

# July 7th VOC Working Group Meeting Notes

## Attendees:

<u>SCAQMD Staff</u>	<u>Department</u>
Brad Parrack (mod)	AQMD Lab
Joan Niertit	AQMD Lab
Hanna Lignell	AQMD Lab
Tereso Banuelos	AQMD Lab

  

<u>Lab Tour Visitors</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Jerry Powers	Chromaflo
Chris Nardi	Chromaflo
Chris Pollack	Sherwin Williams
Stephen Foster	Emerald Chemical
Gina Johnson	Emerald Chemical
Brian Morehouse	Emerald Chemical
Barry Marcks	CalDOT
Cathy Willis	BASF
Chrissy Ford	BASF
Dave Nevison	Valspar
Dave Darling	ACA
Barry Cupp	Sherwin Williams
Cidnie Hoang	Behr
Kristy Rodriguez	Intertek
Kimberly Gutierrez	Intertek

  

<u>Phone Participants</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Dan Knoffe	Rustoleum
Stan Tong	EPA Region IX
Matt Plate	EPA Region IX
Guy Wilson	Sherwin Williams
Pat Gieske	Valspar
Paul Sutton	Sherwin Williams
	Emerald

Brad Parrack opened the meeting by describing the shape of the teleconference; the only agenda item is to check in on the progress that labs participating in the Pilot Test had made since the previous meeting. Brad Parrack added that this meeting could be used to address unexpected problems that had popped up, to answer new questions that participants had come up with or to describe recent success.

Brad Parrack added that the discussion was set to be technical in nature, and that policy would be discussed at a later time. Brad Parrack asked the participants in the room and on the phone whether or not progress had been made or if participants were waiting to return home before beginning the analysis to take advantage of anything learned during the lab visit.

Participants responded that they were still in the process of acquiring chemicals and consumables since they take a lengthy time to ship. Some labs indicated that they had acquired most of the compounds and consumables required, and had begun to move towards characterizing the splitting in the inlet and following the column.

Emerald Chemical indicated that they had acquired all the required materials and were ready to proceed with the IOM preparation and instrument evaluation steps.

Brad Parrack asked if anyone had actually prepped an IOM and injected it yet, and Barry Marcks indicated that he had done so, but had questions as to how to calculate the relative response factors. Brad Parrack indicated that the response factor calculation would be covered in the afternoon session and that a template would be submitted to the group for calculating such factors during phase two of the pilot test.

Brad Parrack asked if anyone else on the line had made progress with the IOM prep, but nobody indicated that they had. Stan Tong asked for the IOM acronym definition, and Brad Parrack responded that it stands for Instrument Optimization Mix. Stan Tong asked how many labs were participating in the project, and Brad Parrack responded that it was currently 11 labs including the SCAQMD lab which intends to run the same samples on 4 different instruments.

Guy Wilson asked about the time frame for performing the optimization check, since the method would require instrument optimization that will cost them time. Brad Parrack stated that the IOM results were initially proposed to be returned to the AQMD on August 19<sup>th</sup>. Chris Pollack and Paul Sutton indicated that some of the equipment that they required was still on its way and they were at the mercy of external forces.

Jerry Powers asked about the delivery date of the samples because it would be in their interest to analyze the samples immediately after the IOMs. Brad mentioned that in addition to not wanting to spend resources to send samples to non-qualifying labs, the associated materials are also not ready and will take time to develop, and there is still no plan or monies available for shipping the materials to participants.

Brad Parrack mentioned that the phase 2 samples were likely to be delivered at the end of September at the earliest, and that the amount of time dedicated to the analysis of those samples would likely be on the scale of a quarter of the year due to the lack of autosamplers in many of the labs. Guy Wilson commented that he felt that this was a reasonable approach to take given what needs to be done.

Brad Parrack indicated that the plan was to get the IOM information back, approve the labs who can meet the criteria, then send out samples that meet the conditions agreed upon in the prior meetings with the expectation that they be completed and returned within the ensuing 3 months.

Dave Nevison added that the instrument methods that are settled on by analysts during the IOM analysis portion of the pilot test can be easily retrieved once the samples are issued to laboratories, thus reducing the amount of time it would take to generate results. A concern was raised as to whether the IOM would need to be re-created during the sample analysis portion of the pilot test, and Brad Parrack stated that the IOMs should be stored in a freezer and analyzed again during phase two; assuming the QC continues to pass for the IOM, it can continue to be utilized.

Brad Parrack decided that the many factors contributing to the analytical difficulties to this point was enough justification to push the phase one due date back to September 2<sup>nd</sup>.

It was asked if the EPA was participating in the process, to which Stan Tong responded that it would take at least a year to perform this kind of work.

A question was asked about what would be provided to the group during the next phase of the study in terms of calibrations and calculations, and Brad Parrack responded that spreadsheet templates would be provided to perform the RRF determinations as well as the VOC g/L calculations for samples, but they were not yet ready.

Brad Parrack asked for a date to speak again, and it was decided that July 27<sup>th</sup> was an optimal time to speak again, with a time TBD and with an additional focus on sample types to be used.