

**TNI PT Program Executive Committee  
Meeting Summary**

**December 18, 2014**

1. Roll call and approval of minutes:

Chair, Maria Friedman, called the TNI PT Program Executive Committee (PTPEC) meeting to order on December 18, 2014, at 1:04 PM Eastern. Attendance is recorded in Attachment A – there were 6 Executive Committee members present. Affiliates Present: Craig Huff, Carl Kircher, and Dixie Marlin.

Maria reviewed the handouts everyone should have received for today's meeting.

A motion was made by Nicole to approve the November 20, 2014 minutes. The motion was seconded by Susan.

Vote: 6 – For 0 – Against 0 – Abstain

The vote will be completed by email.

2. Chair Update

- Maria has continued working with Rami on the issue of how the WET Testing PT samples need to be analyzed and how this is documented. The subcommittee is asking how to deal with all the different state requirements – labs are needing to run the PT many different ways due to state requirements. Maria asked for help from ELAB and Patsy Root (Chair of ELAB) sent the following note back:

*ELAB correspondence regarding WET Testing PTs*

*From: Root, Patsy [mailto:Patsy-Root@IDEXX.com] Sent: Wed 10/22/2014 8:51 AM To: Friedman, Maria Cc: Ilona Taunton; Phelps, Lara; 'pmcarvajal@sara-tx.org'; Kristen LeBaron Subject: RE: PTPEC Question re. WET PT analysis*

*Dear Maria,*

*First, I must apologize for such a long delay in providing a response to your WET PT question. The ELAB has just been through our regular Board member changes and things have been a bit hectic.*

*I wanted to let you know the Board discussed your WET PT question and request. Though this is certainly an interesting and perplexing question, the Charter of the ELAB does not include providing advice to the TNI or its committees.*

*What we would suggest is to contact the State DMR-QA coordinators for their insight on this topic. It appears to be the consensus of the Board that these individuals would likely have good, directional advice for you on this topic.*

*I apologize we can't be of more assistance. I hope things have, or will, progress well on this topic.*

*Respectfully, Patsy*

Maria sent out a list of each of the DMR-QA coordinators, but has since decided that she will write one letter to all the coordinators and ask for their input. The letter will be similar to the one she originally sent to Patsy. Susan noted that the list originally sent did not have all the coordinators listed – she is a coordinator and she was not listed. Susan noted that some states have exemptions and that may be why some people are missing. She thinks it is important that all states be included in our email. Her state is exempt because her state's program is equivalent. Maria said she would resend the list to the committee and ask about other states that are missing.

- Action Item #254: Alfredo from the Policy Committee was supposed to send a review of the PTPEC SOPs that were submitted, but she has not seen anything yet. She will follow-up with him.
- Action Item #255: Maria received an email from Jerry regarding the EPA Lab ID issues discussed at the last meeting and this has been sorted out by EPA and is no longer an issue. Michella agreed. Brian Krause will be sending a letter regarding the new procedure and Michella will also be sending a letter.

### 3. Complaint Update

Maria noted the following complaints are still open:

#### 1. NPW TDS and TSS Complaint

Maria followed up with Carl on the status of this complaint and received the following explanation:

*Dear Maria,*

*These comments will reflect one person's educated opinion and does not reflect the Chem FoPT Subcommittee as a whole.*

*The current quality system for the PTPEC appears to suggest that "question 2" now falls under the purview of the "FoPT Table Management SOP." The effective date on the version that I have is 11/21/13. If any complaints on TDS and TSS were received after that time, the complainant needs to petition the PTPEC and get a NELAP AB sponsor AND SUBMIT PT DATA supporting the*

*proposed revision to the FoPT Table(s). This request falls under the “Modification” option for this SOP. I am sorry if I am misinterpreting the SOP, but that is how it appears to read.*

*The available PT data we have for the former DW and NPW FoPT evaluations were in 2006-2010. Getting PT summary data since that time appears to be more difficult as PT Providers and PTPA’s seem to be more stringent as to confidentiality issues and dealing with “ownerships” of the respective PT data. How is the “PTPA Database” subcommittee, which the PTPEC has been working on, going to address this problem? Getting PT data has been a part of the TNI Board of Directors strategic planning points from the last Milwaukee meeting. What is being done about this point?*

*From my personal knowledge, getting summary PT data that is segregated according to how it is packaged (Minerals ampule versus Hardness Ampule versus Residues ampule) and by matrix may be next to impossible. Even if it is possible, there will be no guarantee that there will a satisfactory number of laboratory participants in all matrix types for all PT ampule options and for ALL PT Providers for the statistical analysis to be meaningful.*

*As for technical merit, the Chem FoPT Subcommittee gave you our best recommendations for NPW TDS, TSS, and TS (however named) earlier. However, because of some “complaint,” we relented and reverted the TSS acceptance criteria in NPW back to the previous regression equations. In retrospect, I think that was a mistake. If I had it to do over again, I would keep the acceptance criteria model that we gave you earlier ( $a=1$ ,  $b=c=0$ , and  $d$ =fixed limit) since most of the variance was due to residue weighing variances on the balance and was largely independent of Residue concentration in the PT. If you ask me to revisit this again, that will be my recommendation to the Subcommittee PLUS changing the DW FoPT for TDS and the NPW FoPT for Volatile Residue to that same model. NPW Settleable Residue can remain with the regression equations as posted. I have the 2006-2010 data in both WS and WP to back all my statements up. As I look back at that time around 2010, it appears that the Subcommittee would have violated our acceptance criteria SOP in recommending regression equations ( $a,b,c,d$ ) for TDS, TSS, and TS (and DID violate the SOP in the case of TVS). The correlation coefficients of Std. Dev. Vs. Assigned Value  $r$ -squared are WELL BELOW the SOP acceptance criteria of 0.75 for each Residue.*

*By the way, if “recent PT data” is a major issue, all regression equations, models, and other considerations based on the US EPA Criteria Document (issued in 2001?) should now be discounted and ignored.*

*Please reconfirm which FoPTs (DW or NPW, and TDS, TSS, TS, TVS, and SolSet) that you want the Subcommittee to re-examine.*

*I am sorry that I cannot respond to question 2 at this time, based on recent PT*

*data. I will try to explain all this to the PTPEC at the next teleconference if you want to make this an agenda item.*

Maria commented that it does not make sense to re-evaluate old data.

Carl reviewed the history of these PTs and how the former TSS complaint was handled. He also noted that there may be a difference in how the PTs are currently combined and this may have an effect. These PTs are now available in a Minerals ampule, a Hardness ampule or a dedicated ampule exclusive to residues. Carl noted that reviewing this data would require a lot of current data to re-evaluate these PTs. He re-emphasized the opinion he gave in his email above.

Andy thought the packaging design could be a real issue. Carl noted that the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee has always made it clear that the information in the FoPT tables are based on formulation recommendations – and that using a different formulation may give different results. Andy noted that he historically had issues with PTs for anions when running them in a Nutrients PT. He now purchases the Anion PT and has not problem.

Maria emphasized that new data would be needed to find out if the root cause of this complaint is different methods being used to analyze PTs. Maria will be meeting with the PTPAs to find a better way to get new data. She asked that people let her know if they would also like to attend this meeting. There is one PTPA that has received permission from PT Providers to share data and one that cannot share data at this time. Maria would like to find out how to make it possible for both PTPAs to share data. This is also an item that needs to be solved for the PT Executive Committee too. Ilona forwarded information from SOP 4-101 that details the data that needs to be submitted to the FoPT Subcommittees and there is a note about the data coming from the PTPA.

Maria asked if something needs to be addressed immediately. Nicole asked if the lab contacted the PT Provider and/or PTPA. Maria noted they had talked to the PT Provider, but she is not sure about the PTPA.

Maria read through the SOP Carl noted in his email. There is no requirement that the complainant needs to complete the form. Maria will send an email to the SOP Subcommittee for clarification.

## 2. Complaint Dealing with Method 3051A and Requesting That Preparatory Methods Be Considered (PTPEC Minutes – 8-2-14)

Maria noted that she has not heard back from the complainant and that the committee is not able to work through this issue at this time. She will prepare a response to the complainant and this will be closed out by the next meeting. She will note that this may be considered in the future. Carl asked that the complainant provide data for this concern so it can be considered in the future.

## 3. UV-254 PT Acceptance Limits

Complaint received on 12-11-14:

<b>Name</b>	xxx
<b>Email</b>	<a href="#">xxx</a>
<b>Phone</b>	xxx
<b>Organization</b>	xxx
<b>Reference</b>	UV-254 PT Acceptance Limits
<b>Description of Issue</b>	Recently two of our laboratories failed PT samples for UV-254 with almost the identical analyte concentration. I cannot recall ever failing this analyte at either facility. Looking at the study results (XX), there is close to a 25% failure rate which seems excessive to me. Have the regression equations been updated recently?
<b>Description of Actions</b>	None.
<b>Description of Remedy Sought</b>	If regression equations have changed then they should be re-evaluated and a written response submitted to us.

Additional Information:

In response to a question about whether they had contacted the PT Provider – *No, they did not feel anything was wrong with the sample. They did feel it was an issue with the limits. I'm really not looking to point the finger at anyone. It just seemed odd to me that both the labs failed with a nearly identical number where there has been no history of issues with this analysis. It also seemed odd when I called XX and looked up the statistics and saw an almost 25% failure rate. I've re-ordered the PT's for both labs and am just trying to explore the root cause for possible corrective action. Thanks.*

Maria noted that UV-254 was originally an experimental PT. It was added to the FoPT table in 2010. It has been in use with the current limits for 3 years.

Nicole feels the PTPA should be contacted before the PTPEC is contacted. Maria will respond to the Policy Committee and the complainant.

#### 4. Subcommittee Updates

##### FOPT Table Format Subcommittee

Craig noted that the subcommittee has met. They will begin with the DW FoPT Table format. Methods – as well as technology – will be included on the table. The committee will meet again early January.

Nicole is concerned that the inclusion of methods should only be for the DW FoPT table and none of the others. She thought the change was being made to accommodate the DW

program. Maria commented that the subcommittee scope is not clear and she will look into this. *(Addition: Ilona forwarded information to Maria from previous minutes regarding the development of the Scope of this subcommittee.)*

Andy noted that there are also some analyte code issues that should be considered in the table format update. This is not currently something on this subcommittee's scope. Carl brought up a concern about Total Dissolved Solids and Filterable Residue and different codes for each of these analytes – though they are probably the same analyte. He asked Michella if anything can be done about this. She said she would not have a problem if the DW code was used consistently. She said EPA is working on standardizing the codes.

There is no question about whether methods should be added to the DW table. This can be revisited when these tables are worked on. Craig asked if the Scope can be updated to clarify what is needed. Maria will amend the Scope and then distribute it to the PTPEC members for review and comment. This will be finalized at the next meeting.

Nicole motioned that methods will be included in the format update to the DW table and not the NPW or SCM table. The motion was seconded by Michella and unanimously approved by the members present on the call.

#### WET Testing FoPT Subcommittee

Last time the PTPEC discussed working with the NELAP AC to accept the table being proposed and let the PTPEC continue to work on better ways to get instructions out. Maria contacted Aaron, but has not heard back yet. She will call her before the end of the year.

#### Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee:

Carl provided an update. The Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee is continuing to review SCM analytes. The group is still working on Pesticides. Maria asked the time frame the data being reviewed was produced. Carl responded that it is between 2006-2010. Carl noted that the Pesticides reviewed to date have not resulted in many changes to the current table.

#### SOP Subcommittee

There has been no committee meeting this month. The committee still needs to discuss options for chairing the committee. Ilona will schedule a meeting for the committee. Committee members are Stacey Fry (liaison on Chem FoPT Subcommittee), Stacie Metzler, Nicole, Patrick and Ilona. Shawn will participate when the subcommittee begins work on the committee's procedural SOPs to replace the procedures currently listed in Volume 4.

5. Compound Naming and Identification Inconsistency - (2,2'-osybis (1-chloropropane) vs. bis

(2-chloroisopropyl) ether

Andy sent a copy of a letter from ELAB to Lara Phelps regarding this issue. The analyte code table still needs to be corrected. Maria noted that this is something the IT Committee needs to look at. Maria will bring this to their next meeting. After this is corrected, a correction can be made to the FoPT table.

See Attachment D for more information about issues.

Andy recommends using the “IRIS” database naming convention in the FOPT tables and updating/correcting the method analyte code tables. Nicole noted that labs have been analyzing the correct compound, but analyte name and CAS numbers have been a problem.

## 6. Micro Request – Carl Kircher

Carl sent the following email to Maria on 9-18-14:

*Dear Maria,*

*I have become aware of potential problems with quantitative Microbiology PTs, MPN FoPTs (both Drinking Water and Non-Potable Water matrices). I do not have the information and data first-hand, but I have second-hand knowledge that bimodal distributions of PT results exist for these particular FoPTs. Volume 3 of the TNI ELS (NELAP) Standards requires the PT Provider to review such bimodal data to determine if a disproportionate number of laboratory PT failures come from analysis by a particular method (e.g., SM 9223 B QUANTITRAY enzyme substrate E. coli versus SM 9221 F EC+MUG MTF E. coli). It is not clear that Unacceptable PT results are particularly method specific.*

*Nevertheless, I request that the Microbiology FoPT Subcommittee reporting to TNI's PTPEC gather the relevant PT data from Providers, consider the following points, and report any recommendations and revisions needed to the DW and NPW quantitative Microbiology PTs for the PTPEC's approval:*

*- Is there a preponderance (significant occurrence or percentage) of quantitative Microbiology PT studies that exhibit a bimodal distribution of reported results from participant laboratories?*

*- If such bimodal distributions exist, do these distributions occur for one particular FoPT (e.g., E. coli)? Or do the bimodal distributions occur for other Microbiology FoPTs (Total Coliform, Fecal Coliform, Enterococci)?*

*- If such bimodal distributions result in PT failures for laboratories that perform a particular MPN test method, should the MPN FoPTs be split into separate FoPTs, so that separate PT result analyses and PT acceptance criteria evaluations (by accredited PT*

*Providers) will occur for more specific technologies? e.g., FoPT for Enzyme Substrate MPN E. coli and FoPT for MTF MPN E. coli listed separately? And the same for the other MPN Microbiology FoPTs?*

*Please feel free to call me if additional clarifications of my requests are needed.*

Carl got this issue from EPA Region 10 and he told them he would bring it up with the PTPEC. Carl reviewed his letter with the committee.

Michelle is of the understanding that Jennifer Best (EPA) is going to submit an application regarding this topic to the PTPEC. She would like to see it separated. Maria will wait for this request to address this issue.

#### 7. Standard Interpretation Requests (SIRs)

Maria sent a copy of the SIRs that LASEC has asked this committee to reconsider. This will be discussed at the next meeting in January.

#### 8. New Business

- Carl asked about the PTPA evaluation schedule. It is thought the next evaluation round will begin in 2016. Maria noted that the change to a four year cycle has not been documented in the committee's SOPs and procedures. Nicole thought this was approved by the TNI Board and Maria will look into this.
- Michella asked if there is a method to let people know the process for complaints, adding analytes, etc. Our SOPs are posted, but it is not clear to people where to go for this information. The website should be reviewed to look for needed additions. Eric noted that a few years ago the committee looked at confusion on processes and a FAQ was started. Eric will look for this document and Maria will ask Jerry/IT Committee about it. The TNI website is being revised and perhaps there is a section for this.
- Maria reminded everyone about the face-to-face meeting in Crystal City, VA on February 3, 2015, Tuesday, 8am-12pm.

#### 9. Action Items

- See Attachment B.
- Complaints are still being addressed.

#### 10. Next Meeting

The next teleconference will be January 15 at 1pm ET.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 2:41pm EST. Eric motioned, Andy seconded. Unanimously approved.

## Attachment A

### Participants TNI

#### Proficiency Testing Program Executive Committee

Members	Affiliation	Contact Information
Stacie Metzler (2009) <b>Absent</b>	HRSD	757-460-4217 <a href="mailto:smetzler@hrsd.com">smetzler@hrsd.com</a>
Maria Friedman (2014) - <b>Present</b>	TestAmerica	949-260-3201 <a href="mailto:maria.friedman@testamericainc.com">maria.friedman@testamericainc.com</a>
Ilona Taunton, Program Administrator <b>Recording</b>	TNI	828-712-9242 <a href="mailto:tauntoni@msn.com">tauntoni@msn.com</a>
Eric Smith (2010) <b>Present after 1:45pm.</b>	ALS Environmental	904-394-4415 <a href="mailto:eric.smith@alsglobal.com">eric.smith@alsglobal.com</a>
Justin Brown (2011) <b>Absent</b>	Environmental Monitoring and Technologies, Inc.	847-875-2271 <a href="mailto:jbrown@emt.com">jbrown@emt.com</a>
Susan Butts (2012) <b>Present</b>	South Carolina DHEC	(803)896-0978 <a href="mailto:buttsse@dhec.sc.gov">buttsse@dhec.sc.gov</a>
Patrick Brumfield (2012) <b>Absent</b>	Sigma-Aldrich RTC	(307) 721-5488 <a href="mailto:Pat.Brumfield@sial.com">Pat.Brumfield@sial.com</a>
Michella Karapondo (2011) <b>Present</b>	USEPA	513-569-7141 <a href="mailto:karapondo.michella@epa.gov">karapondo.michella@epa.gov</a>
Nicole Cairns (2012) <b>Present</b>	NY State DOH	(518) 473-0323 <a href="mailto:nicole.cairns@health.ny.gov">nicole.cairns@health.ny.gov</a>
Joe Pardue (2011) <b>Absent</b>	Pro2Serve, Inc.	423-337-3121 <a href="mailto:joe_pardue@charter.net">joe_pardue@charter.net</a>
Dr. Andy Valkenburg_(2011) <b>Present</b>	Energy Laboratories, Inc.	406-869-6254 <a href="mailto:avalkenburg@energylab.com">avalkenburg@energylab.com</a>
Ron Houck <b>Absent</b>	PA DEP	<a href="mailto:rhouck@pa.gov">rhouck@pa.gov</a>
Matt Sica <b>Absent</b>	ANAB, ANSI-ASQ National Accreditation Board	<a href="mailto:msica@anab.org">msica@anab.org</a>

## Attachment B

### Action Items – TNI PT Executive Committee

	<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Expected Completion</b>	<b>Actual Completion</b>
185	Send updated DW table with Footnote 15 to NELAP AC for approval.	Stacie	4/1/12	Stacie submitted this. Need to confirm approval.
214	Update Tin, Total Xylene and Total Cyanide on FoPT tables and submit for approval.	Carl Stacie	Next Meeting	In Progress
231	Meet to discuss how information is requested from PTPAs and how it relates to PT Providers.	Ilona Maria	4/15/14	See Action Item #249
233	Review complaint process.	Maria Ilona	5/14/14	In Progress
244	Draft response to complainant for 3051A complaint and distribute to committee for review.	Maria	9/11/14	
246	Rewrite request to the Chemistry FoPT subcommittee and send to Ilona for distribution.	Maria	10/6/14	
249	Meet with PTPAs to discuss issues surrounding receiving data for FoPT Limit Updates and complaints. Determine if issue exists and whether subcommittee is needed to address this issue.	Maria	11/13/14	
251	Follow-up with Rami to provide support to solve footnote issue on WET FoPT Table.	Maria	10/30/14	Still in Progress
252	Set-up meeting with Aaren (NELAP AC) to discuss approving the WET FoPT Table as is.	Maria	12/5/14	
253	Check with EPA attorney on requirement that Vinyl Chloride cannot be “0”.	Michella	12/15/14	

	<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Expected Completion</b>	<b>Actual Completion</b>
254	Review PT SOP comments by the Policy Committee and add to agenda as appropriate.	Maria Ilona	12/15/14	12/18: Maria did not receive anything yet.
255	Get back to Michella regarding Lab IDs.	Maria	12/15/14	Complete
256	Letter to DMR Coordinators	Maria	12/12/14	
257	Email to SOP Subcommittee regarding clarification on how limit updates due to issues should be addressed.	Maria	12/12/14	
258	Send letter to complainant regarding prep method complaint.	Maria	12/12/14	
259	Prepare response to Policy Committee and Complainant on UV-254 complaint.	Maria	12/12/14	
260	Amend FoPT Table Format Subcommittee Scope and distribute for review.	Maria	12/12/14	
261	Bring naming and ID inconsistency issue to the IT Committee.	Maria	12/12/14	
262	Look into schedule for next PTPA evaluations and confirm TNI Board extended evaluations to 4 years.	Maria	12/12/14	
263	Look into new website design and see if there is an FAQ section that the committee can use to summarize some of their processes – complaint, addition/deletion of analyses to FoPT tables, etc. Talk to IT Committee.	Maria	12/12/14	
264				

**Attachment C**

**Backburner / Reminders – TNI PT Executive Committee**

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Meeting Reference</b>	<b>Comments</b>
7	Add the Field PT Subcommittee to the limit update SOP during its next update.	3/4/10	
11	Evaluate how labs are accredited for analytes that co-elute.	5-19-11	
12	PTPA Evaluation Checklist needs to be updated prior to next round of evaluations.	8-6-13	
13	Charter needs to be updated in November.	Ongoing	
14	<p>When new limits are established for the FoPTs, what is considered to be a statistically significant change to the old rates? At what point is it appropriate to question new limits? This lends to the TSS discussion a few months ago.</p> <p>Patrick commented that it would make sense to look at changes to pass/fail rates 6 months after new limits are effective. This possible addition to procedures should be evaluated when updating the limit acceptance SOP.</p> <p>3/20/14: Eric noted that there are some logistics with doing a 6 month review. This may need to be a separate committee so it does not hamper the progress of the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee.</p>	2/20/14	

Attachment D: 2,2'-oxybis (1-chloropropane) Issue

Maria,

In regards to Item #5. Thanks for placing this on the Agenda. Below is some related investigation in regards to how to help TNI address this issue.

Were you aware that the PT Executive Committee is specifically mentioned in the SOP on Analyte Codes and most importantly in the section on modifying or retiring codes? Is that one of the SOPs we should be aware of as part of our task descriptions?

<http://nelac-institute.org/docs/policy/SOP-1-109-Rev0-IT-AnalyteCodes-12-16-10-Interim.pdf>

The SOP describes the process we will need to implement to correct the Analyte code tables. Seems a "Method And Analyte Codes subcommittee is involved. What TNI committee is that subcommittee under?

We do a spelling error and assigned case number error to deal with the common name assigned.

In csv downloaded from

<http://lams.nelac-institute.org/analytes>

We have the following two entries in the current Analyte Code Tables.

5780 bis(2-Chloroisopropyl) ether  
4659 bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)ether

Compound naming should be spelled with correct spacing throughout. This issue then identifies a bigger problem then, and related to our FOPT table analyte naming needs to be checked. Having multiple analyte codes is also appropriate for reporting data. The applicable cyanide analyte code in FOPT tables are an issue also. Cyanide in SDWA FOPT table being the example.

The compound 2,2'-oxybis (1-chloropropane) is not listed. EPA lists the CAS number 108-60-1 as Bis(2-chloro-1methylethyl) ether in the iris database. <http://www.epa.gov/iris/subst/0407.htm> and this compound name is not in the analyte code tables. (Search by CAS number also)

I recommend using the "IRIS" database naming convention in our FOPT tables and updating/correcting the method analyte code tables. A footnote describing the alternate ID's than makes the FOPT table correction understood and searchable for this specific compound naming error issue.

Andy