

TNI PT Board Meeting Summary January 21, 2010

1) Roll call and approval of minutes:

Chairman Eric Smith called the TNI PT Board meeting to order on January 21, 2010, at 1:00 PM EST. Attendance is recorded in Attachment A – there were 7 Board members present. Associate member Chuck Wibby was also present. The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 EST (Motion: Gary Second: Carl Unanimously approved.)

The minutes from the December 17, 2009 meeting were reviewed. A motion was made by Steve to accept the minutes. It was seconded by Gary. The motion was unanimously approved and the minutes will be posted on the TNI website.

2) Election of Board Chair and Meeting Times

Eric volunteered to remain Board Chair. Gary motioned to retain Eric as Chair of the PT Board. The motion was seconded and it was unanimously agreed upon.

Meetings will continue to be the third Thursday of the month at 1pm EST.

3) DW FoPT Table

Eric forwarded a DRAFT letter and updated DW FoPT Table to the Board by e-mail on Monday, January 18th.

Michella commented that she would like a little more time to review the table before voting.

The FoPT table describes what the different colors represent. The colors will remain on the table to make it easier for people to identify changes.

Eric asked about the effective date of the table. The NELAP Board will need time to review the table and PT Providers need time to implement the changes. Eric's thoughts were to give 6 months from the time the NELAP Board approves it.

Gary asked if an analyte is moved from the experimental table to the accreditation table, how does this affect a lab's accreditation? The labs would be required to run the PT starting at the effective date. They would then need to include it in their PT orders moving forward and ensure they have passed two within the following year. Chuck commented that in the past the PT Providers had 6 months after the effective

date to provide PTs with the new analyte. He also commented that all of these experimental analytes are already in PTs, so providers may not need this much time. He suggested keeping the July 1, 2010 effective date for DW, and shooting for October 1, 2010 for NPW and January 1, 2011 for Solids. There was general support for this suggestion.

Eric commented that there is a need for clarity on how effective dates are determined. At this point the standard lets the PT Board determine effective dates. The PT Board has already taken advantage of this with the addition of the LL Mercury and LL TRC on the NPW FoPT table.

Gary made a motion to approve the DW FoPT Table and cover letter as sent out by Eric on 1-18-10. Carl seconded this motion.

The vote will be completed by e-mail.

Discussion: Steve commented that there is a problem with EDB, DBCP and Naphthalene (VOA vs. SVOA methods). They all have the same code. The NELAP Board will likely have an issue with this and may have trouble voting on the table with this issue. They will likely have the same comment that was seen when they voted on the NPW table (LL Mercury vs. regular Mercury) that was recently approved. They want to see different analyte codes.

Action item: Eric will send an e-mail to Jerry Parr, Aaren Alger, Carol Batterton and Dan Hickman regarding this issue. There does not appear to be anything the PT Board can do regarding this issue and it needs to be passed on to the appropriate group to address the issue.

4) Adding New Analytes to FoPT Tables

Summary: Discuss possible development of additional procedures for handling future requests to add new analytes to FoPT tables (such as possibly setting minimum time windows necessary to allow the PT Board to process these formal requests).

Eric asked the group if something like this is needed. It was difficult for Eric to answer some of EPA's timing questions when they needed a short time frame for the LL Mercury and LL TRC. There are also new programs coming into TNI that may need PTs and it would be helpful to have some clear procedures to follow. Carl commented that it might make sense to add information about what is needed to add an analyte to a table. This needs to be added as an action item for this year.

Eric suggested that the PT Board should have a solid DRAFT for this procedure by June 17, 2010 so that there will be something available for the DC meeting. The concept can be presented in Chicago. A subcommittee may be formed to work on

this. Eric would be willing to participate on this subcommittee, but people need to think about who would lead the subcommittee. This will be discussed at the next meeting.

7) Discuss interim policy development on evaluation of “less than” (<) reporting

The PT Board needs to work on Action Item # 17. This needs to be completed before a policy can be developed.

Is this an issue that needs to be addressed by the ABs? PT Expert Committee? PT Board? Combination of the above?

The issue is that it was voted into the standard, but the ABs are having a problem with it. It is not an editorial change. Carl will make a recommendation on how to address this. He will e-mail this to the PT Board for consideration.

Carl commented that there have been a lot of comments on this topic that were sent to the PT Expert Committee, but they were found to be non-persuasive.

8) Discuss Standard Interpretation Requests 72, 80, and 95.

Eric sent out proposed language for a response to #95. He read the proposal to the group. In Volume 3 of the new standard, Section 8.1 – It has the no more than 45 day requirement.

The 2003 Standard had an exemption for WET – only one DMRQA study was required. In July 2011, they will be required to do 2.

Amy suggested that Stacie be contacted regarding this issue. Eric thought he already got a response from her, but he will check.

Additional notes are also included within the tables in Attachment B.

9) New Items

- None.

10) Open Action Items

The Action Items table was reviewed and updates were made directly into the table.

11) Next Meeting

The next meeting of the PT Board will be Tuesday, January 26, 2009, at 1:30pm in Chicago, IL.

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

Attachment A

Participants TNI Proficiency Testing Board

Members	Affiliation	Contact Information
Eric Smith, Chair (2009) Present	TestAmerica	615-726-0177 x1238 eric.smith@testamericainc.com
Ilona Taunton, Program Administrator Present	TNI	828-712-9242 tauntoni@msn.com
Gary Dechant Present	Analytical Quality Associates, Inc.	970-434-4875 gldchant@aol.com
Amy Doupe Present	Lancaster Laboratories, Inc.	717-656-2300 x1812 aldoupe@lancasterlabs.com
Steve Gibson Present	Texas Comm. on Env. Quality	512-239-1518 jgibson@tceq.state.tx.us
Svetlana Isozamova Present	Accutest Laboratories – Southeast Division	407-425-6700 svetlani@accutest.com
Michella Karapondo Present	USEPA	513-569-7141 karapondo.michella@epa.gov
Carl Kircher Present	Florida DOH	904-791-1574 carl_kircher@doh.state.fl.us
Stacie Metzler Absent	HRSD	757-460-4217 smetzler@hrsd.com
Matt Sica Absent	State of Maine	207-287-1929 matthew.sica@maine.gov
Curtis Wood Absent	Environmental Resource Associates	303-431-8454 cwood@eraqc.com

Attachment B

Standard Interpretation Request Reviews

#72

Section (eg. C.4.1.7.4)	SCM FoPT (7/1/07) ; NELAC Analyte 1935, footnote 13
Describe the problem:	The SCM PT standard for TPH references HEM/SGT on the FoPT. HEM/SGT is a method defined analyte for method to 1664A. The scope and application section of 1664A says that it is for "surface and saline waters and industrial and domestic aqueous wastes". Therefore, the method has to be modified to be performed on solid and chemical materials. Is it appropriate to have a required PT for a non-standard method?
Comments	<p><u>Gary comment 10/21/09:</u> It is appropriate to have a PT for any analyte/method where the method is used with sufficient frequency and in support of environmental decision making regardless of the source of the method.</p> <p><u>Eric comment 11/16/09:</u> Upon consideration, I have to agree to some extent with this SIR #72. HEM on a solid is performed by 9071B. 9071B does not discuss SGT. SGT is only discussed in 9070A/1664A, which was written for water. The units on the Soil FoPT table are in mg/kg. Scanning the list of approved SW-846 methods, I could not a gravimetric analysis that would apply to this PT, without, technically, modifying the method (9071B) to accommodate for Silica Gel Treatment. Therefore, I think the commenter is correct in that we should not be applying a requirement for this PT to HEM methods. Method 8440, TPH by IR, would appear to possibly still apply to this PT?? If so, at this point, I would suggest that the PT Board consider revising the footnote of this PT to indicate that this PT is only to be required where used in conjunction with supercritical carbon dioxide extraction and subsequent IR analysis.</p> <p>12/17/09: Will be discussed at Chicago meeting.</p>
Response	

#80

Section (eg. C.4.1.7.4)	List of analytes that required Proficiency Testing
--------------------------------	--

<p>Describe the problem:</p>	<p>We are currently accredited for method SW 846 8151, but we want to add Pentachlorophenol by 8151 to our scope. Pentachlorophenol is not listed as requiring PT with the other Herbicides that are analyzed by 8151 that are listed. Therefore, I interpret that as Pentachlorophenol by method 8151 does not require PT.</p> <p>Our Accrediting Body says otherwise. They contend that because Pentachlorophenol is listed under the Acid Extractables (Method 625 or 8270) that require PT, it also requires PT if we want to add it to our 8151 scope.</p> <p>Please advise. Thank you.</p>
<p>Comments</p>	<p><u>Gary Comment 10/21/09:</u> Pentachlorophenol is listed as an analyte for 8151 and is included in the PT sample for herbicides. While the tables have classified pentachlorophenol as an acid this is a general classification and does not imply an analytical method. The acceptance criteria are not method specific at this time so I would say there is a valid PT sample available and the lab is required to report it if wants accreditation.</p> <p><u>Eric Comment 11/16/09:</u> I have written a response below that I would suggest. It is consistent with our previous SIR response #26, but updated based on the documented position of the previous NELAC PT Board. In our previous response #26 we felt that group headers must hold significance. Acceptance ranges and spiking concentrations have been previously determined in part based on how they are grouped, so I don't think we can ignore those group headers.</p> <p>I also think we are limited to only offering our position, not telling the NELAP Board what they have to do. If the NELAP Board chooses to not follow our recommendation, then they choose to operate and accredit outside of our guidance. Here's my suggested response -</p> <p>The Accrediting Body's interpretation is consistent with guidance provided a number of years ago by the previous Board overseeing the FOPT tables, the NELAC PT Board.</p> <p>However, the TNI PT Board's current consensus is that group headers in those FOPT</p>

	<p>tables hold important significance, and group headers are to be utilized to classify when an analyte is required to be processed and analyzed.</p> <p>The TNI PT Board would agree that there has been a general lack of consistency within all sectors of the community on how the group headers in the FOPT tables are being interpreted. The TNI PT Board is currently working to address this by adding some clarification on this matter to the FOPT tables.</p> <p>Until such time as the revised FOPT tables become available, the TNI PT Board recommends that the current FOPT table group headers be taken into consideration and used as guidelines for classifying when a PT is required. The final decision on whether the AB grants accreditation based on TNI PT Board guidance lies with the AB and the consensus of the NELAP Board.</p>
Response	<p><u>Current Draft</u> –</p> <p>The Accrediting Body’s interpretation is consistent with guidance provided a number of years ago by the previous Board overseeing the FOPT tables, the NELAC PT Board.</p> <p>However, the TNI PT Board’s current consensus is that group headers in those FOPT tables hold important significance, and group headers are to be utilized to classify when an analyte is required to be processed and analyzed.</p> <p>The TNI PT Board would agree that there has been a general lack of consistency within all sectors of the community on how the group headers in the FOPT tables are being interpreted. The TNI PT Board is currently working to address this by adding some clarification on this matter to the FOPT tables.</p> <p>Until such time as the revised FOPT tables become available, the TNI PT Board recommends that the current FOPT table group headers be taken into consideration and used as guidelines for classifying when a PT is required. The final decision on whether the AB grants accreditation based on TNI PT Board guidance lies with the</p>

	<p>AB and the consensus of the NELAP Board.</p> <p>12/17/09: Carl and Curtis will be providing comments on this response via e-mail. The Board is not ready to vote on this response.</p>
--	---

#95 (10-13-09)

Section (eg. C.4.1.7.4)	F.2.1, F.2.2, F.3
Describe the problem:	<p>I am confused about the PT requirements for labs doing WET analysis. The only 'true' PT is the DMRQA - but it runs longer than 45 days - which doesn't meet F.2.2 requirements. I need to know will the DMRQA be allowed and counted as a PT until such a time as the PT providers have other PTs available?</p>
Comments	<p><u>Stacie comment 11/19/09</u> –</p> <p>Email from Kirsten McCracken to Jerry 10/22/09 – Ilona & Jerry: I had asked Ilona to forward the following SI request to the PT Board which she did and it was assigned to Stacie Metzler. Stacie is on the PTEC and the PT Board and she and I talked about this SI request this morning and she has found a conflict in the language of the 2003 NELAC Standard and we are not sure how to proceed with resolution so I am writing you for guidance.</p> <p>Section F.2.2 of the 2003 NELAC standard says WET PT must be analyzed within 45 days of sample receipt. Section F.4.1 instructs labs to use DMRQ. The DMRQA study is open for 90 days.</p> <p>Either the time-frames of the standard are in conflict or the authors of the standard intended that the DMRQA be used but that the samples be analyzed within 45 days even though DMRQA is open longer. Stacie has a few members and/or contacts that helped develop the appendix in the 2003 standard but nobody seems to recall a 45 day time-frame and the general consensus is that the 45 day time frame does not make sense.</p> <p>If there is a conflict in the 2003 Standard would this resolved by the PTEC, PT Board, NELAP Board, TNI Board, LASC – other?</p> <p>Email from Jerry Parr to Kirsten McCracken 11/19/09:</p>

Sorry; I meant to come back to this and then forgot. After looking at all of this closely, I think the NELAP Board will need to adopt a policy on this issue. Clearly, the 2003 standard is in error (one way or the other) and the only way to fix it is with the NELAP Board. LASC or the PTEC might be able to develop a recommendation.

I checked the 2002 standard and it had a 60 day period; 30 days for analysis and 30 more days for reporting.

Is this issue addressed in the TNI standard?

From what you have said, it appears the PT committee would recommend a 90 day period if given the choice.

Jerry

Eric Comment 11/24/09: It looks to me like based on Jerry's comments provided by Stacie that this SIR #95 should be forwarded to the NELAP Board for response and resolution.

Discussion 12/17/09:

Should be forwarded to the NELAP Board to adopt a policy. There is an error in the standard.

The PT Board is running under the new TNI Standard, but the NELAP Board will adopt the new standard on July 1, 2011.

1/21/10: There are two sets of requirements for the labs – 45 days to run from time of sample receipt and 45 days to report.

Based on discussion, Eric will work up a DRAFT response.

Response	<p>Sent 1/21/10 (from Eric):</p> <p>While the DMRQA study containing the WET PT is open for a period longer than 45 days, the laboratory must complete the analysis of the WET PT sample within 45 days of sample receipt in order for the WET PT result to be used to meet 2003 NELAC standard requirements. The laboratory would have up to 45 days from sample receipt to analyze the WET sample and then the remainder of the DMRQA study period to report the WET PT analytical results to the PT provider.</p>

Attachment C

Action Items – TNI PT Board

	Action Item	Who	Expected Completion	Actual Completion
10.	Let the new Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee know that information is available from NY regarding extraction/prep methods and PT results.	Carl / Ilona	When Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee is formed.	Describe what this is. Soil in metals too? SVOA.
17.	Work on language for new TNI policy based on NELAC Policy #16 and EPA Criteria Document.	Chuck	Eric will follow-up with Chuck to determine a date.	Looking for volunteer to help Chuck.
42	Submit modified footnote based on the micro discussion during the 3/19/09 meeting.	Eric	Before tables are finalized.	Discussed with Chem FoPT Subcommittee and the group thought it was not needed. Eric will
64	Fix typo in WS Table.	Eric	Jan mtg.	Complete
70	Reassess need to contact PT Providers to give them a heads-up on the FoPT table updates.	Eric	Ongoing	
84	Forward concerns in writing about approving Low Level Total Residual Chlorine.	Chuck Carl	12/16/09	Complete
85	Ask Brian to provide the reasons for approving the limit for Low Level Total Residual Chlorine.	Carl	12/16/09	Complete
86	Forward Chem FoPT Subcommittee minutes from 11-3-09 meeting to PT Board.	Ilona	12/16/09	Complete
87	Revised A2LA documents to Eric later today (11-19-09) and this will be forwarded to the PT Board for final review.	Randy Eric	11/25/09	Complete

	Action Item	Who	Expected Completion	Actual Completion
88	Final comments to A2LA documents should be e-mailed to Board members and Randy. A vote will be held at the December 17, 2009 meeting.	All	12/17/09	Complete
93	Talk to Chuck and Carl and DRAFT response for SIR #95.	Eric	1/21/10	
94	Send out electronic vote on DW FoPT Table and cover letter.	Ilona	2/18/10	
95	Send e-mail to Jerry, Aaren and Dan Hickman regarding analyte code issue.	Eric	2/18/10	
96	Form subcommittee to work on procedures to add new analytes.	Eric	2/18/10	
97	Make a recommendation to address evaluation of “less than” (<) reporting. Distribute to Board for consideration.	Carl	2/18/10	

Attachment D

Backburner / Reminders – TNI PT Board

	Item	Meeting Reference	Comments
3	Send A2LA a formal request to ask PT Providers if PT data can be shared with the Board. Needs to be done before 8/09.	1/14/09	
5	Update PTPA Review SOP.	n/a	
6	DW Table Micro Total Coliform Rule Request	10/15/09	9 out of 10 vs. 10 out of 10