

2009 CAM Revision Work Group

Meeting Minutes from January 27, 2009

Present: Don Muldoon, Liz Denly, Susan Chapnick, Mike Reed, Mike Leblanc, Bianca Hebbel, David Lubianez, Jim Occhialini, Lisa Westerlind, Dave Dickinson, Mark Casey, Lori Herberich, Mark Warren, Mike Erickson, Ray Siegener, Steve Hartmann, Dallas Wait, Kim Reid, Jamie Stapleton, Gretchen Fodor

1. Don Muldoon presented overall approach to CAM Revisions.

- Goal is to complete revisions by the end of the year followed by training for labs.
- ITLA will take the lead in organizing the training (sometime next year).
- Work Group will meet every other month but much of the work will be completed in between meetings.
- Focus of revised documents will be to clarify required vs. recommended actions for “presumptive certainty” under the CAM. Use of the CAM, however, will still be at the discretion of the data user.

2. Discussion on General Revisions to CAM Documents.

- Ten (10) general revisions were presented by Liz and discussed with the Work Group. Work Group members did not add to the list of proposed general revisions.
- List of general revisions included the following:
 1. Incorporate current Analytical Notes into methods, as applicable.
 2. Incorporate current FAQs into methods, as applicable.
 3. Make documents more concise and easier to read by all interested parties.
 4. Clarify required versus recommended procedures in CAM methods.
 5. Version of SW-846 method to retain in documents.
 6. Addition of data audit deliverable tables for each method.
 7. Ensure consistency with current Data Usability policy.
 8. Revise Presumptive Certainty form, as needed.
 9. Significant Figures requirements for each method.
 10. CAM Preface and Overview.
- Highlights from Work Group discussion on above elements:
 - General revision #1: agreed
 - General revision #2: agreed
 - General revision #3: agreed. MCP Method 1 standards will be deleted from Analyte list tables in the CAM since these change over time. Instead, methods will include links to the MCP standards. In addition, the CAM web page will include the links to the various standards.
 - General revision #4: agreed
 - General revision #5: To be resolved. SW-846 method references (e.g. 8260B) should be retained as this was basis of CAM. Work Group will evaluate the current SW-846 methods, for updating CAM Performance Standards, as applicable. It was subsequently proposed by Don Muldoon that reference to required analytical method, SW-846, etc.) should only be mentioned in the text of the document in a new Section 1.1.1 for ease of future editing.
 - General revision #6: agreed

- General revision #7: agreed. Add data rejection criteria (as summarized in Appendix IV of the Data Usability policy) to CAM methods Performance Standards table. One Work Group member also stressed the importance of having a measure of accuracy in the sample matrix for methods that do not use surrogates (e.g., metals). Discussion will continue in method-specific revisions.
- General revision #8: agreed
- General revision #9: agreed that there should be information in CAM methods concerning significant figure reporting by laboratory. There was discussion on standardizing how many significant figures should be reported for each method (organic vs inorganic). A consensus on this issue will be made at Work Group Meeting #2. **ACTION ITEM: Laboratory members within the Work Group will e-mail Liz within the next week on how many significant figures they are currently reporting and any recommendations.**
- General revision #10: Not discussed – add to next Work Group meeting agenda
- Enforcement: There was a brief discussion on how DEP will enforce the use of the CAM in the laboratories. Don Muldoon stated that this is something he is currently working on.

3. Discussion on Specific Revisions to CAM 8260B.

- Section 1.5.5 (Trip Blanks and Field Duplicates for SW-846 Method 8260B Analyses): it was agreed upon that this section would be eliminated. Instead, one sentence would be included in every method to refer to CAM VII for field QC requirements.
- Example 8260 data audit table handed out to Work Group.
- Performance Standard Table IIA-1: The Work Group went line by line reviewing all QA/QC parameters in the Performance Standard Table IIA-1 for VOC 8260B to decide on updates to Performance Standards, Corrective Actions, and Analytical Responses. Work Group members decided on “required” vs. “recommended” corrective actions. Updated 8260B CAM will be distributed to Work Group members with these changes. Several issues required further action, as follows:
 - (1) For all Performance Standards, Liz will check the new 8260C to ensure we are meeting these requirements.
 - (2) Labs to e-mail us their list of “difficult” analytes for 8260B; need to determine if 50-150% is reasonable for these “difficult” analytes

4. Final Wrap-up

- Next meeting: March 3, 2009: 9:15 AM: DEP, Worcester, MA office

5. Summary of Action Items:

- **Laboratory members within the Work Group will e-mail Liz within the next week on how many significant figures they are currently reporting and recommendations going forward.**
- **For all Performance Standards, Liz will check the new 8260C to note changes in criteria – any differences will be brought up in the next version of the VOC CAM.**
- **Labs will get back to us on this issue of “difficult” analytes for LCSs.**

- **An e-mail will go out to the Work Group with the 8260 issues that were not covered in the meeting.**
- **A revised version of the CAM 8260B method will be sent to the Work Group within the next few weeks.**

Thank you all for participating in this important Work Group to assist DEP in continuing improvement and consistency of the quality of chemical data to support MCP decisions.