

TNI Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee
Meeting Summary
May 8, 2012

1. Roll call and Meeting Minutes:

Chair Carl Kircher called the meeting of the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee to order on May 8, 2012 at 12:07 EST. Attendance is recorded in Attachment A. There were 6 members on the call for the first 45 minutes and then 5 remained.

The April 24th meeting minutes are being reviewed and will be voted on during the next teleconference.

2. Re-Vote on Specific Analytes Recorded on Excel Table

The minutes from 11/29/11 were recorded, but the recording did not save properly. Carl recorded the results of the vote for these analytes and they are included below. A new vote needs to be taken to officially confirm these results.

A motion was made by Stephen to accept the concentration limits and regression equations as described below. The motion was seconded by Stacey. Vote: For – 5
Against – 0 Abstention - 1 The motion did not pass. It will be put on the agenda for the next call to allow subcommittee members more time to review the information. Carl confirmed that the results below are what he has in his notes for the meeting.

Naphthalene

The study concentration was 32 – 190 ug/L. It passed the SOP criteria.

A motion was made to use a concentration limit of 20 - 200 ug/L for Naphthalene on the NPW FoPT accreditation table and use the new regression equation with the abcd coefficients described in the PDF provided by Jeff by e-mail in 2010. The motion was seconded.

2-Methylnaphthalene

The study concentration was 31.4 – 181 ug/L. It passed the SOP criteria except for the Stdev R² Eval > 0.75 test.

A motion was made to use a concentration limit of 20 - 200 ug/L for 2-Methylnaphthalene on the NPW FoPT accreditation table and use the new regression equation with the abcd coefficients described in the PDF provided by Jeff by e-mail in 2010. The motion was seconded.

Benzo(b)fluoranthene

The study concentration was 20.1 – 123 ug/L. It passed the SOP criteria.

A motion was made to use a concentration limit of 20 - 200 ug/L for Benzo(b)fluoranthene on the NPW FoPT accreditation table and use the new regression equation with the abcd coefficients described in the PDF provided by Jeff by e-mail in 2010. The motion was seconded.

Benzo(k)fluoranthene

The study concentration was 25.8 – 184 ug/L. It passed the SOP criteria except for Mean R² Eval > 0.9 and Stdev R² Eval > 0.75.

A motion was made to use a concentration limit of 20 - 200 ug/L for Benzo(k)fluoranthene on the NPW FoPT accreditation table and leave the current regression equation in place. The motion was seconded.

Fluoranthene

The study concentration was 14.1 – 196 ug/L. It passed the SOP criteria.

A motion was made to use a concentration limit of 30 - 200 ug/L for Fluoranthene on the NPW FoPT accreditation table and use the new regression equation with the abcd coefficients described in the PDF provided by Jeff by e-mail in 2010. The motion was seconded.

Benzo(ghi)perylene

The study concentration was 21.4 – 174 ug/L. It passed the SOP criteria.

A motion was made to use a concentration limit of 10 - 200 ug/L for Benzo(ghi)perylene on the NPW FoPT accreditation table and use the new regression equation with the abcd coefficients described in the PDF provided by Jeff by e-mail in 2010. The motion was seconded..

Dibenz(ah)anthracene

The study concentration was 18.9 – 104 ug/L. It passed the SOP criteria.

A motion was made to use a concentration limit of 20 - 200 ug/L for Dibenz(ah)anthracene on the NPW FoPT accreditation table and use the new regression equation with the abcd coefficients described in the PDF provided by Jeff by e-mail in 2010. The motion was seconded.

3. Review of NPW FoPT Table

Phenol

The study concentration was 90.3 – 179 ug/L. Carl commented previously by e-mail: new regressions FAIL the r-squared for Std Dev vs. AV, thus, keep current regression equations, recommend concentration range of 50-200 ug/L (expanded range, current range of 100-200 ug/L is way too narrow).

Stacey's current Reporting Limit is 10 ug/L and her MDL is 1 ug/L. The PTRL with the suggested new concentration is 5 ug/L This would be a problem. More input is needed and this analyte will be considered again at the next meeting.

2-Nitrophenol

The study concentration was 20 – 200 ug/L. Carl commented previously by e-mail: all SOP criteria met (correlation coefficients), use the new regression equations with abcd coefficients as presented on pdf file, recommend concentration range of 40-200 ug/L.

Jeff noted that the present equation converges at the lower end, so the new regression equation should be used. 40 ug/L would produce a lower acceptance limit of 9 ug/L. Joe is not comfortable dropping the lower limit below 50 ug/L.

A motion was made by Joe to use a concentration limit of 50 - 200 ug/L for 2-Nitrophenol on the NPW FoPT accreditation table and use the new regression equation with the abcd coefficients described in the PDF provided by Jeff (dated 11-1-2010). The motion was seconded by Stephen and unanimously approved.

4. SOP Review

At the last meeting there was a comment about 2.1. Jeff commented that shouldn't it be anyone. Stephen thought it should come from providers that are accredited under the program. Jeff noted that if EPA might want to add DMRQA data – would that be OK? Stephen still felt that it should come from accredited organizations.

Carl suggested some wording along the lines of: PT data can be submitted by anyone, but data from ISO 17043 accredited organizations is preferred.

2.7 – Jeff suggested wording could be similar to above.

Carl is leaving the time frame open for comments on this SOP to the next meeting. If no comments are received, the notes from the last two meetings will be compiled and Carl will put a response together for the Policy Committee for the subcommittee to review.

Discussion:

Stephen noted that the subcommittee is about to get started on soils. He asked if New York is going to have any issues similar to the other matrices. Dan noted there are different concerns with soil, but is not sure whether there is a need to make any changes to the SOP language for this.

The procedure is a little grey on how data is being processed. Do we need to look at how r^2 is being calculated? Jeff's concern is that this will cause problems with the soils.

Stephen emphasized the need for fixed limits. Carl asked if the language of the SOP could be revised to show what this would look like. Stephen felt that the subcommittee needs to be comfortable with this option before a lot of effort is made to change the SOP. Is there anyone that cannot accommodate something like this in their state regulations?

Dan D. said that we are effectively using fixed limits now for many analytes because of the requirement to invoke 10% and/or 110% acceptance limits from the FoPT footnotes(4&6) due to large standard deviations and poor mean recoveries.

There may be enough language in the SOP that offers flexibility to do what has been discussed during previous calls and this call. Everyone is asked again to carefully review the SOP and send comments to Carl by e-mail prior to the next meeting.

4. Action Items

See action item table in attachments.

5. New Business

None.

6. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee will be May 22, 2012, at 12:00 PM EST.

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

Stephen motioned to adjourn the meeting and Stacey seconded the motion. Unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 1:29 pm EST.

Attachment A

Participants TNI Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee

Members	Affiliation	Contact Information
Carl Kircher, Chair Present	Florida DOH	904-791-1574 carl_kircher@doh.state.fl.us
Joe Marotti Present	Sigma-Aldrich RTC	307-721-5485 jmorotti@sial.com
Amy Doupe Absent	Lancaster Laboratories, Inc.	717-656-2300 x1812 aldoupe@lancasterlabs.com
Jeff Lowry Present	Wibby Environmental	720-560-2232 Jlowry@wibby.com
Mark Mensik Absent	Wibby Environmental	303-940 -0033 MMensik@wibby.com
Eric Smith Absent	TestAmerica	615-726-0177 x1238 eric.smith@testamericainc.com
Dan Tholen Absent	A2LA	231-929-1721 Tholen.dan@gmail.com
Stephen Arpie Present	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	Ongoing	
87	Discuss views on dropping problem analytes with the PTP EC.	Carl	Next PTP EC Meeting	
88	Review SOP 4-101 distributed by e-mail on 4-24-12. Prepare any additional comments for the PT Exec Committee in writing and send to Ilona for review at the next subcommittee meeting on 5/8/12.	ALL	5/4/12 (Friday)	
89				

Attachment C

Backburner / Reminders – Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee

	Item	Meeting Reference	Comments
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. 3/13: Close out on Subcommittee table and bring up at PTEC meeting. New member is from SC and they can use the new SOP for adding analytes to address this.
7	Review completed NPW table and look for grouped analytes that behave similarly and look for consistent criteria. Compare results to Drinking Water values too.	11-30-10	
9			