

CONNECTICUT ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

November 9th, 2007

Attendees: Phil Rusconi	Premier Laboratories
Jeffrey Curran	Dept. of Public Health
Kim Maloney	Town of Wallingford
Dermot Jones	Dept. of Public Health
Barbara Obert	Baron Consulting
Bert Geuser	ACT
Peter Frick	TestAmerica
Dr. Xie	
Donna Ruokonen	Northeast Laboratories
Garrett Johnson	Northeast Laboratories

Administrative:

1. The meeting was called to order at 9:35 AM.
2. Philip Schlossberg and Kevin Miller had excused absences. Greg Lawrence and Terry Spalletta did not attend.
3. (Donna) Introduction of Garrett Johnson to the committee.
4. October minutes accepted.
5. The meeting was adjourned at 12:00pm.

Old Business:

6. (Bert) Did we ever get a Freon letter response from the DEP?
7. (Pete) I don't think we actually requested a direct response.
8. (Jeff) I'll ask informally for a response. I was told in the past that the DEP wanted to move away from the Freon methods.
9. (Bert) It follows since there is a federal ban on the Freon.
10. (Dermot) Aren't some labs re-distilling and recovering Freon for reuse.
11. (Jeff) Understandable considering the cost of the Freon.

DPH Update

12. (Jeff) There are some minor changes to the PT program. We dropped the PT requirements on analytes where obtaining the PT sample is difficult. Going forward if you want to be certified for free and total chlorine; you will be required to perform PT for each. The same will be true for hardness and calcium hardness. A letter went out explaining the changes.
13. (Jeff) The CT state program will also be inspected by the EPA in the spring. The EPA inspects the state lab and looks at the DPH program every three years.

New Business

14. (Jeff) The RSR draft that was released was withdrawn the next day.
15. (Pete) So we are not in an RSR draft comment period right now?
16. (Jeff) No, we are not currently in an RSR comment period.

17. (Bert) As the lab advisory committee we need to comment on RSRs when they approach the unachievable limits. The stated intent of the regulation was to provide predictable, dependable and cost effective cleanup of properties within the state. Somehow this appears to have gotten lost. The analytical costs are being driven higher based on very low action limits. The question is will this foster cleanups or promote property abandonment. RSRs need to consider what is practical in a commercial lab today.
18. (Dermot) The action limits are not derived from what is practical in the lab rather from toxicological data.
19. (Jeff) The toxicologists are only concerned with health based risk assessment of different analytes.
20. (Jeff) We need to wait until the draft update is released and deal with what is achievable in the comment period. I'll be surprised if the update comes out with the same numbers as in the pre-released version.
21. (Phil R) The regulators aren't going to be concerned with analytical cost; they will only be concerned with the health based numbers. We need a reality check between the desired limits and what we can do in the lab.
22. (Pete) There is still a disconnect between RSRs and RCP. The RCP doesn't recommend flagging to the MDL and a good portion of the engineers don't understand the RSRs or the RCP.
23. (Bert) A property owner would be better off if their site was a federal superfund site. The EPA CLP limits are much more realistic than the Connecticut RSRs.
24. (Jeff) Let's wait to actually see the draft update and then respond appropriately.

Subcommittee Notes

25. (All) We continued the page by page review of the draft and noted edits for Jeff Curran.

Remaining 2007 Scheduled Meeting Dates:

December 14th DPH (Hartford, CT)