

**SUMMARY OF THE
TNI LABORATORY PROFICIENCY TESTING EXPERT COMMITTEE
MEETING**

MARCH 1, 2013

The Committee met by teleconference on Friday, March 1, 2013, at 11:00 am EST. Chair Mitzi Miller led the meeting.

1 – Roll call

Fred Anderson, Advanced Analytical Solutions (Other)	Present
Stephen Arpie, Absolute Standards (Other)	Present
Kareen Baker, Veolia Water N. American (Other)	Present
Yumi Creason, PA DEP (AB)	Present
Rachel Ellis, NJ DEP (AB)	Present
Scott Hoatson, Oregon DEQ (AB)	Present
Shawn Kassner, Phenova (Other)	Present
Roger Kenton, Eastman Chemical Co. (Lab)	Present
Stacie Metzler, Hampton Roads San. Distr. (Lab)	Present
Mitzi Miller, Dade Moeller Assocs. (Chair; Other)	Present
Judy Morgan, Env. Science Corp. (Lab)	Absent
Virgene Mulligan, Amrad (Lab)	Present
Joe Pardue, P2S (Other)	Present
Jim Todaro, Alpha Analytical (Lab)	Present
Lisa Touet, MA DEP (AB)	Present
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present

Associate Committee Members present; Audrey Cornell, ERA; Bob O'Brien, Sigma-Aldrich; Brian Stringer, ERA; Kathy Westerman, VADEP; Nicole Cairns, NYSDOH

2 – Previous Minutes

It was moved by Stacie and seconded by Shawn to approve the minutes of February 15, 2013. All Committee members present voted in favor.

3 – Updated Committee Charter

It was moved by Fred and seconded by Shawn to approve an amended charter. All Committee members were in favor, and Mitzi said she would send it on to Bob Wyeth for the Consensus Standards Development Executive Committee's consideration.

4 – Consideration of Comments on the WDS

Group 21

Two comments from this group remained outstanding. Mitzi thanked Kathy Westerman for being present on the call to explain her concerns.

Westerman11 related to the deletion from the standard of the requirement for PTs being run twice per calendar year. Scott argued that it would not really matter if a laboratory would occasionally not have 2 in a calendar year because it chose to run them 7 months apart. The proposed language in the revised standard is as follows:

“The laboratory shall analyze and report a PT study for each accreditation FoPT for which it seeks to maintain accreditation that meets the following criteria:

- a) The closing dates of subsequent PT study samples for a particular accreditation FoPT shall be no more than seven (7) months apart.*
- b) The opening date of subsequent PT study samples for a particular field of accreditation must be at least seven (7) calendar days after the closing date of a PT study for the same field of accreditation.*
- c) A laboratory that analyzes and reports PT study results with an opening date of subsequent PT studies for the same field of accreditation that are closer than seven (7) days from the closing date of the previous PT study are invalid for the purposes of compliance with this standard and are not counted toward the laboratory’s PT history of the most recent three (3) attempts.”*

On review of this language, Kathy said it was acceptable to her state. It was, therefore, moved by Shawn and seconded by Scott to rule the comment non-persuasive. All Committee Members were in favor.

In **Westerman12** Kathy asked why the requirement to report a PT by its accredited method had been removed. Scott explained that the PT provider’s responsibility is just to score the result, irrespective of the method. They did not want ABs changing the score, but it is then the responsibility of the AB to decide if that score meets the accreditation requirement. It was pointed out that the language now gives laboratories the option of reporting PTs by technology or by method. Scott provided the following note from Section 4.1.5 of V2M2:

“NOTE: “Acceptable” PT study scores from a PT Provider do not automatically result in a successful evaluation of a PT study by an AB. For example, failure to report an analytical method or reporting of an incorrect method, failure to release the results to the AB before the close of the study, failure to report results to the PT Provider before the closing date, failure to handle PT study samples in the same manner as real environmental samples, etc.”

It was discussed whether this should be changed from a note to a standard requirement, so it would be enforceable. Shawn and Virgene agreed to work with Kathy to draft language to make it a requirement in V1, or to decide if it should stay as a note and for the note to then go into V1.

5 – Status of Volume 3

Shawn reported he is gathering comments from PT providers and will make some changes. Other proposed changes will need to be considered by the committee. He asked everyone on the call to review V3 and send comments to him.

6 – Next Steps

On the next call, it was decided to again address Westerman12 and then V3. Mitzi said she would fix the comment forms that are resolved, but not yet complete and then send them all to Shawn for his group to check on consistency and completeness.

7 – Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 pm EST. The next meeting will be March 15, 2013.