

TNI PT Program Executive Committee Meeting Summary

July 28, 2016

1. Roll call and approval of minutes:

Chair, Maria Friedman, called the TNI PT Program Executive Committee (PTPEC) meeting to order on July 28, 2016, at 1:02 PM Eastern by teleconference. Attendance is recorded in Attachment A – there were 10 Executive Committee members present. Associate Members Present: Carl Kircher and Jennifer Mullins.

Maria confirmed that everyone received the meeting information she sent on July 26, 2016.

The June 16, 2016 were reviewed by the committee. Maria noted that she misspelled Langelier Index when she reviewed the minutes. This will be corrected in the final version of the minutes.

A motion was made by Dixie to approve the June 16, 2016 minutes with the spelling correction noted above. The motion was seconded by Nicole and unanimously approved.

2. DW FoPT Table

Footnote 1

Maria noted that on the last call the committee settled on a footnote for the regulated analytes on the DW FoPT table. Maria added the footnote language and sent the table to Carl Kircher for Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee review:

Footnote 1: All analytes regulated under the US EPA's Safe Drinking Water Act must be spiked at non-zero Assigned Values, except when not required for evaluation in a supplemental PT study.

Maria asked if we need the footnote for secondary DW analytes. There are other analytes too, such as herbicides, pesticides, etc ... Maria is wondering if the footnote should be more specific to primary analytes. Michella will check with her office about secondary analytes.

Carl looked at the new Volume 3 Standard and found the following language:

“For those multi-analyte categories designated in the TNI FoPT tables as not requiring all analytes to be spiked, the PT Provider shall determine the number of analytes to be spiked based on the following...”

He noted that the DW FoPT table doesn’t designate what is not required to be spiked. It now appears everything needs to be spiked.

Maria noted that the committee needs to look at Volume 3. Nicole commented that this language is not new, so there shouldn’t be a problem. The Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee should take this under consideration when they review the updates to the table.

Langelier Index

The Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee looked at this and provided language for the PTPEC to approve. This is footnote 16 in the table Maria distributed on 7/26/16:

16) Corrosivity (Langelier Index) should be calculated based on the solution ionic strength as calculated from Total Filterable Residue.

Maria asked why it is a “should” and not a “must”. Carl said they can’t require this, only the Consensus Standards Development Program (CSDP) can. The PT Provider could share this footnote in the lab instructions.

Eric said the sentence could be worded differently: Calculate corrosivity (Langelier Index) based on the solution of ionic strength ...

Andy noted that this does impact the results and there should be consistency between PT Providers. The PTPEC cannot use the tables to provide instruction to the labs.

Nicole noted that the lab should use the method they normally use and not make a change based on the footnote in the FoPT table. Carl commented that Footnote 13 talks about recommended sample design. It is hoped the PT Providers will use these recommendations and perhaps labs will notice these recommendations too. Maria questioned whether the info in Footnote 16 could be put in Footnote 13. The Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee decided to put it as Footnote 16 because it is information about a calculation, not design criteria.

Andy thinks it is related to design criteria and Nicole noted that these are not requirements, just recommendations. After further discussion there was agreement that the information in Footnote 16 should be added to Footnote 13. Maria will send this request to the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee.

3. FoPT Table Updates Going Forward

Maria emailed information from the Tulsa meeting and copies of the flowchart. She would like to begin reviewing this information to improve the update process. It took a number of years for the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee to update the DW, NPW and SCM FoPT tables.

Maria suggests putting the information into an outline form for easier discussion. Once the outline is complete she would like the SOP Subcommittee to prepare an SOP. Gil (SOP Subcommittee Chair) said the subcommittee could help with this.

The committee began the review of the comments (*in italics*) in the Tulsa meeting minutes:

Comments:

- Looking at analytes that might have a new prep method may not be good criteria because it would be hard to collect this info. It was noted that NY does ask for prep methods and there are others who do too. Nicole thinks this could be helpful. Stacie Metzler thinks it is not right to decide which analytes should be looked at based on prep methods which are not currently part of the PT Program as required.

This would only relate to the FoPT Table updates if the scope of the FoPT tables is expanded. Maria thinks this needs to be discussed further and the NELAP AC would need to be involved.

Andy noted that this can't be looked at until data are provided and their collection is not currently required. Maria noted that NY is already collecting this data. Eric would like to see the data collection procedures updated so that prep method information can be collected if it is available. Nicole commented that even if PT Providers are willing to make this change, there is no requirement for the lab to provide the data.

Jennifer Duhon noted that they don't collect this information and it would require a change to their database. Maria will check with PT Providers to see who currently collects this.

- Carl Kircher: When FoPTs are considered there is a lot that is taken into consideration. An example is Pentachlorophenol.

It is an overlapping analyte. It can be analyzed by different technologies. The method is requested so the subcommittee can tell which method was used. Carl commented that he thinks the PT Providers are grouping Pentachlorophenol in two different PT products so there is no confusion – acid extractables grouping and herbicides grouping. Maria noted on DW table it is currently listed under the herbicides.

Eric thinks performance should be based on the technology. Carl said they could do a statistical analysis to compare the results from the different technologies.

Carl also noted that they also look to make sure there is not a big difference between PT Providers. These are just examples of all things considered.

- Kelly - Could use moving weighted averages to determine info. The more recent data gets more importance.

Carl commented that not all analytes are spiked at non-zero assigned values. “One size does not fit all.”

We can use moving weighted averages depending on the analyte and availability of data. It would be better to use more current data. The subcommittee could give a preference to this. Should the subcommittee only use the most recent x number of points? Or prefer to use data from larger studies.

Maria is hoping the changes in how the data for updates will be collected will solve some of the problems with data collection in the past where not all data could be collected.

The PTPEC should decide how old the data can be for it to be considered. Eric thinks it should be all data between FoPT Table updates. It shouldn’t be older than that.

Andy commented that many results between the old table and the update are similar.

Eric thought it would be helpful to understand how frequently an analyte is spiked in a PT. Spiking frequency is a part of the PTPA checklist. There shouldn’t be any analytes that are not spiked. Maria will keep this in mind when talking to Ilona and Shawn regarding the PTPA checklist.

- Shawn: We need to collect the data to be able to evaluate prep methods in the future. There may be issues that ABs will raise because their systems are not set-up to receive this additional data.

See similar discussion above.

- Kelly – Is the first step in the update process to pick the FoPT table to update? Maybe it is a particular analyte that needs to be updated and it is across all the tables. What if the FoPTs were in an Access database?

Maria asked if it is OK to jump between tables when doing updates? Look at an analyte across all tables at the same time. Focus is on the analyte and not the table.

Eric thinks this would be confusing. One table should be focused on at a time. There was general agreement with this.

On the second part of Kelly’s suggestion, Nicole thinks it was about data being kept in one database instead of all the separate FoPT tables. It would make it easier for PT

Providers to upload the new information to their systems. Use Access instead of Excel. Reports can be published out of Access.

- Carl asked if labs have the ability to let the PT Provider know what data go to which AB or program? It is complicated.

This is already happening. This information has no bearing on FoPT table updates.

Eric moved ahead to the flow chart and looked at future suggestions. He would like to add a suggestion that the PTPEC could get recommendations from the FoPT Subcommittees on certain analytes that have higher fail rates, analytes with not as much supporting data (some limits couldn't be updated because there was not enough data to update them) or have the potential to be a problem. The subcommittee would essentially provide a list of analytes that need to be reviewed. Andy added that the subcommittee should also look at analytes with high acceptance rates.

4. SOP 4-102

SOP 4-102 has been updated by the SOP Subcommittee. Nicole provided a comparison between versions of the SOP to make it clear what changed.

Maria had some questions about the revised update:

Section 10: Revision 2 starts after the line.

Section 6.5.1: Is this really only a document review? Nicole noted that the subcommittee considered this and decided if it was a situation that needed an on-site, the situation would be beyond the appeals process.

There were no further comments.

Once the SOP is approved it will be sent to the Policy Committee for review.

Gil made a motion to approve SOP 4-102 and Nicole seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Maria – For

Justin – No longer on call.

Nicole – For

Gil – For

Jennifer D – For

Michella – For

Dixie – No longer on call.

Eric – For

Andy – For

Joe – Had to leave call at 2pm

Maria will continue the vote by email.

(Addition: Maria finished the vote by email. Additional votes:

Dixie – For (7/29/16)

Joe – For (7/29/16)

Susan – For (8/1/16)

Patrick – For (8/1/16)

The motion passed and the SOP has been approved.)

5. Chair Update

- SIR 26 and 80 are still being voted on by the NELAP AC.
- There will be separation between the WETT FoPT Subcommittee and the WETT Expert Committee. One reports to the PTPEC and the other to the CSDEC.
- Bob Shannon has agreed to provide radiochemistry technical expertise to the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee when it is needed.

6. Subcommittee Report

FoPT Format Subcommittee

Nicole reported the subcommittee met briefly to decide that assignments need to be divided up. They will be meeting tomorrow.

Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee

The subcommittee will meet next Tuesday to review the three requests before them.

Microbiology FoPT Subcommittee

Maria noted that PTPs have uploaded the data requested. An update will be provided next month.

7. Action Items

The action items can be found in Attachment B.

8. Next Meeting

The next PTPEC teleconference will be in Orange County on August 9, 2016. (Members expected to be there: Jennifer Duhon, Eric, Andy, Maria.) There will also be a teleconference on August 25, 2016 at 1pm Eastern.

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

Maria adjourned the meeting at 2:35pm Eastern. (Motion: Eric, Second: Andy Unanimously approved.)

Attachment A

Participants TNI

Proficiency Testing Program Executive Committee

Members	Affiliation	Contact Information
Maria Friedman (2014) Present	n/a	949-307-0949 qamfriedman@gmail.com
Ilona Taunton, Program Administrator Recording	TNI	828-712-9242 tauntoni@msn.com
Eric Smith (2010) Present	ALS Environmental	904-394-4415 eric.smith@alsglobal.com
Justin Brown (2011) Present	Environmental Monitoring and Technologies, Inc.	847-875-2271 jbrown@emt.com
Susan Jackson (2012) Absent	South Carolina DHEC	(803)896-0978 jacksosb@dhec.sc.gov
Nicole Cairns (2012) Present	NY State DOH	(518) 473-0323 nicole.cairns@health.ny.gov
Joe Pardue (2011) Present (until 2pm)	Pro2Serve, Inc.	423-337-3121 joe_pardue@charter.net
Dr. Andy Valkenburg_(2011) Present	Energy Laboratories, Inc.	406-869-6254 avalkenburg@energylab.com
Jennifer Duhon (2019) Present	Millipore Sigma	307-3897218 jennifer.duhon@sial.com
Matt Sica Absent	ANAB, ANSI-ASQ National Accreditation Board	msica@anab.org
Dixie Marlin (2015) Present	Marlin Quality Management, LLC	513-309-3593 marlinquality@gmail.com
Gil Dichter (2015) Present (at 1:15)	IDEXX Water	207-556-4687 gil-dichter@idexx.com
Patrick Garrity (2019) Absent	Kentucky DEP	502-319-4040 patrick.garrity@ky.gov
Michella Karapondo (2019) Present	USEPA	513-569-7141 karapondo.michella@epa.gov

Attachment B

Action Items – TNI PT Executive Committee

	Action Item	Who	Expected Completion	Actual Completion
185	Send updated DW table with Footnote 15 to NELAP AC for approval.	Stacie Maria	4/1/12	Stacie submitted this. Need to confirm approval. Action: Look to see if this got done. 8/20/15: Maria will follow-up.
214	Update Tin, Total Xylene and Total Cyanide on FoPT tables and submit for approval.	Carl Stacie	Next Meeting	In Progress Ilona will look for this stuff. 8/20/15: Maria thinks Cyanide is done, but need to find status on Xylene and Tin. 11/19/15: Ilona reviewed minutes and provided notes to Carl and Maria.
233	Review complaint process.	Maria Ilona	5/14/14	In Progress
257	Email to SOP Subcommittee regarding clarification on how limit updates due to issues should be addressed.	Maria	12/12/14	Maria prepared it, but is waiting for a chair for this subcommittee.
264	Update Complaint SOP to reflect Standard requirement that PTPA be contacted.	TBD	TBD	Waiting for input - #233.
271	Provide list of replicates and volumes from WET Subcommittee to PT Providers.	Maria	3/19/15	It gives them information about the methods that

	Action Item	Who	Expected Completion	Actual Completion
				PT Provider's don't have. 8/20: Jeff asked that this be distributed to the PT Providers. Maria will take care of this. 6/16/16: Maria requested this be deleted from the table.
295	Moved from Backburner: PTPA Evaluation Checklist needs to be updated prior to next round of evaluations. (Originally discussed 8/6/13)	Gil	August 2016	In Progress (Likely complete by 8/2016)
310	Coordinate the update of the SCM FoPT table with Carl and send to NELAP AC for approval.	Maria	3/24/16	3/24/16: Working through Cyanide issue first.
311	Contact Lem Walker about new ARA to remove an analyte.	Maria	3/24/16	3/24/16: Waiting for response from NELAP AC.
317	Provide Carl/Chem FoPT Subcommittee with information to make updates to the DW table.	Maria	6/15/16	
319	Update DW FoPT table with discussed footnotes and Corrosivity Langlier Index footnote.	Maria	7/27/16	Complete
320	Send thank-you note to WETT FoPT Table Subcommittee.	Maria	7/27/16	Complete
321	Send data reminder to PT Providers. Data due the end of June.	Maria	6/23/16	Complete

	Action Item	Who	Expected Completion	Actual Completion
322	Check with EPA on whether DW footnote should be specific to primary analytes.	Michella	8/25/16	
323	Ask Chem FoPT Subcommittee to add Footnote 16 to Footnote 13.	Maria	8/1/16	
324	Survey PT Providers to see who collects sample prep method.	Maria	8/25/16	

Attachment C

Backburner / Reminders – TNI PT Executive Committee

	Item	Meeting Reference	Comments
7	Add the Field PT Subcommittee to the limit update SOP during its next update.	3/4/10	In Progress
11	Evaluate how labs are accredited for analytes that co-elute.	5-19-11	
13	Charter needs to be updated in November.	Ongoing 2016	
16	Moved back to Backburner (originally discussed 2/20/14) : 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. 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.	2/20/14	
17	Discuss possible procedural changes to how limits are updated. Maria talk to SOP Subcommittee.		Need to look at PT database implications.