

Whole Effluent Toxicity Committee Meeting

Wednesday, June 17, 2026 – 1:00 PM Eastern

Minutes

1 - Welcome and Roll Call

Teresa called the meeting to order at 1301 Eastern. Attendees are found in Attachment 1. 9 Voting Members and 4 Associate Members were present. Paul Junio was present as the PA.

2 - Approval of Agenda

The Agenda was approved as presented by consent.

3 - Approval of Minutes from May 20 meeting

Following a review of the May 20 meeting minutes, Chandra made a motion to approve minutes, with Darrin seconding. All committee members voted in favor, with abstentions from Stephen and Christina. The minutes will be forwarded for posting.

4 - Discussion of Comments on Draft V1M7

Discussion began with the comments that Paul had submitted prior to the meeting. Caitie's comments were also added to a document with Paul's since she submitted comments in response to his.

Section 5 – Paul suggested that the bulleted list following the paragraph beginning 'For new test methods, procedures are developed' be moved to an informative Annex. Stephen would be ok with it in an Annex if it wouldn't get lost. Paul gave a description of Annexes. They are new for TNI based on how ISO/IEC 17025:2017 uses them. Modules 2 and 3 (at a minimum) will contain Annexes. The Annex will follow immediately after the Module. Teresa mentioned that Lynn had made comment of not using Annexes, or of adding additional terms to the committee's webpage. *[EDITOR'S NOTE – Paul is not aware of any ability to add terms to a committee page – they would need to appear in the Standard in order to appear in the Glossary]*. Matt suggested that this list is necessary from an assessment perspective, and suggested changing 'considered' to 'included'. That suggestions was met with approval. Teresa commented that we need to look at whether we need this same language to apply to methods other than new methods.

Paul suggested that the Note that appears at the end of Section 5 should be moved to an Annex. This was considered a good suggestion. Paul will move that language to an Annex

that he will format appropriately. *[EDITOR'S NOTE – the suggested items to move to the Annex were completed in conjunction with these minutes.]*

Paul suggested that the NOTE in Section 6.3 and the bulleted lists that follow be moved to the Annex. Stephen pointed out that there are differences in how laboratories choose to operate, and that making this non-mandatory by including it in an Annex was a good idea while still providing useful information. Christina agreed for the same reasons.

Paul noted that the committee needed to make a decision on the language regarding new analysts at the beginning of Section 6.3.1. We have repeated language that came from other Modules, but haven't deleted the original language referring to a 'senior analyst'. Stephen preferred the original language. Calista said that the laboratory procedures should make it clear how training is done. Matt pointed out that the language from other Modules implies more than a new laboratory, while the 'senior analyst' language implies only existing laboratories can train. For that reason, he doesn't like the 'senior analyst' language and prefers the same language as in other Modules. Paul pointed out that we would have to determine what is meant by a 'senior analyst' and that is problematic. Matt agreed saying that it is covered better in the other language. Teresa asked if this could be taken too broadly and lead into training needs such as in Sample Receipt needing a DOC. Stephen supports having roles described and wondered where they would be found. Teresa thought that the tasks in the fourth paragraph would cover this and Paul noted that language for module 5 for support tests might help. Matt asked if we want to require laboratories to demonstrate the ability to feed and care for organisms. It isn't support but also not part of the test. Jessica noted that if culturing fails, it shouldn't be an issue because while they didn't care for the organisms they also wouldn't be able to pass the test. Teresa asked how do you show the culturing works? Christina commented culturing is support for testing and that they don't do a DOC for culturing but do one for testing. Matt noted that there's a difference of how laboratories handle that issue. Stephen is struggling wondering if there is a husbandry SOP in the laboratory? Would you have an SOP for login for example. Why would there be a DOC for these support rules because in his mind DOC is training. Paul said those are two different things -- DOC's and training. How would you do a DOC for login? Christina said support shouldn't require DOC because it's something else. Matt said as an assessor he's indifferent, but again he likes the wording from the other modules better than that referenced by the senior analyst. The Committee modified the training wording as follows: 'An individual who performs any activity as defined by the laboratory's procedures involving support, preparation, and/or analysis must have constant, close supervision (as defined in the laboratory's training procedure) until a satisfactory initial DOC is completed. The laboratory must have a documented procedure describing initial DOCs for analysts.'

Paul pointed out that the ‘substitution table’ talks about ‘may or may not substitute’ and the Notes before and after make this guidance, making it something that should be in the Annex. The committee agreed, and will look at the language once moved to make sure we have all of the required information.

Paul’s final comment was that Section 7.1.1 a) viii uses consider, and that we need to either make those things requirements or move to an Annex. The committee quickly agreed to a wording change from ‘consider’ to ‘include, as applicable’.

5 – New Business

Paul will move the agreed upon items to, and format, an Annex. Paul committed to having this sent to all Committee members by June 22, including reviewing Caitie’s comments as we have likely addressed some of them. *[EDITOR’S NOTE – comments from Caitie that still need addressing were highlighted in conjunction with these minutes.]* Teresa asked all members to review the document in total, with the consideration of ‘can you live with it’. She also reminded everyone to review the usage of test, test method, and toxicity test method to determine a path forward. She asked for comments to be submitted by July 8 so that they could be compiled for all to review, with a goal of having this ready for the TNI Meeting in Houston. WET will have its session Tuesday afternoon from 1 until 3.

Note that Word’s review feature allows for both a ‘clean’ and a ‘track changes’ version in the same document. By selecting the Review header from Word’s menu, you can change the markup style from ‘All Markup’ which shows all changes made to ‘No Markup’ to see what a clean version looks like.

6 - Adjourn

The Committee’s next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 15 at 1PM Eastern. Paul noted that he has a conflict and needs to re-schedule the meeting scheduled for July 15. A quick survey among those in attendance indicated that moving the meeting to the following week (July 22 at 1PM ET) would work. Paul will survey all Members to confirm that date and time. The meeting adjourned at 1434 Eastern.

Attachment 1 WET Expert Committee Membership

Member	Organization	Email	Stakeholder	Term Expires	Present?
Carlita Barton	LA County Sanitation Districts	cbarton@lacsds.org	Lab	2029 (1)	No
Beth Biller	VA DCLS	Beth.biller@dgs.virginia.gov	AB	2029 (2)	Yes
Thekkekalathil "Chandra" Chandrasekhar	FL DEP	Thekkekalathil.Chandrasekhar@dep.state.fl.us	Lab	2027 (2)	Yes
Stephen Clark (Vice Chair)	Pacific EcoRisk	slclark@pacificecorisk.com	Lab	2027 (2)	Yes
Darrin Greenstein	Southern CA Coastal Water Research Proj. (retired)	darrinjg@verizon.net	Other	2029 (2)	Yes
Christina Henderson	Eurofins Environment Testing Ecotoxicology	Christina.Henderson@et.eurofinsus.com	Lab	2027 (1)	Yes
Matthew Jones	KS DHE	matthew.jones@ks.gov	AB	2029 (1)	Yes
Teresa Norberg-King (Chair)	USEPA (retired)	Norbe010@alumni.umn.edu	Other	2027 (1)	Yes
Katie Payne	Nautilus Environmental	katie.payne@nautilusenvironmental.com	Lab	2027 (2)	Yes
Lyndsay Thomas	Coastal Bioanalysts, Inc.	lyndsay@coastalbio.com	Lab	2027 (1)	No
Caitie Van Sciver	NJ DEP	Caitie.VanSciver@dep.nj.gov	AB	2027 (2)	No
Gretchen Welfinger	NY ELAP	gretchen.welfinger@health.ny.gov	AB	2027 (1)	Yes
Elizabeth West	Retired	eawest1111@gmail.com	Other	2027 (1)	No

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

Associate Members present were:

Calista Daigle, Kathleen Mitchell, Jessica Redifer, and Jennifer Whitaker.