

Whole Effluent Toxicity Committee Meeting

Wednesday July 16, 2025 – 1PM Eastern

1 - Welcome and Roll Call

Paul Junio will serve as the scribe for the meeting in Lynn's absence and will prepare meeting minutes. Attendance is recorded in Attachment 1. A quorum was present for the meeting. 4 Associate Members were present.

2 - Approval of Agenda

Teresa Norberg-King called the meeting to order at 13:03 Eastern. Teresa offered the proposed agenda which was approved by consent. Stephen asked to add Congratulations to Darrin on his retirement.

3 - Approval of Minutes from June 18 meeting

Teresa noted that Craig Huff would be retiring soon but that he intended to stay active. With that said, she asked if there were any comments/corrections on the June 18 Minutes. Hearing none, Stephen moved to approve the minutes. Chandra seconded the motion. The motion passed with abstentions from Katie and Lyndsay.

4 - Discussion on V1M7 Draft Standard Comments

Teresa asked each attendee for their thoughts on the comments as a whole. Stephen said he needs to go through it in its entirety. In a broader strategy, he would like to attack the toughest items first because those details might make the rest of it easier. Teresa isn't positive how to handle the requests for things like either 'being more specific' or addressing the paragraph style. Paul offered to reformat the module based on the style guide SOP that TNI has written. Darrin takes an opposite stance to Stephen in that he thinks it's hard to address a non-specific comment. He thinks that addressing the specific ones might take care of the non-specific ones. This might especially apply to comment #1 as there is no benchmark for success. Teresa added that she has no idea how to build a guide without knowing how the first comment is handled. Katie says she's going through the stages of grief – overwhelmed, angry, and isn't sure how to address that. Chandra said it would be nice if there were a master editor. We should focus on the substance rather than the style. Jennifer asked what do we do if someone thinks it's too wordy, but we've got information that we think is important? Teresa asked how can we pare it down and yet make it more specific, following up on similar seemingly conflicted comments. Potentially nothing comes out but if it's numbered differently, it makes it easier for people to understand as they go. Lindsay thought it looked overwhelming. Paul pointed out that it's not that bad in that many comments are simply his regarding definitions. Many of them should be easy to

deal with. Rebecca said there's lots of ground to cover and there sure is overlap among the comments. Adding specificity would help. Adding a feedback column to the Response to Comments spreadsheet may be a start. This could make it easier for people to address individual comments that have been submitted. Paul pointed out that the use of the Response to Comments form is mandated by TNI; however, a column could be added to help capture comments from committee members. That wouldn't be used when the form is published, but could be used to help us determine the direction that we want to go. Amy said their comments were mostly generalized due to the lack of time and staff for review. From a regulatory standpoint this doesn't hold up. There's too much explanation and examples of how to do something. They would like less gray but needs it to be concise. Something could be done that would make it easier to read.

The committee began reviewing comments in the order presented on the Response to Comment form. [NOTE – comments are captured in the Response to Comment Form as well as being made within the Draft Module 7. Both are important parts of these minutes.] Stephen commented that it's difficult to address some of the comments because they are not regulatory, however the module was written based on what assessors were asking for. Amy commented that we also have the method so that there was no need to rehash the method. Stephen countered that that was the frequent request, however. Teresa added that not all methods are clear on certain points. Stephen said that EPA methods contain certain points while the ASTM methods don't, so we preferred to have it included in the standard as best practice. Teresa suggested that comment one be moved to the end as it will need a good deal of discussion. [EDITOR'S NOTE – A column called 'Sort Order' was added so that comments such as #1 could be noted as being moved later in the discussion] She wasn't sure if it maybe could become guidance or in a table. Stephen said that was a big ask trying to create a table like this in the end. Darrin agreed we don't want to have information in too many places. Teresa said it's difficult because there is no context to the comment. The committee will need to explain what is being done where the standard says how. Katie added we'll need to clarify the how if it is being used as an example as opposed to when it is an explicit requirement. Darrin asked an editorial question regarding making changes, such as was suggested with numbering of paragraphs and other editorial changes. Paul explained that he could do the formatting of the document. Teresa thought that might help to have the definition comments placed into the document to capture the issues at hand. The use of the term approach will need to be addressed on a case-by-case basis in comment 48. In choosing to put the definition comments into the body of the document for ease of review, the committee moved forward to comment #28, skipping past the definitions entirely for now. Darrin said he had no access to Module 2 which makes it

difficult to consider the comment. Paul will provide the relevant language in Module 2 to the committee.

Comment 34 references 'non-approved methods' as being something related to the CFR. Stephen said it would apply to methods that are requested that aren't in a methods manual or otherwise promulgated; he asked if what was listed in section 1.4 in the current standard was better language to keep? Again, Paul will share with the committee the language appropriate for non-reference methods from Module 2. Stephen said it looks like we've added a validation sentence. Amy said her issue was the first part of the sentence. It first must be a regulatory requirement and second a customer requirement, and the order was changed. Stephen said we were trying to capture both data user requirements and customer requirements. Both are obligations and one shouldn't overrule the other. Amy expressed concern that the regulatory requirement was stated second, and Pennsylvania didn't like the order. The DOC section also talks about non reference validation so we need to make sure we have agreement there.

- New Business - None

- Adjourn

Having reached the end of the allotted time the committee stopped its debate at comment #34. The meeting adjourned at 1430 Eastern. The next meeting will be August 20th at 1300 Eastern. The committee's session at NEMC in St. Louis is on Monday, August 4 from 9-10. Paul will present for the committee.

Attachment 1 WET Expert Committee Membership

Member	Organization	Email	Stakeholder	Term Expires	Present?
Beth Biller	VA DCLS	Beth.biller@dgs.virginia.gov	AB	Jan. 2026 (1)	No
Thekkekalathil "Chandra" Chandrasekhar	FL DEP	Thekkekalathil.Chandrasekhar@dep.state.fl.us	Lab	Jan. 2027 (2)	Yes
Stephen Clark (Vice Chair)	Pacific EcoRisk	slclark@pacificecorisk.com	Lab	Jan. 2027 (2)	Yes
Darrin Greenstein	Southern CA Coastal Water Research Proj.	Darring@sccwrp.org	Other	Jan. 2026 (1)	Yes
Christina Henderson	Eurofins Environment Testing Ecotoxicology	Christina.Henderson@et.eurofinsus.com	Lab	Jan. 2026 (1)	No
Teresa Norberg-King (Chair)	USEPA (retired)	Norbe010@d.umn.edu	Other	Jan. 2027	Yes

Katie Payne	Enthalpy Analytical	katie.payne@enthalpy.com	Lab	Jan. 2027 (1)	Yes
Lyndsay Thomas	Coastal Bioanalysts, Inc.	lyndsay@coastalbio.com	Lab	Jan. 2026 (1)	Yes
Caitie Van Sciver	NJ DEP	Caitie.VanSciver@dep.nj.gov	AB	Jan. 2027 (2)	No
Gretchen Welfinger	NY ELAP	gretchen.welfinger@health.ny.gov	AB	Jan. 2027 (1)	No
Elizabeth West	Retired	eawest1111@gmail.com	Other	Jan. 2027 (1)	No

Program Administrator: Lynn Bradley, lynn.bradley@nelac-institute.org

Scribe: Paul Junio, paul.junio@nelac-institute.org

Associate Members present were Carlita Barton, Amy Hackman, Rebekah Pauly, and Jessica Redifer.

Whole Effluent Toxicity Committee Meeting

Wednesday July 16, 2025 – 1PM Eastern

Microsoft Teams [Need help?](#)

[Join the meeting now](#)

Meeting ID: 281 375 704 480 3

Passcode: 3CC9PW99

Dial in by phone

[+1 469-340-2365,,631483963#](tel:+14693402365) United States, Grand Prairie

Phone conference ID: 631 483 963#

Welcome and Roll Call

- Approval of Agenda
- Approval of Minutes from June 18 meeting
- Discussion on V1M7 Draft Standard Comments
- New Business, if any
- Adjourn

Action Items:

- * Paul Junio will present the committee's progress at the TNI conference in August.
- * Teresa Norberg-King will gather feedback from the committee members regarding their thoughts on the comments received and how to approach them.
- * Paul Junio will take on the task of reformatting the document to address the comments and send it back to the committee for review and approval.
- * Paul Junio will ensure that the comments received are organized and presented in a manner that allows the committee to address them effectively.
- * Paul Junio will add a feedback column to the comments document to track committee members' thoughts on each comment.