

## Whole Effluent Toxicity Committee Meeting

Monday, January 12, 2026 – 1:00 PM Eastern

Minutes (Forum on Environmental Accreditation – Boston, MA)

There was no formal meeting of the Whole Effluent Toxicity Expert Committee at the Forum on Environmental Accreditation due to a known lack of Committee members in attendance. Paul Junio was present as the PA and presented for the committee. Committee members in attendance were Thekkekalathil “Chandra” Chandrasekhar and Catie Van Sciver.

Following a summary of how we arrived at this point, including an overview of the intended changes and the committee's intent to provide a document usable regardless of the method, the current Response to Comment document was reviewed.

The summary is as follows:

Slide	Section	Comment
30	7.2	Suggest that the 5 SRTs must be performed within the last 18 months, similar to the application period, limiting data to that timeframe. <i>Comment rejected – too stringent, follow the requirement as written.</i>
31	7.2.1	A suggestion was made to delete the highlighted (added) text, as that requirement is redundant. There may be better language in use by another Expert Committee regarding DOCs. <i>Committee moved the comment to the start of the section for clarity, and added ‘existing’ to the second portion of the requirement.</i>
38	8.1.1 a)	Is it the last 20 data points that are needed, or the last 5? Clarify. Also, suggest clarifying by separating the ‘outside sources’ into a separate section or paragraph. <i>See revised language in Draft Module 7</i>
39	8.1.1 a)	The use of ‘just outside’ begs the question of how outside that is.
40	8.1.1 a)	Related to the previous slide, this part of 8.1.1 a) declares what ‘well outside’ means. Does the committee mean that just outside is then within 3 standard deviations?

41	8.1.1 b)	Does 'each test' mean each batch? Among the attendees, there were differing interpretations of whether a test or a batch was appropriate and what each meant. A suggestion was made to include a negative control for each client sample (which did not receive consensus approval). There seemed to be agreement that 'test' was more correct than 'batch'.
43	8.1.4	[NOTE – this slide was errantly labeled 8.1.1] Is it necessary to verify this, or is batch QC sufficient? This seems redundant. Suggest deleting' the second sentence of 8.1.4 a). If not deleted, clarify the discussion on hygroscopic chemicals in the webinar (such as by noting that such chemicals should be free flowing and without clumps).
47	8.1.5 g)	A new section should begin with the sentence 'Dissolved oxygen and pH in aquatic tests...' to aid in clarity.
49	8.1.5 j)	Must the water be 18 megaohms? The section only requires it to be 'available'. Suggest stating reagent-grade water, however named, must meet method requirements. Suggest that as a global change.
51	8.1.5 k)	Suggest making the requirements clearly a summation if that is the committee's intent. This is most appropriate for PCBs and Organochlorine Pesticides; metals should be analyzed individually.
50	8.1.5 k)	Suggest adding 'quality of the reagent water used to make' before 'standard dilution water'.
38	8.1.1 a)	Suggest changing 'may not be older' to 'must not be older'.
	Global	SRT seems to be used interchangeably between Standard Reference Test and Standard Reference Toxicant. The Committee should consistently use one.

These comments will be presented to the Committee at its next meeting on Wednesday, January 21, 2026.