

**Stakeholder Advisory Committee  
for *Ceriodaphnia dubia* Quality Assurance Study**

**Minutes of Meeting #3**

Held remotely on Wednesday March 24, 2021, 1:00 PM to 3:00 PM  
Webcast link <https://vimeo.com/528828861>

---

**List of Participants:**

*Facilitators:*

Ken Schiff and Alvina Mehinto (SCCWRP)

*Stakeholder Committee members:*

State Water Board - John Wheeler (SWRCB)

USEPA - Debra Denton (EPA Region IX)

Regional Water Quality Control Boards - Veronica Cuevas (RWQCB4)

Wastewater Agencies - Mitch Mysliwicz (Larry Walker and Assoc/CASA)

Stormwater Agencies - Jian Peng (Orange County Public Works/CASQA)

Agriculture Organizations - Sarah Lopez (Central Coast Water Quality Preservation Inc)

Private Laboratories - Jeff Miller (Aqua-Science Laboratories)

Public Laboratories - Josh Westfall (Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts)

Non-Governmental Agencies - Kaitlyn Kalua (CA Coastkeeper Alliance)

There were 51 attendees in the virtual public audience.

---

**Agenda Item #1 – Call to Order and Introductions**

Ken Schiff of SCCWRP called the meeting to order at 1:05 PM and welcomed the attendees. The Stakeholder Committee members provided roll-call attendance.

**Agenda Item #2 – Minutes of Stakeholder Committee Meeting #2**

Two committee members provided minor written revisions prior to this meeting. Lopez motioned to approve the minutes including the revisions, which was seconded by Mysliwicz. The revised minutes of the January 20 meeting were approved unanimously, with Kalua abstaining.

**Agenda Item #3 – Review of Written Draft Study Workplan**

Alvina Mehinto gave a brief summary of the process to develop the workplan, the five steps of the project, and the steps emphasized in the current draft document. Due to the nature of the project, the emphasis was placed on Step 2 (analysis of historical data and lab techniques to identify sources of variability). The results of these analyses will be used to inform the study design for the subsequent steps and revise the workplan accordingly. The amended workplan for Steps 3 and 4 will be reviewed by the Stakeholder Committee and Science Panel.

Next, each member was given the opportunity to share their major concerns and recommendations about the draft workplan. Below are the main changes that will be made to the workplan:

- The Project governance structure (Figure 1) will be revised to accurately reflect the roles of the Stakeholder Committee and Expert Science Panel and add the role of the Public. Additional information on SCCWRP staff involved in the project will be added to describe their relative roles in the project (i.e., QA officer).
- The data quality assurance section will be expanded to explain how secondary data (i.e., historical data) will be transcribed in the database and assessed for quality. A QAPP will be generated in the amended workplan detailing Steps 3 and 4.
- Variability measures will be clearly defined. Stakeholders Committee members have different interests (i.e., within test, among test, and among laboratory variability) and would like to see all of them reflected as much as possible. It was suggested to use EPA documents for definition of intra- and inter-lab variability.
- Throughout the document the study goals and objectives will be repeated to ensure that the Expert Panel, Stakeholders and the Public have a good understanding of the objectives and limitations of the study.
- Step 3 called “dose-response testing” is source of confusion and the section will be revised, including title, to better describe the approach. This Step will consist in controlled experiments to optimize select parameters.
- A glossary of terms will be included to define terms that may be misinterpreted (e.g., dose response, control variability, etc.)

The Committee also discussed the challenges associated with the collection of historical data and methods from ELAP certified labs. Information submitted to CETIS can be highly variable among laboratories. Other data included in Table 3 may not be available altogether. The Committee was reminded of the different avenues that will be used to collect the information. While SOPs and CETIS reports will be the first approach, SCCWRP will follow up with surveys and phone calls to collect missing information. Ultimately, the Science Panel will advise on the best method to deal with missing data. Concerns were also expressed regarding data sharing policies, especially for private laboratories.

Overall, the Committee agreed that the workplan should be submitted to the Science Panel after SCCWRP has made the suggested modifications. The Committee members will provide their comments in writing by March 29, 2021. SCCWRP will revise the workplan accordingly and send the document to the Expert Science Panel for review at least one week prior to their meeting on April 12<sup>th</sup>. Written comments from the Stakeholders will also be shared with the Science Panel.

#### **Agenda Item #4 – CASA Funding Update**

Mitch Mysliwicz gave an oral presentation on CASA’s recommended augmentation to the workplan as part of Step 2 (additional split sample testing after historical data analyses). The proposal was designed to address interlaboratory variability, a key issue for CASA’s membership. CASA requested the opportunity to submit the proposal to the Science Panel for their review and recommendations on the timeline for such analyses.

There was not consensus among the Stakeholder Committee members that the CASA proposal was addressing all of their concerns, and raised additional concerns. Select members of the Committee indicated that the proposal does not follow the scientific process laid out for this

project. However, the Committee agreed to include the proposal as an Appendix to the SCCWRP documents that will be sent for review by the Expert Science Panel. The Committee recommended to include detailed instructions to guide the Science Panel's review of the CASA proposal.

**Agenda Item #5 – Public Comments**

Public comments and questions were answered live and through the question and answer feature in the remote attendance software.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:07 PM.