outline document to share with the group
- j. The Group will review individually and provide feedback to the rest of the group members via email
- k. Work Group will make a technical recommendation to address whether, in general and in certain specific cases, it is scientifically feasible to switch from helium to hydrogen
- l. Data and Work Group recommendation will be sent to the Board for further action