

TNI Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee
Meeting Summary
December 14, 2010

1. Roll call and Meeting Minutes:

Chair Carl Kircher called the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee to order on December 14, 2010 at 12:08 pm EST. Attendance is recorded in Attachment A. There were 7 members on the call today.

The minutes from the November 30th meeting were reviewed. Dan Dickinson motioned to accept the minutes with the repair of a typo in the Discussion section. The motion was seconded by Eric and unanimously approved. They will be forwarded to the TNI webmaster.

2. NPW FoPT Tables

4,4'-DDD

Data evaluated was 0.6 to just under 10 ug/L. The analyte passes SOP criteria except for Stdev R² Eval > 0.75. Carl would like to expand the concentration on the higher end. The labs are reporting lower, so Eric suggested 1-10 ug/L.

If the present regression is used with a 1-10 ug/L concentration, the range would be 47-161% at 1 ug/L and at 20ug/L it would be 36-141%. Chris noted that the recoveries are improving in the new studies and this would be a reason to use the new regression equation. Carl noted that using the new regression would require noting that it did not pass all the SOP criteria.

A motion was made by Chris to update the limits for 4,4'-DDD on the NPW FoPT accreditation table to the regression equation with the abcd coefficients described in the table provided by Jeff (file dated 10-5-10; pdf file dated 8-17-2010) and a concentration range of 1.0 – 10 ug/L. The motion was seconded by Stacey.

Discussion: Jeff noted that the 10% rule is going to kick in.

Vote: It was unanimously approved.

4,4'-DDE

Data for evaluation was 0.4 to a little under 10 ug/L. The analyte passes all SOP criteria. There is a swing up in recovery at about 0.6 ug/L.

A motion was made by Eric to update the limits for 4,4'-DDE on the NPW FoPT accreditation table to the regression equation with the abcd coefficients described in the table provided by Jeff (file dated 10-5-10; pdf file dated 8-17-2010) and a concentration range of 1.0 – 10 ug/L. The motion was seconded by Chris and unanimously approved.

4,4'-DDT

The analyte passes all SOP criteria. Data for evaluation was 0.22 – 9.6 ug/L.

A motion was made by Stacey to update the limits for 4,4''-DDT on the NPW FoPT accreditation table to the regression equation with the abcd coefficients described in the table provided by Jeff (file dated 10-5-10; pdf file dated 8-17-2010) and a concentration range of 1.0 – 10 ug/L. The motion was seconded by Eric and unanimously approved.

Methoxychlor

Data for evaluation was between 1.4 – 19 ug/L. The analyte passes all SOP criteria. Jeff suggests expanding to 20 – this analyte does not respond well on ECD.

A motion was made by Eric to update the limits for Methoxychlor on the NPW FoPT accreditation table to the regression equation with the abcd coefficients described in the table provided by Jeff (file dated 10-5-10; pdf file dated 8-18-2010) and a concentration range of 2.0 – 20 ug/L. The motion was seconded by Chris and unanimously approved.

Endosulfan I

Data for evaluation was 1.92 – 21.1 ug/L. The analyte passes all SOP criteria. Looking at the data, it appears that the 4-20 ug/L would be a good choice for concentration.

A motion was made by Eric to update the limits for Endosulfan I on the NPW FoPT accreditation table to the regression equation with the abcd coefficients described in the table provided by Jeff (file dated 10-5-10; pdf file dated 8-17-2010) and a concentration range of 4.0 – 20 ug/L. The motion was seconded by Stacey and unanimously approved.

Endosulfan II

Data for evaluation was 4.62 – 29.8 ug/L. It passes all SOP criteria.

A motion was made by Chris to update the limits for Endosulfan II on the NPW FoPT accreditation table to the regression equation with the abcd coefficients described in the table provided by Jeff (file dated 10-5-10; pdf file dated 8-17-2010) and a concentration range of 4.0 – 20 ug/L. The motion was seconded by Stacey and unanimously approved.

Endosulfan sulfate

Data for evaluation was 2.85 – 23.4 ug/L. It passes all SOP criteria. There are lots of degradation problems. Carl noted that a concentration range starting at 4 ug/L avoids some of the issues seen in the data.

A motion was made by Dan Dickinson to update the limits for Endosulfan sulfate on the NPW FoPT accreditation table to the regression equation with the abcd coefficients described in the table provided by Jeff (file dated 10-5-10; pdf file dated 8-17-2010) and a concentration range of 4.0 – 20 ug/L. The motion was seconded by Chris and unanimously approved.

Chlordane (total)

Data for evaluation was 3.17 – 24.1 ug/L. The analyte passes all SOP criteria.

A motion was made by Eric to update the limits for Chlordane (total) on the NPW FoPT accreditation table to the regression equation with the abcd coefficients described in the table provided by Jeff (file dated 10-5-10; pdf file dated 8-17-2010) and a concentration range of 3.0 – 25 ug/L. The motion was seconded by Stacey and unanimously approved.

Toxaphene

Data for evaluation was 21.2 – 96.4 ug/L. There were several data points below 20 ug/L that were terrible. The analyte passes all SOP criteria. The new equation is more realistic.

A motion was made by Eric to update the limits for Toxaphene on the NPW FoPT accreditation table to the regression equation with the abcd coefficients described in the table provided by Jeff (file dated 10-5-10; pdf file dated 8-18-2010) and a concentration range of 20.0 – 100 ug/L. The motion was seconded by Jeff and unanimously approved.

Review

Looking at Aldrin (PDF – 8/4/10): A concentration range of 1-15 ug/L would make it consistent with other similar analytes. Originally it was set at 0.5 – 15 ug/L. This is lower than what labs are expected to see in the DW program.

Jeff motioned that the lower limit for Aldrin be changed to 1 ug/L. The motion was seconded by Chris and unanimously approved.

Looking at 4,4'-DDD: The PTRL will be 0.1 ug/L at a lower concentration range of 1 ug/L. At 2 ug/L for the lower concentration, the PTRL would be 0.63 ug/L.

Eric motioned to raise the concentration for 4,4'-DDD to 2 ug/L. The motion was seconded by Stacey. There were 6 affirmative votes. Carl voted against and there were no abstentions. The motion passes.

3. Review E-mail Information From PT Executive Committee

Carl forwarded the following e-mail from Eric Smith (Chair, PT Executive Committee):

I discussed FOPT tables with the NELAP AC on their teleconference call last week. In a nutshell, they just want accreditation tables now. They also want analytes that don't meet the minimum number of studies as per the 2003 NELAC Standard to be dropped as PT analytes rather than move them over to the accreditation table with a smaller dataset. They said they can't vote to approve (between now and July 1st) transferring any experimental analytes to the accreditation tables that don't meet the 2003 NELAC standard criteria. While the PTEC may have already moved on to the TNI PT Standards, the NELAP AC has not. They said that they have a concern about and don't want poor performing accreditation PT's with really wide acceptance limits, and they feel that to some degree that's what they are going to get with the smaller datasets. They said that there are no analytes on the Experimental tables that they can't live without.

So, they want to see accreditation tables and a just a list of analytes that didn't make the cut. They just really, really want to see the Experimental tables completely gone by July 1, 2011 (implementation date of the TNI standard). In order to meet that timetable, we really need to get updated NPW and SCM accreditation tables from the subcommittee very soon. I don't think we can wait for the subcommittee to go through and review the rest of the analytes already on the accreditation tables. I hope this quick summary of the discussion provides some of the clarity the PTEC and subcommittee have recently requested.

The AC would like to see the tables complete by July 1, 2010. To meet this request the tables probably cannot have all the accreditation analytes reviewed and updated. It would likely need to be the version of the tables where the experimental analytes have been added as appropriate.

The NELAP ABs also noted that they can't vote on the tables using the 2009 standard requirements before July 1, 2010. They will need to vote using the 2003 NELAC standard requirements in order to have new tables in place by July 1, 2011.

4. New Items

- Carl noted that looking at past performance, the subcommittee will review and approve about 120 analytes by July 1st given the current schedule. This will not allow all analytes on the table to be evaluated by July 1st.

To do what the NELAP AC has requested, it will take a couple of meetings to go back through the NPW and SCM tables. The subcommittee will take off the analytes

that don't meet the 2003 NELAC Standard criteria, but all experimentals that meet the criteria will be left on the table.

- Jeff asked about the e-mail he sent asking about how the subcommittee would like to handle the question about SCM data where there is insufficient data? Dan Tholan suggested that new data is available from the PT database. Jeff will resend the question with the other ideas members offered and decide how to move forward based on feedback.

Discussion on the idea of using data from the PT database will be discussed at Thursday's PT Executive Committee meeting. This may require TNI Board approval because it may require a modification to the TNI/A2LA MOU.

5. Action Items

- Updates are included in the table.

6. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee will be January 4, 2011, at 12:00 PM EST. It will be bi-weekly after this.

Action Items are included in Attachment B and Attachment C includes a listing of reminders.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:34 pm EST.

Attachment A

Participants TNI Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee

Members	Affiliation	Contact Information
Carl Kircher, Co-Chair Present	Florida DOH	904-791-1574 carl_kircher@doh.state.fl.us
Chris Rucinski Present	RT Corp	crucinski@rt-corp.com
Amy Doupe Absent	Lancaster Laboratories, Inc.	717-656-2300 x1812 aldoupe@lancasterlabs.com
Jeff Lowry Present	ERA	303-431-8454 jlowry@eraqc.com
Chuck Wibby Absent	Wibby Environmental	303-940 -0033 cwibby@wibby.com
Eric Smith Present	TestAmerica	615-726-0177 x1238 eric.smith@testamericainc.com
Dan Tholen Present	A2LA	231-929-1721 Tholen.dan@gmail.com
Stephen Arpie Absent	Absolute Standards, Inc.	203-281-2917 stephenarpie@mac.com
Dan Dickinson Present	New York, DOH	518-485-5570 dmd15@health.state.ny.us
Stacey Fry Present	E.S. BABCOCK & Sons, Inc.	951-653-3351 x238 sfry@babcocklabs.com
Ilona Taunton, Program Administrator Present	TNI	828-712-9242 tauntoni@msn.com

Attachment B

Action Items – Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee

	Action Item	Who	Expected Completion	Actual Completion
13.	Prepare letter to ABs to find out their needs on analytes that may be under consideration for deletion. <i>(3/24/09 – It was determined that these tables are used by more than just ABs. This needs to be reconsidered.)</i>	TBD	TBD	
46	Re-evaluate experimental volatile halocarbons for fixed limits when the rest of the volatile halocarbons are evaluated for an NPW table update.	All	On-going	
74	Check with Eric on SC request for low level EDB, DBCP. Send back to PT Executive Committee.	Carl	10/26/10	Keep on subcommittee list.
76	Check with PT Executive Committee to find out when they would like the current work on the NPW and SCM tables to be completed.	Carl	11/16/10	Hold
78	Write update letter to PT Executive Committee to inform them of subcommittees status.	Carl	12/13/10	Complete

Attachment C

Backburner / Reminders – Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee

	Item	Meeting Reference	Comments
1	Review summary data to see if it supports a change in the acceptance criteria for DW analytes (For example, VOA, 30% instead of 20%). If data is supportive, Jeff Lowry will approach ELAB.	10-30-08	<p>3/10/09 - Jeff has approached ELAB. They would be happy to put it in a work group – and pass it along with a letter to EPA. We need to provide them with the data.</p> <p>2/23/10: Jeff will forward the VOA data. Jeff noted that the data supports the tighter limits. He will provide the information to ELAB and they will decide whether to approach EPA.</p> <p>5/4: Jeff is working with ELAB on this now.</p> <p>7/19: The workgroup is continuing to work on this and should discuss this on the September 2010 call.</p> <p>9/21: No work has been done in ELAB – so this has been delayed a month.</p>
3	Consider changing the lower limit for Vanadium on WP to 50 ug/L.	6-30-09	
4	Consider nomenclature differences between the analyte codes and the FoPT tables.	2-23-10	
6	From PT Board: South Carolina requested that low level EDB and DBCP (8011) be added to the NPW table.	4-15-10 PT Board Meeting	They were added to the solids table where they were experimental. They were not experimental on the NPW table.
7	Review completed NPW table and look for	11-30-10	

	grouped analytes that behave similarly and look for consistent criteria. Compare results to Drinking Water values too.		