

**TNI Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee  
Meeting Summary  
December 16, 2008**

1. Roll call and Meeting Minutes:

Co-Chair Carl Kircher called the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee to order on December 16, 2008, at 11am EST. Attendance is recorded in Attachment A.

Minutes from the November 18, 2008 meeting were approved for posting on the TNI website. (Motion: Jeff Second: Dan) Ilona will have minutes posted.

2. Request to PT Providers for Data

- Carl distributed the written request for data to the various PT providers. It was noticed that a due date was missing. Carl will contact the providers and give them a due date (1/31/09).

3. PT Board Update

- The PT Board would like the subcommittee to reorganize the FoPT tables as part of the limit updates. The current headings do not make it clear what is expected. The PT Board has had a couple of Standard Interpretation Requests (SIRs) where the need for a PT or a question of PT availability have come up. The Board has addressed these questions and has sent a recommended response to the NELAP Board. If additional information is received from the NELAP Board regarding these responses, this will be passed on to the subcommittee.
- Carl will take a look at the tables and attempt to make some initial clarifications for the subcommittee to review. Jeff pointed out that these clarifications can be footnotes. He also noted that when adding naphthalene to volatiles – the limit should be evaluated based on it being in the volatile listing.

4. SOP Update (TNI #4-001)

- The only comment Dan received was from Stephen Arpie: My main concern has to do with using only data from studies of greater than 20 results. The SOP should allow for any study of greater than 0 and weight the result relative to N. The justification is founded in the fact that the data was used for laboratory accreditation. Using a limit of 20 is arbitrary at best and only partially relevant to the data coming from the evaluation/accreditation process. That is to say if the data is good enough

for a laboratory's evaluation, then it should be used in establishing criteria. It was mentioned that Tom Coyner's thesis concluded similarly.

Dan's response to the comment: This would require a significant revision of the procedure to employ a weighted regression, and that at the current time that is too complex for our existing procedures. Note also that this would result in an even greater weight on those studies with a very large number of labs, with minuscule impact of smaller studies. I expect that in the future, once we have sufficiency data for oversight of PTPs, a weighted regression based on both n and SD will be used. For the current time, studies with  $n < 20$  are still influential if used by the individual PTPs to assess the impact of any proposed changes to evaluation criteria. So my recommendation is to not follow Stephen's suggestion...for this round of review.

Discussion surrounding this topic included:

Lance – He has not seen a big difference in his facility and would prefer to use the studies with  $n < 20$  and not eliminate a lot of data.

Carl – Supports Dan's recommendation. If smaller studies are included, would quick response studies be included too?

The group decided to leave the SOP as is, but will look at what the minimum "n" should be once they start getting data from the PT providers. They will take a few studies and run some comparisons. They will also look to see if the unacceptable rates are higher in smaller studies.

- Dan highlighted where he thought the more substantial changes were in the SOP:
  - Page 7
  - pg 8 – Note
  - pg 11 – 24, 25, change "test" to "examine"
  - pg 14 – Deleted line. (It is currently too vague and can not really be implemented.)
- A motion to accept the SOP with its revisions was made by Dan and a second was given by Jeff. The subcommittee approved the changes.
- Ilona was asked to forward the marked-up version of the SOP to the PT Board for review and acceptance. This item will also be added to the PT Board's next meeting agenda.

## 5. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee will be January 20, 2009 , at 11AM EST.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 PM EST.

**Attachment A**

**Participants  
TNI  
Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee**

<b>Members</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Contact Information</b>
Carl Kircher, Co-Chair <b>Present</b>	Florida DOH	904-791-1574 <a href="mailto:carl_kircher@doh.state.fl.us">carl_kircher@doh.state.fl.us</a>
Brian Boling, Co-Chair <b>Present</b>	Oregon DEQ	<a href="mailto:Boling.Brian@deq.state.or.us">Boling.Brian@deq.state.or.us</a>
Amy Doupe <b>Present</b>	Lancaster Laboratories, Inc.	717-656-2300 x1812 <a href="mailto:aldoupe@lancasterlabs.com">aldoupe@lancasterlabs.com</a>
Jeff Lowry <b>Present</b>	ERA	303-431-8454 <a href="mailto:jlowry@eraqc.com">jlowry@eraqc.com</a>
Chuck Wibby <b>Present</b>	Wibby Environmental	303-940 -0033 <a href="mailto:cwibby@wibby.com">cwibby@wibby.com</a>
Eric Smith <b>Absent</b>	TestAmerica	615-726-0177 x1238 <a href="mailto:eric.smith@testamericainc.com">eric.smith@testamericainc.com</a>
Dan Tholen <b>Present</b>	A2LA	231-929-1721 <a href="mailto:Tholen.dan@gmail.com">Tholen.dan@gmail.com</a>
Stephen Arpie <b>Present</b>	Absolute Standards, Inc.	203-281-2917 <a href="mailto:stephenarpie@mac.com">stephenarpie@mac.com</a>
Dan Dickinson <b>Present</b>	New York, DOH	518-485-5570 <a href="mailto:dmd15@health.state.ny.us">dmd15@health.state.ny.us</a>
Ilona Taunton, Program Administrator <b>Present</b>	TNI	828-712-9242 <a href="mailto:tauntoni@msn.com">tauntoni@msn.com</a>

Attachment B

**Action Items – Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee**

	<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Expected Completion</b>	<b>Actual Completion</b>
7.	Send due date for PT Data to PT Providers.	Carl	12/19/08	
8.	Forward Draft SOP to PT Board Members for review and inclusion in next meeting Agenda.	Ilona	12/16/08	12/16/08

### Attachment C

#### Backburner / Reminders – Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Meeting Reference</b>	<b>Comments</b>
1	Review summary data to see if it supports a change in the acceptance criteria for DW VOA (30% instead of 20%). If data is supportive, Jeff Lowry will approach ELAB.	10-30-08	
2	Reminder: Look at what the minimum “n” should be once we start getting data from the PT providers. Take a few studies and run some comparisons. Also, look to see if the unacceptable rates are higher in smaller studies.	12-16-08	
3			
4			
5			