

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

OCTOBER 30, 2015

The Committee met by teleconference on Friday, October 30, 2015, at 11:00 am EST. Chair Shawn Kassner led the meeting.

1 – Roll call

Fred Anderson, Advanced Analytical Solutions (Other)	Present
Kareen Baker, Independent (Other)	Absent
Nicole Cairns, NYSDOH (Other)	Absent
Rachel Ellis, NJ DEP (AB)	Present
Scott Hoatson, Oregon DEQ (AB)	Present
Shawn Kassner, Phenova (Chair; Other)	Present
Stacie Metzler, Hampton Roads San. Distr. (Lab)	Present
Mitzi Miller, Dade Moeller Assocs. (Other)	Absent
Judy Morgan, Pace (Lab)	Absent
Joe Pardue, P2S (Vice-Chair; Other)	Absent
Jim Todaro, Alpha Analytical (Lab)	Absent
Lisa Touet, MA DEP (AB)	Present
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present

Associate Committee Members present: Mike Blades, ERA; Amanda Bruggeman, Phenova; Chandra Thekkekalathil Chandrasekhar, FLDEP; Audrey Cornell, ERA; Maria Friedman, Testamerica; Patrick Garrity, KYDOW; Rob Knake, A2LA; Tim Miller, Phenova; Shari Pfalmer; ESC Lab Services; Donna Ruokenen, Microbac; Brian Stringer, ERA.

2 – Previous Minutes

It was moved by Fred and seconded by Scott to approve the minutes of October 9 and October 16, 2015. All were in favor.

3 – Standards Interpretation Requests (SIR)

Two SIRs were considered.

SIR 266 asked if a laboratory reports PT results on an analyte by two separate methods, whether a failure in one of them would also constitute failure of the other if both methods were of the same technology. The committee agreed with Shawn's draft response confirming this is so and citing Clause 5.1.1 in the 2009 standard. However, Shawn agreed to re-word his last paragraph that referred to the requirements for drinking water analytes.

SIR 275 asked if the requirement of an AB to inform all secondary ABs of laboratory revocation also applied to partial revocation. Shawn had drafted a response confirming this is so, but Scott cautioned this does not apply to suspension of an analyte through PT failure. Shawn agreed to re-draft his response, to point this out.

4 – Comments on V3 Voting Draft Standard

Several comments considered by Scott had been discussed during the previous call, without a conclusion being reached. They were re-visited.

5.9.3.1.2 :*Up to now, it seemed clear that, without a clear conjunction, the subsections (a), (b), (c), etc. in the various clauses of this volume are connected by "and." In this clause, it is not clear at all and, in fact, any one case presented could and should cause the reported PT result to be scored "Not Acceptable." Recommended change: Insert the word "or" after Subsection (b) of this Clause.*” As agreed during the last call, Shawn had drafted revised language for this section of the standard, to read as follows:

“5.9.3.1.2 The result shall be scored “Not Acceptable” if the following are true:

- a) the numeric value is reported with a less than (<) sign or*
- b) the numeric value reported is outside the established acceptance limits or*
- c) the numeric value is reported with a greater than (>) sign.”*

It was moved by Scott and seconded by Fred to rule the comment persuasive and to accept Shawn’s language.

5.9.3.1.2.c *“Regarding “The result will be scored not acceptable if: the numeric value is reported with a > sign”: The current design range listed on the NPW FoPT for Total, Fecal & E. coli is 20-2400 CFU or MPN/100mL. Several of the commonly used MPN methods have dynamic ranges that have a undiluted upper capacities of 1600 (9221, 15 tube, 1x:10x:100x) and 2420 (IDEXX QT). The 95% confidence intervals associated with each of these methods are 700-infinity and 1440-infinity respectively. Given such a high level of overlap between the TNI manufacturing range and the confidence levels associated with these methods, to evaluate >results as unacceptable would be technically inconsistent. It this standard was put in place all labs using QT2000 would need to run every WP study at a 50% dilution.”* Mike Blades said ERA evaluates a result with “>” as the actual number reported, but added this only occurs in 1-2% of laboratory reports. Lisa added that Massachusetts had never had a “>” reported. Tim Miller said if the number is less than the upper acceptance limit it is acceptable. It was noted that an AB cannot over-ride the PT Provider’s ruling of acceptable or unacceptable. Shawn suggested the standard could say a “>” value is accepted if the number provided is within the acceptance limits. Scott suggested returning to the 2003 NELAC language and a protracted discussion led to the following motion by Scott and seconded by Lisa: “The comment is Non-persuasive. Laboratories should be making dilutions based on the information at hand and within the known ranges, as with real samples.” All were in favor.

5.9.3.2 *“5.9.3.2.1 - The result shall be scored “Acceptable” if: a) the numeric value reported is less than the PTRL or b) the numeric value is reported with a less than (<) sign. The use of the term “or” at the end of clause a) segregates it from clause b) which means the clauses must be treated independently. If the committee had used the term “and” at the end of clause a) I would have agreed that in its entirety section 5.9.3.2.1 would have been correct and not in conflict with the New York regulation for PT scoring. If you change the “or” to “and” I will change my vote to “Yes”. As a PT provider for the New York State Environmental Laboratory Approval Program, I am required to*

score analytes with assigned value less than (<) the PTRL in accordance with the New York Code of Rules and Regulations Title 10, Subpart 55-2.8. The regulation states; (c) Performance in examining an individual chemical or physical analyte shall be evaluated as follows, for a synthetic blank test sample: (1) Satisfactory performance shall be a result reported with the term "less than," and having a value less than or equal to the detection limit specified by the department, or, if no detection limit is specified, the method detection limit. (2) Unsatisfactory performance shall be a result reported with or without the term "less than," and having a value greater than the detection limit specified by the department, or, if no detection limit is specified, the method detection limit. The detection limit we specify is the PTRL. The TNI V3-VDS-2015 clause 5.9.3.2.1 is in conflict with NYCRR 55-2.8. The committee continued to discuss this comment at length. It was concluded if the "or" was changed to "and" as suggested, this would change the sense of the clause. Scientifically, reporting a quantitative value less than the PTRL is valid. It was moved by Fred and seconded by Lisa to rule the comment Non-Persuasive. All were in favor.

5.9.3.2.2 *"As in the previous clause 5.9.3.1.2 above, any one of the subsections in this clause should cause the reported PT result to be scored "Not Acceptable." Recommended change: Insert the word "or" after Subsection (b) of this Clause."* It was moved by Scott and seconded by Fred to rule the comment Persuasive and insert "or" as suggested. All were in favor.

5 – Next Call

Comments assigned to Shawn and Joe would be considered during the next call on November 13.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:25 pm EDT.