SUMMARY OF THE
TNI LABORATORY PROFICIENCY TESTING EXPERT COMMITTEE MEETING

FEBRUARY 12, 2016

The Committee met by teleconference on Friday, February 12, 2016, at 11:00 am EST. Chair Shawn Kassner led the meeting.

1 – Roll call

Fred Anderson, Advanced Analytical Solutions (Other)	Present
Nicole Cairns, NYSDOH (Other)	Present
Rachel Ellis, NJ DEP (AB)	Absent
Patrick Garrity, KYDOW (AB)	Present
Scott Hoatson, Oregon DEQ (AB)	Present
Craig Huff, ERA (Other)	Present
Shawn Kassner, Phenova (Chair; Other)	Present
Stacie Metzler, Hampton Roads San. Distr. (Lab)	Present
Mitzi Miller, Dade Moeller Assocs. (Other)r	Absent
Tim Miller, Phenova (Other)	Absent
Judy Morgan, Pace (Lab)	Absent
Joe Pardue, P2S (Vice-Chair; Other)	Present
Donna Ruokenen, Microbac (Lab)	Present
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Absent

Associate Committee Members present: Amanda Bruggeman, Phenova; Thekkekalathil Chandrasekhar, FLDEP; Audrey Cornell, ERA; Shari Pfalmer, ESC Lab Services; Bob Shannon, Quality Radioanalytical Support; Brian Stringer, ERA.

2 – Previous Minutes

It was moved by Fred and seconded by Craig to approve the minutes of January 25, 2016. All were in favor.

3 – Volume 1 Module 1 Comments

Three outstanding comments on section **4.3.6** were considered with the help of Bob Shannon who had been invited to join the call:

1. *"Similarly, 4.3.6 is too narrow and dances around what really needs saying. According to Volume 1, module 6, labs should not censor results (not just against an MDA), rather results should be reported "as measured". Suggest the following language: 4.3.6 Radiochemistry results shall be reported as measured, including zero, negative, and positive results, and shall not be censored or reported as "less than" values (e.g., < PTRL or <MDA). All radiochemistry PT study results shall be reported in association with the measurement uncertainty, as appropriate to the program (e.g., CSU is generally appropriate although counting uncertainty at the 95% confidence interval may be required for SDWA compliance measurements)."*

2. The second comment was similar to comment #1

3. *"Section 4.3.6 is not accurate. The combined standard uncertainty (CSU) does not apply to drinking water analysis, under Safe Drinking Water Act."*

It was discussed that the only two PT Providers for radiochemistry (NYSDOH and ERA) were not collecting uncertainty values. Shawn pointed out that Volume 3 received no comment on this at the VDS stage, so it could not be changed to include a requirement to collect uncertainty values without going back to a Modified Voting Draft Standard. Bob Shannon said Module 6 would require laboratories to report activities measured. He was concerned that the original language in V1M1 Section 4.3.6 talked about censoring against an LOD, but that would not be applicable for radiochemistry. Shawn said the committee would need to meet with the FoPT subcommittee and the ABs doing radiochemistry to discuss how to evaluate uncertainties. Bob said he would send to Shawn a recent paper he wrote for AWWA where they looked at some historical results and pooled the PT data. Shawn was concerned the language proposed in the comments was too specific, and he suggested removing the two parenthetical clauses that provided specific examples. Bob said he could agree with that, because the Module 6 language should push laboratories in the right direction. However, he did not want laboratories to think they can do one thing for their PT results and another for their normal results. Nicole was concerned it could be confusing for laboratories that might think they had to report uncertainties to the PT provider, yet the PT Providers would not be capturing that information, because it is not in V3 that they have to do so. Bob and Joe stressed it would be necessary to collect the uncertainty data because they would be used in the future. Nicole suggested the PTPEC be asked to reach out to the 2 PT Providers to start collecting the uncertainty data, even thoughV3 does not require it. Shawn added the standard might then be changed from "shall be reported" to "shall be provided on request". It was agreed to ask Dan Dickinson if the NY provider would be willing to collect the data under those circumstances, and Shawn said it would then be discussed again during the next call.

Nicole asked the committee to reconsider the language agreed during the Tulsa Meeting on Section 4.3.7:

"4.3.7 The laboratory shall evaluate and report chemistry FoPT result to the PT Provider as follows:

a) If the analytical result is a numeric value above or equal to the PTRL, the lab shall report the value. If the PTRL is less than the laboratory's Limit of Quantitation (LOQ), the laboratory shall report the result without the qualification of result required in Volume 1, Module 4 of this Standard.

b) If the analytical result is a numeric value below the PTRL, the laboratory shall report one of the following;

i. < PTRL or,

ii. the obtained analytical result, if the result is between the LOQ and the PTRL or,

iii. < LOQ, if the LOQ is less than the PTRL.

c) If the analytical result is a non-detect the laboratory shall report one of the following;

<PTRL or,
< LOQ**

Of concern was 4.3.7 b) iii. Nicole gave an example of a PTRL of 5, a result of 4, and an LOQ of 3. In such a case, it would be incorrect to have to report "<3" when the actual result was 4. She suggested amending the requirement to:

<LOQ if the analytical result is below the LOQ and PTRL.

The Committee agreed and this was so moved by Craig and seconded by Stacie. All were in favor.

4 – Next Steps

There were no further comments on V1M1 or V2M2. Shawn said V4 was ready to be converted to an Interim Standard, and he would have V3 ready by the middle of the next week. He would then circulate both draft standards so they could be voted out of Committee during the next call and subsequently posted as Interim Standards.

5 – Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 pm