Approved June 30, 2016

New Jersey Drinking Water Quality Institute (DWQI)
Wednesday October 28, 2015, 1 pm
Meeting Minutes

Members Present:
Keith Cooper (Chair)
Jessie Gleason
Laura Cummings
Judith Klotz
Sandra Krietzman
Anthony Matarazzo
Bahman Parsa
Gloria Post
Sheng-lu Soong
Carol Storms
George Van Orden

Members Absent:
Norman Nelson

Non-members Present:
Kati Angarone, Linda Bonnette, Karen Fell, Lorraine Salamanca, Kristin Tedesco (NJDEP-Division of Water Supply & Geoscience)
Lee Lippincott (NJDEP – Division of Science, Research & Environmental Health)
Sam Jones, Tom Leach (Chemistry Council of NJ)
Jon Hurdle (NJ Spotlight)

The meeting was open to the public. All attendees were asked to sign in and provide contact information.

1. **Comments from the Chair & Introductions** – Chairman Cooper welcomed all in attendance and reminded them to please sign in. He noted that all comments will be limited to 5 minutes per person. He also asked all members to introduce themselves. He announced that the purpose of today's meeting was to discuss the Institute's review of the earlier DWQI 2009 recommendation for an MCL for 1,2,3-trichloropropane (1,2,3-TCP).
2. **Review of the September 30, 2015 minutes** - Laura Cummings made a motion to approve the minutes; Sheng-lu Soong seconded the motion. The minutes were approved. Chairman Cooper indicated that they would be posted on the DWQI website.
3. **Reports from Subcommittees on review of 1,2,3-TCP 2009 DWQI MCL recommendation** –
    - Health Effects Subcommittee – Draft 1,2,3-TCP health-Based Recommendation - Jessie Gleason presented the Health Effects Subcommittee's review of the March 2009 Health-based MCL recommendation of 0.0013 µg/L (1.3 ng/L), including relevant new information that became available after March 2009. After consideration of new information, the Health Effects Subcommittee recommended a lower Health-based MCL of 0.0005 µg/L (0.5 ng/L). There were no questions asked after this presentation. The recommended Health-based MCL is based on the same cancer potency factor recommended by the DWQI in 2009. The change is due to the application of Age Dependent Adjustment factors, as recommended by current

USEPA risk assessment guidance, to account for the greater susceptibility early in life to carcinogens that act through a mutagenic mode of action. This recommendation will be posted for public comment.

- Testing Subcommittee – Report on the Development of a Practical Quantitation Limit (PQL) for 1,2,3-TCP - Dr. Bahman Parsa presented the Testing Subcommittee's review of the March 2009 recommended Practical Quantitation Limit (PQL) of 0.03 µg/L. The Subcommittee obtained reporting limits and minimum detection limits from NJ certified drinking water laboratories (EPA Method 504.1); from UCMR3 labs (524.3) and OQA vetted labs (EPA 524.3), and calculated the PQL using five different approaches. The results ranged from 0.029 – 0.048 µg/L.

- Laura Cummings noted that some of the labs have reporting limits (RL) that were an order of magnitude higher than the PQL recommendation from the Subcommittee. Dr. Parsa explained that there was some variation, but in using the bootstrap method these labs got eliminated. Sandy Krietzman stated although some labs obtain certification to perform a method, the method may not specify a method detection limit for an unregulated contaminant. Regulation of the contaminant drives the method detection limit and PQL to lower values. Sheng-lu Soong also noted that, because the lowest calibration point is equal to the reporting level in the lab certification, the RL will not pass for quality control if it is set below the lowest calibration point. For this reason, the labs set the RL at a higher value. Sandy Krietzman stated that once a lower reporting level is required, the labs in the past have adjusted their equipment to meet it. Keith Cooper asked if method 504.1 or 524.3 would be required for the analysis of 1,2,3-TCP. Dr. Parsa replied that is a regulatory decision. Sandy Krietzman indicated that the document being presented describes the PQL, and that in the past the DWQI has not specified a method other than to say that it must be an EPA method, the labs performing the method must be DEP certified, and the labs must be able to report to the PQL. EPA Method 524.3 can achieve the UCMR3 reporting level of 0.03 µg/L in SIM mode. Gloria Post noted that for example, the Testing Subcommittee report on arsenic discusses that there are many acceptable methods that can achieve the PQL. However, for arsenic, the Testing Subcommittee report had recommended that one method that could not achieve the PQL not be accepted unless the lab demonstrates that it can achieve the PQL with that method. Anthony Matarazzo related that analyzing for synthetic organic compounds requires use of method 504.1. Sandy Krietzman indicated that method 524.3 was relatively new. Anthony Matarazzo re-stated that the Institute is not prescriptive with a method.

- **Treatment Subcommittee** – Laura Cummings noted that, in general, the Treatment Subcommittees report from 2009 indicated that the best available technology was

granular activated carbon (GAC). She indicated that the Subcommittee was actively working to validate the 2009 recommendation by looking at installations in Hawaii, California and New York. The Subcommittee has not come across any other field applications of treatment other than GAC, and, as such, is focusing on that type of treatment. Judith Klotz inquired as to whether GAC would remove other contaminants. Laura Cummings indicated that it would and that the standard empty bed contact time is 10 -15 minutes. Screening for the appropriate type of carbon is critical because of varying background matrices.

4. **Chairman's Summary** - Keith Cooper summarized the Treatment Subcommittee's position that the likely recommended treatment would be GAC, but also noted that he understood that the Treatment Subcommittee wanted to look more closely at case studies. He stated that once all the Subcommittee reports on the re-evaluation of 1,2,3-TCP were presented, they would be posted on the DWQI website and a 30-day comment period would follow. At the next full DWQI meeting following the comment period, the Institute will hold a vote. All attendees were thanked as were those that submitted information regarding 1,2,3-TCP. He indicated that the re-evaluation was meaningful work for the Institute to accomplish. He asked if there were any questions from the public; there were none. He noted that the DWQI Subcommittees continued to move forward on PFOA and PFOS. The meeting adjourned at 1:45 pm.

Minutes taken by Katrina Angarone