

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

Minutes of Meeting #1

Held remotely on Tuesday December 8, 2020, 1:00 PM to 3:30 PM
Webcast [link](#)

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)

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

Laboratory Accreditation - Steven Boggs (CA ELAP)

Private Laboratories - Jeff Miller (Aqua-Science Laboratories)

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

Invited speakers:

Karen Mogus (SWRCB)

There were 46 attendees in the virtual public audience.

Agenda Items #1 and #2- Welcome and Stakeholder Committee Introductions

Ken Schiff called the meeting to order at 1:01 PM and welcomed the attendees. The Stakeholder Committee members provided self-introductions.

Agenda Item #3- Context with Toxicity Provisions and charge to the Stakeholder Committee

Karen Mogus of the SWRCB described the specific intent of the project, which is to:

- Investigate test conditions and factors that can be controlled to reduce within-test variability and improve a laboratory's performance
- Evaluate the consistency and comparability of *C. dubia* toxicity testing among state-accredited laboratories across California
- Guided by an Expert Science Panel and a stakeholder advisory committee

The project is a quality assurance study to help determine whether laboratory best practices might be recommended to improve laboratory performance. The project is not intended to be:

- A method validation study to determine whether *C. dubia* should be used in California regulatory programs
- A study to estimate false positive or false negative rates using the Test of Significant Toxicity (TST)

John Wheeler finished the presentation providing the charge to the Stakeholder Committee:

- Attend Stakeholder Advisory Committee meetings to ensure equal sector representation
- Communicate with organizations you represent
- Review proposed list of expert panelists
- Review drafts of project deliverables, and provide feedback to SCCWRP including Planning documents, Interim milestones, and Final recommendations/guidance

The Stakeholder Committee members accepted their charge.

Stakeholder Committee members discussed several items including the timeline to complete the study. Despite some delays to get started, the study should be completed by the end of 2022. Also, the Committee discussed if the study could result in a delay of implementing the *C. dubia* reproduction toxicity provisions. The *C. dubia* reproduction test is an approved method, and it is unlikely that the outcome of the study would cause delay in implementation of the numerical objectives for the chronic *C. dubia* test included in the Toxicity Provisions. Finally, the Stakeholder Committee endorsed the use of a project web page easily accessible from the SWRCB website to enhance transparency.

Agenda Item#4- Project Scope

Alvina Mehinto presented an outline of the project approach to the Stakeholder Advisory Committee. The approach is comprised of three basic steps:

- Form an Expert Science Panel
- Evaluate and optimize test method conditions
 - Identify potential sources of variability within and among laboratories
 - Optimize test method parameters to minimize variability
 - Evaluate efficacy QA refinements for this test method
- Develop guidance document

While the Committee members had much discussion about the project approach, no Committee member rejected the overall approach. Much of the discussion were potential options or preferences on detailed development of the approach, but many of the details will be developed and decided upon in future steps with the help of the Expert Science Panel. Clarification was provided that the Stakeholder Advisory Committee will review early versions of the detailed workplan, all interim deliverables, and the final recommendations prior to presentation to the Expert Science Panel. Moreover, the Stakeholder Advisory Committee comments will be documented and presented to the Expert Science Panel. The Expert Science Panel will evaluate and approve all deliverables including the Workplan, Interim deliverables and Final recommendations.

The Stakeholder Committee also discussed the issue of funding. SWRCB funding was designed to pay for all activities related to study planning, facilitation, project coordination among laboratories, data management and analysis, and reporting. The SWRCB funding does not include laboratory reimbursement for toxicity testing. The SWRCB is in consultation with the regulated parties to provide match funding or in-kind services to pay laboratories for testing, but these decisions have yet to be finalized. If funding were not to occur, the SWRCB recommended reducing the laboratory analysis portion of the project scope.

Agenda Item #5- Public comments

Public comments and questions were addressed through the question feature in the remote attendance software. Several questions were raised including concerns about false indications of toxicity, how many and what type of samples will be distributed to laboratories, and coordination with the SWRCB's Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (ELAP) requirements using The NELAC Institute (TNI) standards. Ultimately, cooperation of State-accredited laboratories is paramount for the success of the study. So, the goal is to include every State-accredited laboratory for *Ceriodaphnia dubia* toxicity testing in California.

Agenda Item #6- [Closed session] Formation of the Expert Science Panel.