

2009 CAM Revisions Work Group

2009 CAM Revision Work Group

Meeting Minutes from April 14, 2009

Present: Don Muldoon, Liz Denly, Susan Chapnick, Nancy Rothman (via phone), Lori Herberich, Mark Warren, Jim Occhialini, Paul Fyfe, Heather Beaudoin, Bianca Hebbel, Laurel Stoddard, Mike Erickson, Mike Reed, Kim Reid, Dallas Wait, Mike LeBlanc, John Fitzgerald, Edie Hutchinson

1. Liz Denly presented the Organic Subcommittee's recommendations for CAM Methods 8081B (pesticides) and 8082A (PCBs).

- Updated performance standard tables were provided to Work Group members for 8081B and 8082A. Items which were added or which changed from the original CAM were discussed with the Work Group. There were no objections to any of the changes/additions that were discussed. Additional issues discussed include the following:
 - 8081B & 8082A: "Obvious interference": A definition of this will be provided in the Analytical Notes section of the text.
 - 8082A: Aroclors 1262 and 1268 will be included as part of the CAM PCB Aroclor analyte list.
 - 8082A: The holding time for PCBs will be updated as per 8082A: There will be no holding time until extraction but we will keep the holding time for analysis as 40 days from the date of extraction.
 - All methods: The method name will be added to the table headers as well as the header of each individual method.

2. Susan Chapnick presented the Inorganic Subcommittee's recommendations for CAM Method 6010B (ICP metals).

- Updated performance standard tables were provided to Work Group members for ICP-AES 6010 (updated with 6010C method requirements & technical judgment of the subcommittee). Items which were added or which changed from the original CAM were discussed with the Work Group. It was agreed that a footnote will be added to the Analyte List Table III A-2 stating that other metals can be done by this method (e.g., copper).
- There were no objections to any of the changes/additions that were discussed with the following exceptions:
 - Resolution is required for the recommendation of a low-level calibration verification standard analysis at the end of the analytical run (required under certain conditions at the beginning of the analytical run to verify the RL): Labs will e-mail Susan their opinions about this additional requirement.
 - Measurement of accuracy in the sample matrix: The Inorganic Subcommittee is recommending that matrix spikes be required. After significant discussion, this issue was not resolved.
 - Resolution is still required for whether the matrix spikes will be required for all matrices or just soil and sediment.
 - Resolution is still required for where the matrix spike requirement will be included: CAM method, CAM VII A, or REDUA

- Sensitivity exceedance Required Analytical Response was deleted from General Reporting requirement because this issue would be documented on the revised Certification Form, discussed below.

3. CAM VII A Discussion

- Don Muldoon provided copies of a new Certification Form to the Work Group for discussion. Agreed-upon issues include the following:
 - The text of CAM VII A will include a discussion of each question on the Certification Form to provide clarity on what issues each question includes.
 - Question G will be moved below the Presumptive Certainty line.
 - Don deleted VPH/EPH question as he feels it is included in Question C. Section 2.2 of CAM VII A will state that if a significant modification to EPH/VPH/APH is performed, Question C should be answered “No”.
 - Susan Chapnick raised the question of whether or not the Department was wedded to the term “Presumptive Certainty” as it was confusing to some data users that this is interpreted as “usable” data. She recommended the term “CAM-compliant”, which is what the data are if they meet all the criteria. Don said that he is staying with this term “Presumptive Certainty” and the discussion was dropped.
 - Don discussed Additional Specific “Presumptive Certainty” Requirements (Section 2.2) that he recommended adding to the CAM VII document as examples of where a lab should answer “No” to Question C. The Workgroup did not agree with several of these as presented in the handout. Don suggested Work Group members read them over and comment back to him.
 - John Fitzgerald was concerned that labs would not be reporting the most reasonable reporting limits (based on method “best practices”) but instead would be using elevated reporting limits that were at or below the MCP criteria. The language in Section 1.1.1 of each method will be revised to tighten up the expectations of reporting limits for each method. Two questions will be included on the Certification Form to address this concern:
 - (1) Did the lab achieve the expected reporting limits of the CAM protocol?
 - (2) Did the lab achieve the regulatory standards requested by the data user?

4. Miscellaneous Method Calibration Issues

- Forcing the curve through the origin: Curves must be forced through the origin. This will be added to the performance standard table in all organic methods in the Initial Calibration row.
- Terminology: We need to ensure consistency for language regarding curves between the organic and inorganic methods and APH (e.g., quadratic, second order, linear, non-linear, etc.).
- Analytical notes for organic methods must include comment that quadratic equation can only be used if there is a legitimate reason/justification.
- Don handed out some new language for the APH method about linear regression. Once this language is finalized, an abbreviated version of it needs to be incorporated into the Analytical Notes of each organic method, not just in the performance standard table.
- Organic methods that use linear regression or quadratic equations: agreement has not yet been reached on whether the low-level standard must be plugged back into the curve for all methods or just 8260B and 8270D. Currently, only SW-846 methods 8260B and 8270D require this but SW-846 method 8081B and 8082A do not. The acceptance criteria for this standard would be %D \pm 30 or %R \pm 30. We need to decide on whether to use %D or %R and then be consistent with all organic methods.

5. "Difficult" Analytes by 8270D

- Liz Denly presented the summary of "difficult" analytes by 8270D based on the survey of labs in the Work Group.
- The Organic Subcommittee will decide upon the acceptance limits for these "difficult" analytes.

6. 8270D Aqueous Sample Preservation Techniques

- Liz Denly presented a table on the different preservation techniques currently in CAM 8270 for aqueous samples, including the 1,4-dioxane Appendix. The labs will comment back to me on this table so we can determine what is appropriate for the final method. It will be especially interesting to see if labs are using different preservation techniques for 1,4-dioxane versus the other SVOCs.

7. CAM 8260B Comments

- Liz Denly presented a summary of the major comments received on the posted CAM 8260B document.
 - The Work Group agreed that the minimum RF requirement would remain in the CAM document although only recommended in the method.
 - The performance standard table row for the LCS will include a note that the LCS must be evaluated using the continuing calibration acceptance limits if it is being used as a continuing calibration standard.
 - The discussion on the comment on reactive VOCs will occur at the next Work Group meeting due to the lack of time.

8. **Next meeting** will be held at MassDEP Central Office, 627 Main Street, Worcester, MA on June 9, 2009 beginning at 9:15 AM. NOTE: This is a change from the meeting. A conference room was not available for the originally selected date of June 2, 2009. Therefore, the meeting date was changed.

9. Summary of Action Items:

1. Laboratory members within the Work Group will e-mail Susan on their opinion on the requirement of a low-level calibration verification standard at the end of the analytical run for 6010.
2. Laboratory members within the Work Group will e-mail Liz on appropriate aqueous sample preservation techniques for SVOCs, including 1,4-dioxane, based on the table provided in the meeting.

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