

## **AAPCO Workgroup or Liaison Report to Annual Meeting**

Work Group/Liaison Name: **Laboratory Committee**

Lead Person's Name: **Michelle Bogner**

Members: **Michelle Bogner (Chair), Andy Randall, Eric Petty, Jim Zhan, Ping Wan, Steve Sobeck, Michelle Campbell, and other State FIFRA laboratory representatives who may attend.**

Date of Report: **February 10, 2016**

Issues to be raised for discussion by AAPCO Board or General Session:

These are the issues the working group or liaison wishes to raise for specific deliberation by the AAPCO Board of Directors and/or the AAPCO General Session at the annual meeting. *(Note: This section can also include a self-assessment as to the effectiveness and continued need for this workgroup/liaison function.)*

**The Laboratory Committee has no issues to be raised at this time.**

General summary of work group/liaison activities for the year:

This summary will be included in the General Session meeting folder

*(Note: Reports that contain specific recommendations will be acted upon individually.)*

**The Laboratory Committee meets annually during the AAPCO spring meeting. The following report outlines activities from last year's meeting.**

The Laboratory Committee met on Monday, March 9 and Tuesday, March 10, 2015 at the Hilton Alexandria Old Town during the AAPCO annual meeting in Alexandria, VA. There were a total of 10 participants, a large decrease from the previous year. Of those participants, 5 were from state laboratories, three were from EPA and two were from industry. The low attendance was mostly due to many state lab directors attending a FDA ISO meeting in California being held during the same week. Also held during this week was PittCon, which may have attributed some to the low attendance.

Ping Wan of the Indiana State Chemist's Office provided an update on the AAPCO Formulation Check Sample Program. In the previous check sample round, 79 laboratories participated, similar to the prior year. Once again, there were more international labs that participated than domestic labs. Products that are able to be used for this program are restricted by shipping constrictions, especially for international shipping. For example, aerosols cannot be shipped and organophosphates are restricted in amounts that can

be shipped. There are usually three products representing four active ingredients that are used. Participants can choose to do however many of the four they wish. This year the deltamethrin product that was a dust was problematic for many of the labs. Some labs do not participate every year, but alternate years.

An update on the Wisconsin Residue Check Sample Program was given by Steve Sobeck of Wisconsin's Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection. There are 37 labs in the program, only 28-32 are active in any given year. Two rounds of samples were sent out in the last year, one set of soil in the spring and another set of foliage in the fall. A new foliage of corn leaves was used this year at the request of participants for a foliage that was not so dry. A couple labs reported issues with homogeneity of the foliage samples. Because of this and information shared with Wisconsin, Steve will be doing a survey of participants to see if the amounts sent out are still appropriate and to ask about adding some new compounds to the list of possible analytes spiked. Wisconsin checks similarity of spikes from jar to jar, which is called "homogeneity testing" in the report. They also test for stability of compounds spiked over several weeks after shipments. Wisconsin is compliant with the ISO 17043 standard and are now on the list of acceptable PT providers published by The American Association for Laboratory Accreditation (A2LA).

Terry Cole from EPA's repository gave an update on difficulties the repository is facing. Staffing has been cut for the repository making it more challenging to keep up with orders, especially during the summer when many states have their busy seasons for drift and other complaints. They have fallen behind in putting out regular newsletters that are distributed via AgLabs. These newsletters contain information on standards that have expiration dates coming up in the near future, standards that are currently on backorder and standards recently received. The committee encouraged them to at least put out regular letters with the backlog list since many labs will order from another source if they know the analyte is on backlog. This could save the repository staff time by not having to respond to requests for backlogged analytes. The repository prefers orders on-line; they will eventually stop accepting orders by fax. They encourage labs to not throw away expired standards, but to check with the repository for new Certificates of Analysis for them by requesting the new certificates on an order form with the expired analyte and its lot number.

Paul Golden reported on EPA's lab. They lost five people this year and are hoping to hire at least one replacement. The Mississippi lab has closed and only one person transferred to the lab at Fort Meade.

Eric Petty presented work being done in Colorado in the testing of hemp for cannabidiol, cannabinol and delta-9 THC levels to assure that it is industrial hemp and not marijuana. The presentation included information on Colorado standards, what industrial hemp is used for and extraction and analysis methodology for the testing.

Jim Stry of Dupont talked about the new requirements for registrants to determine extraction efficiencies of the methods tested and reported on as part of their registration package. They do this by comparing data gained during the metabolism study using radioactive labeled product with the quantities found using the various residue methods. Overall they find that the QuEChERS method used internationally is about 70% efficient for watery crops and 50% efficient for dry crops.

A report on the 2014 SFIREG meetings was presented by Michelle Bogner of Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development. Topics discussed were the methomyl labeling requirements, EPA performance measures and the need for labs to be able to give SLAs the needed information for the labs, an update on the pollinator project, the EPA study on cleaning up compounds used indoors, highlights for region reports, cover crops, DfE labeling, the beginning of Enlist Duo use and information on the new EPA website for analytical methods for pesticide testing.

Michael Hastings of Dow provided an update on their work on methods for testing of residues in compost. Working toward improving recoveries for method. May use standard addition to correct for matrix effects that are very sample specific, or use isotopic internal standards to correct for recoveries. They are also considering a derivatization step.

Several states in attendance gave brief updates on current issues in their state lab including testing of pollinator friendly plants for presence of neonicotinoids, hemp testing, new equipment, accreditation efforts, extensive pesticide screens via LC/MS/MS, and document control software being used.

Michelle Yaras explained the use of EPA funding for national laboratory workshops (\$30,000 per year). A workshop is to be co-hosted in 2015 by Indiana and Oklahoma. States were encouraged to consider hosting. It was decided that it would be a good strategy to apply for grant money the fiscal year prior to holding the workshop in order to have money in hand for spring meetings as EPA often does not get funds to release until too late in the spring to allow for same year planning. Minnesota will apply for fiscal year 2016 money to host a workshop in 2017. Other states were encouraged to consider hosting in future years. Every other year there may be an

additional \$41,700 available for workshops. It was confirmed through Michelle Yaras that we could utilize vendor training for these workshops with a state handling reimbursement and payment for the courses as their "hosting" obligations. Years when there is extra money would work well for this strategy. Since the meeting Michelle Yaras has corrected this understanding that in the years where there is additional \$41,700 funding, that would be used instead of the \$30,000, not in addition to so that the \$30,000 could be used for training needed in the tribes.

The Laboratory Committee is meeting during the 2016 AAPCO meeting on Monday, March 7 and Tuesday, March 8. Agenda topics include topic discussions on ISO17025 accreditation, QAPP revisions, global harmonization system, a presentation on the use of high-resolution instruments in pesticide residue analysis, a presentation on gaining efficiencies in times of budget cuts, state updates, and updates from the check sample programs, EPA repository, grant funding and SFIREG.

Respectfully submitted,  
Michelle Bogner, Michigan