SUMMARY OF THE
TNI LABORATORY PROFICIENCY TESTING EXPERT COMMITTEE MEETING
DECEMBER 19, 2014

The Committee met by teleconference on Friday, December 19, 2014, at 11:00 am EDT. Chair Shawn Kassner led the meeting.

1 – Roll call

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

Associate Committee Members present: Shari Pfalmer, ESC; Brian Stringer, ERA.

2 – Previous Minutes

It was moved by Kareen and seconded by Scott to approve the minutes of December 5. All were in favor, except Rachel and Virgene who abstained.

3 – Committee Membership

Shawn, Steve, Roger and Stacie's terms were ending, and only Stacie was eligible for another term. Therefore, the committee would have to decide on leadership, and would require another AB, two "others" and a laboratory representative. No one on the call expressed interest in chairing the committee, and Shawn said he had spoken with Jerry who said they could petition the PT Board to extend Shawn's term for another year so he could continue to oversee the current standard development. That was so moved by Kareen and seconded by Virgene. All were in favor. Steve suggested his replacement might be a provider who had not had a staff member on the committee. Shawn would petition the PT providers for their interest. There was some concern that the committee would lose continuity with so many people rotating off during a critical period of standards development.

4 – Volume 3 and Volume 4

Shawn reminded the committee that both volumes had one outstanding topic to be dealt with before they could be put forward as Voting Draft Standards. An equation was required for the calculation for standard deviation between samples for homogeneity testing in V3. The outstanding question in V4 was how the PTPEC gets information from the PTPA. Shawn said the PTPEC would be discussing it during its January meeting. The goal was to have all four volumes as Interim Standards by the summer of 2015.

5 – Volume 1 Module 1, and Volume 2 Module 2 comments.

Virgene's assigned comments pertaining to radiochemistry were discussed.

Prior to the specific comments, Virgene raised the issue that a lot of the PT providers are calibrating their check instruments with a standard other than the method-required calibration standard, and added that EPA is looking at this. Also, the matrix may be different than that required in the method. She asked if this is also a problem with chemistry PTs and if the committee should address this in the standard. Shawn explained, with the chemistry samples, the providers are not necessarily using for verification the same methods required for analysis of samples. Virgene said, however, in radiochemistry the difference in verification of activity can be significant when a different standard is used. Steve said the PT has to be fit for use and Scott felt it was not a standard issue. Since ERA is a provider of radiochemistry PT samples, Shawn asked Brian if he could have Brian Miller join the next call to discuss this issue.

Regarding the comments on the standard, Virgene said they all refered to LOQ not being typically determined in radiochemistry. All were persuasive and LOQ for radiochemistry should be removed throughout the document. She said **V1M1 4.3.7** should have an extra sub-section added stating: "For radiochemistry, all results, including negative numbers, shall be reported whether above or below the MDA. Each result shall be reported with its Combined Standard Uncertainty (CSU). At no time shall radiochemistry results be reported as "<" the MDA". Shawn recommended, besides a separate sub-section for radiochemistry, a definition for MDA needed to be added. Virgene suggested also adding a definition for critical value. Virgene said she and Joe would draft language and present it to the committee at the next call.

This just left Bob Shannon's comment on **V1M1 4.2.4** saying it refers to calibration curves defined as a function of concentration, which is not applicable to radiochemistry. Virgene agreed this is persuasive and "radiochemistry" should be removed from that section. She said she would check with Joe to make sure nothing else should be added to the section.

Brian Stringer's comments were discussed next.

Aaren Alger, V1M1 4.3.8. The commenter suggested the following sentence did not belong in the standard: "Upon request, and only after the issuance of final evaluation reports, the laboratory may obtain from the PT Provider the results of the provider's assigned value verification, homogeneity, and stability testing for any PT sample/analyte for which results were submitted to a laboratory AB." Brian agreed, because this is information and not a requirement. There was discussion whether to turn the sentence around to say the laboratory may not obtain the results before the issuance of the reports. After discussion it was agreed that 4.1.5d already covers this. It was therefore moved by Kareen and seconded by Yumi to remove 4.3.8. All were in favor.

Maria Friedman, V1M1 4.3.8. This was no longer applicable, since the section had been removed.

Maria Friedman, V1M1 4.4. Maria said this entire section duplicates section 4.3.6, and she suggested removing either 4.4 or 4.3.6. Brian agreed and suggested it was a better fit in 4.4 (not in 4.3 for reporting requirements). Therefore he recommended removing section 4.3.6. This was so moved by Scott and seconded by Kareen. All were in favor.

Aaren Alger, V1M1 8.0. Aaren commented the language was written in such a way that it implied the laboratory did the reinstating of accreditation, and she suggested alternate language. Brian agreed. Brian also suggested a new 8.3 to address a laboratory's reinstatement after suspension for failing to supply a timely corrective action report. Scott thought this was not necessary, because reinstatement after suspension was already addressed in 8.1. Rachel favored adding the new section, and after discussion it was agreed to do so. Shawn drafted proposed new language, which was discussed and modified as follows:

" 8.1 A laboratory seeking reinstatement of accreditation after suspension due to unsatisfactory PT performance, shall meet the requirements for continued accreditation as described in Section 5.2.

8.2 A laboratory seeking to have their accreditation reinstated for an FoPT after suspension for failure to supply a requested corrective action report, shall meet the requirements for corrective action as described in Section 6.0 of this module.

8.3 A laboratory seeking to have their accreditation reinstated for an FoPT after revocation, shall meet the requirements for initial accreditation as described in Section 5.1 of this module. "

It was moved by Scott and seconded by Judy to approve this language. All were in favor.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:40 pm EST.