

Emerging Constituents Workgroup

January 21, 2010

ATTENDEES:

Nira Yamachika, OCWD
Steve Fitzsimmons, OCWD
Jason Dadakis, OCWD
Roger Lewis, LACSD
Max Rasouli, City of Riverside
Norris Brandt, EVMWD
Linda Garcia, WMWD
Valerie Housel, City of SBMWD
Bobby Gustafson, City of SBMWD
Kristen Wardlaw, YVWD
Jack Nelson, YVWD
Kathy Kunysz, MWDC
Carrie Guo, MWDC
Andy Eaton, MWH Labs
Jack Safely, WMWD
Bonita Fan, IEUA

Heather Collins, CDPH
Sean McCarthy, CDPH
Jennifer Torres, City of Corona
Lyndy Lewis, City of Corona
Mark Bulot, SBVMWD
Jayne Joy, EMWD
Edward Filadelfia, EMWD
Robert Kent, USGS
Carmen Burton, USGS
Joe LeClaire, WE Inc. (teleconf)
Gerard Thibeault, CRWQCB (teleconf)
Larry Chrystal, Babcock Labs (teleconf)
Hope Smythe, CRWQCB
Tim Moore, Risk Sciences
Mark Norton, SAWPA
Regina Patterson, SAWPA

Call to Order / Introductions

The Emerging Constituents (EC) Workgroup meeting was called to order at 9:35 a.m. at the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority located at 11615 Sterling Avenue, Riverside, California. Introductions were made.

Approval of Meeting Summary

Mark Norton presented the December 7, 2009 Meeting Summary for approval. The following revision was made:

Page 2, Paragraph 2, first sentence, replace the word "large" with the word "small".

The Meeting Summary was deemed acceptable as amended.

Draft Emerging Constituents TF Agreement and Status of Phase II EC Report Signature Page

Mark Norton presented the Emerging Constituents (EC) Task Force Agreement and provided some background. He stated there are costs involved with conducting and compiling work for the Phase II Report and the Annual Sampling Report. Kathy Kunysz requested that Metropolitan Water District of Southern California be added to the list of Task Force Agencies, not as Advisory Member.

Jayne Joy expressed concerns of misrepresentation of emerging constituent sampling and asked that a task be added to the Task Force agreement to address communications. She suggested creating a communications document that is consistent, and all agencies are responding with the same message. Heather Collins stated their database is intended to provide the reporting tools to EPA and for their internal staff to make evaluations. It is not intended to be a public

database because there are other vehicles to convey that information. Mr. Norton invited the group to attend the EC Communications Workgroup meeting to be held immediately following this meeting to continue this discussion.

Mr. Dadakis asked what services Risk Sciences would perform in the future? Mr. Norton said the Annual EC Sampling Report that will be reevaluated based on the communication responses being received. Mark Bulot said the concept is that we are trying to keep on track, and if in the process we find research that is important and pertinent, that it be brought before the Workgroup to continue the education process. We have also made a commitment to look into the issue of ECs existing in groundwater. Mr. Moore said we need to coordinate everything we're doing with what the Blue Ribbon Panel recommends and then with what the State Board requires.

Draft FY 2010-11 EC Workgroup Budget Allocation

Mark Norton presented and discussed the budget noting the Phase II EC Report Table 7 outlines the sample locations, frequency and type of sampling, and identifies the responsible agency. He explained the projected expenses and projected revenue reporting the balance is currently at \$85,000. **The budget will be presented for approval at the next meeting.**

Status Report on Sampling and Analysis Plan

Tim Moore provided notes and background from the January 5, 2010 EC Methods Meeting with the technical experts who helped sort through the issues. The questions discussed were:

- a. What are our minimum MDLs and RDLs?
- b. How will we calculate those?
- c. What will be the rationale supporting our decision?
- d. What should be our error band for split samples within a lab/between labs?
- e. What kind of QA check samples should be used? (blanks, travel blanks, field blanks, identical split samples, spike samples that are unknown to the lab)
- f. How should that budget for QA be allocated?
- g. What's the most useful thing for interpreting the data?
- h. How should data be reported?

Discussion continued on the notes and Mr. Norton inquired about an estimate of what the anticipated sampling and analysis costs would be. Mr. Moore said the cost would be approximately \$1,000 per sample, but that details could be worked out to minimize those costs.

Andy Eaton briefly presented a table outlining batch QC and Field QC MRL results. He discussed method blank reporting limits and lab contamination. Larry Chrystal said Babcock Labs has no problem with the scenario described by MWH Labs. Jason Dadakis suggested the labs develop a sampling and collection process document that Tim Moore and the Task Force could review. **Mr. Dadakis will coordinate the sample collection process with the other labs. Mr. Moore suggested the labs do the matrix spike so that we know how much QA/QC is done and what the costs will be.** It also needs to be determined who should prepare the reference samples or if an outside source should be used.

Presentation by Dr. Dan Schlenk - Blue Ribbon Panel on Emerging Constituents (ECs)

Dr. Dan Schlenk, U.C. Riverside Professor, Environmental Toxicologist, and Blue Ribbon Panel member on Emerging Constituents discussed the following questions that were derived from the technical group to address issues related to ECs:

- What are the appropriate constituents to be monitored including analytical methods and MDLs?
- What is the known toxicological information for the above constituents?
- Would the above lists change based on level of treatment and use? If so, how?

CEC Panel Schedule:

- Meeting: February 25-26, 2010
- First Draft Report: March 30, 2010
- Meeting: April 22-23, 2010
- Submission to SWRCB: May 5, 2010

Dr. Schlenk discussed stakeholder concerns including sediment toxicity, urban stormwater, brine, pet waste, issues related to monitoring tools and approach, and a host of constituents. Issues on policy and guidance including things related to cautionary principle, source control and treatment, and how to optimize resources and avoid duplication of other groups that do the same thing.

He reported a member of the Mussel Watch Program offered his services in terms of using the Mussel Watch Program to look for compounds other than the legacy compounds that are normally done.

In the next steps, SCCWRP will be putting together some of the data needed, chemistry and some toxicity primarily from NPDES permits.

Future Meeting(s)

February 24, 2010 - 1:30 p.m.

March 23, 2010 - 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Norton stated the next meeting will be a combined meeting of this Workgroup and the EC Communications Workgroup. The Task Force asked the Regional Board representatives if it was acceptable to extend the deadline for the EC Annual Sampling and Analysis Plan from March 15th to April 1st. Mr. Thibeault indicated he did not think that would be a problem.

Adjournment

The Emerging Constituents Workgroup meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Handout(s) (available at www.sawpa.org)

1. EC Task Force Agreement
2. Draft FY 2010-11 EC Workgroup Budget Allocation
3. Notes from EC Methods 1/5/10 Meeting
4. Samples Table (QC)