

TNI Information Technology Committee Meeting Summary

April 21, 2011

1. Roll Call

Participants	Present
Caldwell, David	
Clark, Arthur*	X
Daystrom, William	
DiRienzo, Bob	
Fitzpatrick, Tim	X
Friedman, Maria	
Hickman, Dan	
Kuhn, John	X
Morgan, Judy	X
Parr, Jerry	X
Ronning, Irene	X
Shepherd, Mei Beth	X
Starr, Rip	
Varner, Pam	X
Ward, Keith	
Wlodarski, Jan	X

Approval of March 17, 2011 Minutes

With Changes: None

Approved: Accepted. William will post.

2. Database Update

(Dan) – Doesn't have PA demographics in. Aaron sent file – it should upload just fine and Dan will tell her to go ahead and do it. Then all labs will be in.

Issues:

>Problem in LABS – when you create a lab manually in the database, the database does not issue a TNI code number like a bulk upload. Workaround is in place but needs to be fixed.

>Analyte/Method Codes Issue –have been updated in tables and database. “Categories” – in general groupings – one is called “air” and looks more like a matrix than a category and is causing confusion. These are mostly related to stack sampling. There are about 100 items in this “category”. “Air Testing” is okay.

Also working on adding a lot of methods -- the ones that are obvious. The others Dan will wait until there is agreement on how we should go about adding them. He will scope out the magnitude of the issue. As example, FL is exceptionally bad (allow modified methods; also not following recommendation from toxicity committee on how toxicity and analytes should be set up). New Hampshire is the other issue – modified methods; more about prep methods and how those are handled. New Jersey may have a prep method issue as well.

Items for discussion from Dan's List

#3. The WET committee came out with a decision a few years ago that the toxicity method needed to list temperature and species as part of the method and the analyte would be the measured effect. This makes a lot of sense but not how all the ABs are doing it.

Dan's suggestion: Go back to NELAP and tell them this is what we agree to – we have to get everyone to do it the way we agreed. Develop recommendation of how it should be done (position paper), based on what was decided several years ago; seek concurrence from EPA rep and other experts in the field. Florida will have to change their program.

Dan will send email to Susan and ask who was on the committee and find the final report that came out of that committee. Dan will write up and send to John Kuhn so his wet testing expert can review it.

#2. A few years ago we added preparation/extraction/cleanup methods to the method table so ABs could track what they approved onsite (no requirement for PT). At that time, we agreed to list Preparation/Extraction as the analyte for accreditation. We have a few ABs (or maybe just one) that lists the technology, i.e. separatory funnel as the analyte.

>>>Only New Hampshire is doing this. Dan will write up; committee will endorse it. Jerry will forward to committee.

#1. The Standards require that the laboratory must identify any changes to the method including addition of new analytes (not listed in the reference method). Some ABs list these methods as modified, with no indication of what was modified, and others list them as extended, indicating additional analytes but not identifying them. Either way a separate method code would be required. Dan would like to find a way not to issue more codes and confuse secondary recognition even more. The standard method and code could be used but the lab would be required to flag the added analyte with AA or something like they would with any other QC flag.

>>>In neither case do they tell you what analyte has been added.

Suggestions:

Concept of "source method". Ok for AB to certify for that (that a lab has tweaked a method) but we don't track those individual changes in the national database – what problems will that cause?

Rewrite the Standard to be consistent with what we decide here. EA – Extended analyte; not AA because we use that elsewhere.

Method code with “M” after it for those that have really modified the method. Pick from a list. If it’s something brand new, then we would add a new method code. Would expect them to have published it somewhere.

PDMFs: Labs may not be required to indicate the method if considered an industry secret. Should be able to tell “source”?

Ideal: reduce the number of codes we use. But still be able to give people codes for everything they need.

Labs - Internally developed methods (they’re own sop) – different process – not automatically recognized for secondary accreditation.

Use “M” for modified; not track lab modified/specific/internal SOP in national database?

Minimum characteristics to define a method that goes in the database:

- Source of the method
- Date
- Revision #
- Title (specific)
- Technology (if not described in title)
- List of analytes that the method covers (so we know when we have an extended analyte) *Question: How do we know if we have an EA?*

Continue discussion next time and continue this “pedigree”. Float by Steve for comment.

3. Next Call: May 19, 2011; 3:00 p.m. EST