

**SUMMARY OF THE  
TNI ASBESTOS EXPERT COMMITTEE MEETING**

**FEBRUARY 21, 2018**

The Committee met by teleconference on Wednesday, February 21, 2018, at 1:00 pm EST. Chair Myron Getman led the meeting.

**1 – Roll call**

Mike Carpinona, NJDEP (AB)	Present
Zonetta English, Louisville Jefferson County (Laboratory)	Absent
Myron Getman, Chair, NY State DOH (AB)	Present
Glen Green, Vice-Chair, Xcel Energy (Other)	Present
Dixie Marlin, Marlin Quality Management (Other)	Absent
Carl Kircher, FLDOH, Associate Committee Member	Absent
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present

**2 – Review and Approval of Previous Minutes**

There being no dissensions, the minutes of January 17, 2018 were approved.

**3 – Agenda**

The Committee approved the proposed agenda.

**4 – Consideration of New Members**

Applications from Dan Shelby (EMLab P&K) and Michelle McGowan (EMSL Analytical) were discussed. It was moved by Glen and seconded by Mike to appoint both applicants as Committee Members. All were in favor. This would make the composition of the committee to be 3 Laboratory, 2 Accreditation Body, and 2 Other.

**5 – Old Business**

**Carl Kircher E-mail Items**

**Section 1.7.3.1.3** *“Are there any acceptance criteria to be specified in this Standard for the Bulk Sample Intra-Analyst Precision (as is specified for other matrices and methods)?”* (Item **7.1.3.3** in the new layout).

Myron had found no criteria in the methods, and Mike had also found none in the NVLAP methods. Mike suggested using control charts, but Myron felt there would be a negative reaction from laboratories if this became too specific. He suggested the standard should state that acceptance criteria would be laboratory developed in accordance with the quality control requirements.

**Section 1.7.4.1(b)(ii)** *“Are there any acceptance criteria to be specified in this Standard for the Air TEM accuracy check (as is specified for other matrices and methods)?”* (Item **7.1.4.2** in the new layout).

Myron said the criteria are method-defined in AHERA, so nothing could be added.

**Section 1.7.4.2(b)** *“The statement reads more like an exemption rather than a requirement. Consequently, I would recommend moving the sentence to (a) or make this a NOTE to Section (a), and renumber (c) as (b).”* (Item **7.2.6** in the new layout).

The committee agreed with Carl’s suggestion to make this a note to (a) and to renumber (c) as (b).

**Section 1.7.4.3(a) and (b)** *“Are there any acceptance criteria to be specified in this Standard for the PLM Accuracy and Precision checks (as is specified for other matrices and methods)?”* (Item **7.3.6** in the new layout).

Myron said he uses control charts, and the standard should say the acceptance criteria should be developed by the laboratory in accordance with quality control requirements.

**Sections 1.7.3.1.1(a), 1.7.3.1.1(b), 1.7.4.3(a), and 1.7.4.3(b)** *“It has been my experience in assessing Asbestos laboratories that FEW Drinking Water or other samples are ever analyzed for NELAC compliance. Consequently, it could be 20-50 years (if ever?) before the 1-in-100 sample requirements would become applicable. Should the frequency be increased to 1 per 20 samples? Or a minimum of once annually or biannually?”* (Item **7.1.1.2** in the new layout).

The method states the frequency should be greater than or equal to 1 per 100, and Myron suggested tabling this until the new committee members had joined, when more input could be obtained from laboratories.

**Section 1.7.5.1.3** *“No requirements appear to be present (auxiliary verb is “may”). Should requirements for Bulk Sample TEM sensitivity be specified, as with the water and air samples?”* (Item **7.1.3.3** in the new layout).

Myron pointed out the massive sampling uncertainty associated with the method, and he believed it would present impossible requirements if a sensitivity requirement was specified. Therefore, he suggested keeping the generalized statement in the standard.

**Section 1.7.5.2** *“The section has some good information, but no requirements. Are there any requirements needed for PCM sensitivity?”* (Item **7.2.3** in the new layout).

It was agreed this is defined in the method.

**Section 1.7.6.2** *“The section says that standards of known concentration have not been developed for PCM. Is this still true in year-2018? Since PTs are required (per Section 1.5), should the auxiliary verb “may” be changed to “shall” in the second sentence?”* (Item **7.2.7** in the new layout).

Myron agreed, since there are still no standards, “may” ought to be “shall”.

**Section 1.7.7.1.3(b)** *“The section has some good information, but no requirements. Are there any requirements needed for Bulk Sample TEM Measurement Uncertainty?”*. (Item **7.1.3.4** in the new layout).

It was agreed no changes were merited.

## **6 – New Business**

Method Review was continued.

### **Section 7.1.2 [TEM] Air**

#### **7.1.2.1 Calibration (1.7.1.1.2 in current standard)**

It was agreed there should be no change

#### **7.1.2.2 Test Variability/Reproducibility (1.7.3.1.2 in current standard)**

Section (a) needed no change. In (b), in both instances after the NIST SRM was cited, it should be added “or equivalent”. There should be no changes to (c), (d), or (e), which are all boilerplate out of the method.

#### **7.1.2.3 Analytical Sensitivity (1.7.5.1.2 in current standard)**

#### **7.1.2.4 Data Acceptance/Rejection Criteria (1.7.7.1.2 in current standard)**

#### **7.1.3.1 Calibration (1.7.1.1.3 in current standard)**

All three sections would remain unchanged.

#### **7.1.3.2 Test Variability/Reproducibility (1.7.3.1.3 in current standard)**

Carl’s comment on this section had already been addressed. It was agreed to leave (a) and (b) unchanged. In (c), Myron said PT rounds were sometimes accepted in lieu of round robins, and the language should be retained.

#### **7.1.3.3 Analytical Sensitivity (1.7.5.1.3 in current standard)**

This should remain unchanged. It had already been addressed as one of Carl’s comments.

#### **7.1.3.4 Data Acceptance/Rejection Criteria (1.7.7.1.2 in current standard)**

It was agreed to keep the text in (a), and to make (b) into a note as information only.

## **7 – Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 pm EST. The next call would be on March 21, 2018, when the committee would begin discussing section 7.1.4.

# TNI Asbestos Testing Expert Committee (ATEC) Conference Call

Committee Meeting  
Wednesday, February 21, 2018  
Call in: 1-712-832-8300; Access code: 862 9608

Myron Getman, Chair  
Glen Green, Vice Chair

## AGENDA

Roll call

Review and approve January 17, 2017 Minutes

Review and approve Agenda

Consideration of new members

- Dan Shelby (Lab)
- Michelle McGowan (Lab)

Old Business

- Carl Kircher email items
  - **Section 1.7.3.1.3** *“Are there any acceptance criteria to be specified in this Standard for the Bulk Sample Intra-Analyst Precision (as is specified for other matrices and methods)?”*
    - Item **7.1.3.3** in new layout; below
  - **Section 1.7.4.1(b)(ii)** *“Are there any acceptance criteria to be specified in this Standard for the Air TEM accuracy check (as is specified for other matrices and methods)?”*
    - Item **7.1.4.2** in new layout
  - **Section 1.7.4.2(b)** *“The statement reads more like an exemption rather than a requirement. Consequently, I would recommend moving the sentence to (a) or make this a NOTE to Section (a), and renumber (c) as (b).”*
    - Item **7.2.6** in new layout
  - **Section 1.7.4.3(a) and (b)** *“Are there any acceptance criteria to be specified in this Standard for the PLM Accuracy and Precision checks (as is specified for other matrices and methods)?”*
    - Item **7.3.6** in new layout
  - **Sections 1.7.3.1.1(a), 1.7.3.1.1(b), 1.7.4.3(a), and 1.7.4.3(b)** *“It has been my experience in assessing Asbestos laboratories that FEW Drinking Water or other samples are ever analyzed for NELAC compliance. Consequently, it could be 20-50 years (if ever?) before the 1-in-100 sample requirements would become applicable. Should the frequency be increased to 1 per 20 samples? Or a minimum of once annually or biannually?”*
    - Item **7.1.1.2** in new layout

- **Section 1.7.5.1.3** *“No requirements appear to be present (auxiliary verb is “may”). Should requirements for Bulk Sample TEM sensitivity be specified, as with the water and air samples?”*
  - **Item 7.1.3.3** in new layout
- **Section 1.7.5.2** *“The section has some good information, but no requirements. Are there any requirements needed for PCM sensitivity?”*
  - **Item 7.2.3** in new layout
- **Section 1.7.6.2** *“The section says that standards of known concentration have not been developed for PCM. Is this still true in year-2018? Since PTs are required (per Section 1.5), should the auxiliary verb “may” be changed to “shall” in the second sentence? “*
  - **Item 7.2.7** in new layout
- **Section 1.7.7.1.3(b)** *“The section has some good information, but no requirements. Are there any requirements needed for Bulk Sample TEM Measurement Uncertainty?”*
  - **Item 7.1.3.4** in new layout; below

### New Business

- Method Review (refer to draft table of contents)
  - Section **7.1.2** [TEM] Air
    - **7.1.2.1** Calibration (**1.7.1.1.2** in current standard)
    - **7.1.2.2** Test Variability/Reproducibility (**1.7.3.1.2** in current standard)
    - **7.1.2.3** Analytical Sensitivity (**1.7.5.1.2** in current standard)
    - **7.1.2.4** Data Acceptance/Rejection Criteria (**1.7.7.1.2** in current standard)
  - Section **7.1.3** [TEM] Bulk Samples (as time allows)
    - **7.1.3.1** Calibration (**1.7.1.1.3** in current standard)
    - **7.1.3.2** Test Variability/Reproducibility (**1.7.3.1.3** in current standard)
    - **7.1.3.3** Analytical Sensitivity (**1.7.5.1.3** in current standard)
    - **7.1.3.4** Data Acceptance/Rejection Criteria (**1.7.7.1.2** in current standard)

Next Meeting: March 21, 2018 @ 1pm