

TNI PT Program Executive Committee Meeting Summary

January 27, 2014

1. Roll call and approval of minutes:

Chair, Stacie Metzler, called the TNI PT Program Executive Committee (PTP EC) meeting to order on January 16, 2014, at 1:35 PM EST in Louisville, KY. Attendance is recorded in Attachment A – there were 11 Executive Committee members present. Associate members on the phone: Jeff Lowry.

The meeting minutes from January 16, 2014 were distributed. These will be approved at the February meeting.

2. Introduction

See presentation in Attachment D. Stacie summarized the slides.

The committee is still looking for candidates to fill the Chair and Vice-chair positions.

3. FoPT Tables

See Presentation in Attachment D.

Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee:

See committee information in Attachment D. Carl will continue to chair this subcommittee. The liaisons between the subcommittee and the PTP EC will be Joe, Andy and Ilona.

FoPT Table Updates

See Presentation in Attachment D.

The Protozoa table is still in question. It may actually be approved by NELAP.

WET FoPT Subcommittee

They will be making major changes to the table. See summary slide in Attachment D. There is a new WET Expert Committee being developed in TNI, so in the near future the standard will be getting updated through this new committee.

Microbiology FoPT Subcommittee

See slides in Attachment D. There are 15 members on the subcommittee.

Susan presented the three questions posed to the PTPEC on the January 16th call and then provided some additional information regarding areas of concern.

Discussion 1:

- Matt commented that he thought homogeneity testing is required. Susan clarified her question: If a quantitative number were required, is there more work or cost involved. Jeff Lowry and Matt commented there would be more cost.
- Scott Hoatson commented on the ranges posted in the table in the slides. The ranges are from the PT Providers. Scott thought they looked too high. It was commented that these are the ranges currently used by PT Providers.
- Shawn Kassner: Difference between quantitative DW and NPW is that there are 10 samples needed for DW.
- Nicole thinks the cost needs to be looked at and then determine if there is a benefit to specify a preparation range.
- Patsy Root: The PT providers are accredited and they have procedures in place for qualitative samples that have a range. She does not believe they are that far off. She thinks it is a question of need for consistency between PT Providers.
- Shawn Kassner: It depends on the PT Provider. They have different procedures.
- Jennifer Best (USEPA OW): She is interested in a range, but would like to understand what the cost difference is. She feels the point is to show the lab can run the PT, so having PTs run in different ranges depending on the PT Provider makes it difficult to see the PTs as meaningful. She is looking for consistency between providers.
- Stacie looked up the definition of Proficiency Testing.
- Carol Haines (EPA Region 10): They are concerned that some people are receiving a sample with 50 and another person may receive a sample of 500.
- Jennifer Best: They would prefer to see a lower number because a higher number can overwhelm the method. No range diminishes the usefulness of the sample.
- Patsy Root: It is harder to make a lower PT.

Next Steps:

- Look at costs of setting a range or setting a maximum level.
- Contact ABs to see if not having a range negatively affects their program.

Discussion 2: Susan provided a slide with a number of recommendations and asked for input.

- Matt: How expensive do you want the PT to be? By requiring specific methodologies you are going to create a more rigorous program. Need to look at cost benefit to the Program itself.

- Nicole: You don't see this in the chemistry program – maybe micro is different?
- Shawn Kassner: This is a presence/absence test – How accurate do you need it to be?
- Patsy Root: Advocates bullet 4: Another recommendation was to require the documentation associated with the PT scheme to include information on which method(s) were used to verify range. Patsy also thinks the method should not be prescribed – there are lots of approved methods. Knowing the validation for the PT scheme helps the lab and then they should be able to choose the method. Nicole commented that this would be outside of PTPEC and is really a PT Expert Committee issue. Shawn Kassner (PT Expert Chair) thought this would be possible.
- Andy pointed out that having a range does not prescribe the method.
- Jennifer Best: There are a lot of accredited methods, but that does not mean they are all equivalent. She also prefers bullet 4.
- Michella opened the Criteria Document (1999): When a sample set is developed, they are supposed to be confirmed by all EPA approved methods. Shawn confirmed that providers do check it with multiple methods.
- Stacie asked what is broken that needs to be fixed? Some feel things are fine, but others think a range is important for consistency. Stacie said they are not seeing failure rates that require corrective action for the PT Providers. If a lab believes there is an issue, they should complain to the PT Provider. If they get no response within 90 days, then they can go to the PTPA. If there is still no resolution – it would go to the PTPEC. Stacie reminded everyone that there is a subcommittee that is adding technology to all the FoPTs.
- Shawn Kassner: Given the discussion – the subcommittee should make a recommendation to the PTPEC.

Susan commented that they need data to identify there is a problem. They don't have any evidence to show there is a problem. They investigated the areas of concern. Nicole pointed out that perhaps that is the recommendation from the subcommittee. Nothing to validate the concern. No more data needs to be gathered.

FoPT Table Subcommittee

See slides in Attachment D.

Jennifer described the subcommittee's scope. They will not be adding any analytes to the table, just formatting what already exists.

They will be getting in touch with the PT Providers to see if any methods are reported that they can share with the subcommittee.

The scope will be voted on at the February meeting.

SOP Subcommittee

See slides in Attachment D.

The group is now working on the FoPT Acceptance Limit Determination SOP. This will be presented in DC.

PTP Evaluation Program Subcommittee

This committee still needs to be developed. There is also a possibility that this action item will be worked on by the committee as a whole.

4. PTPA Presentation

AClass

Matt Sica presented.

See presentation in Attachment D.

The amount of data doubled, but numbers did not change – the weighted average changed by only 0.25%. In general, the pass rate is still about 96%.

There is really nothing new to report. Matt looks at data sets that are at less than 85% pass. There were two DW analytes less than 85%, but they are analytes set by the old Criteria Document and were a problem last time too.

Matt would like to suggest that FoPTs be evaluated after an update is made to see if there are any issues that should be considered after the update.

If anyone would like a PDF of Matt's data that was used to develop his report – just email him and he will provide it.

A2LA

Rob Knake and Kelley Black presented.

See presentation in Attachment D.

Kelly looked at how to determine whether ranges are being randomly allocated. She shared data that showed that there may be an issue with random allocation. The PTPA needs to find documentation for why the PT Provider was not able to randomly allocate the concentration. Sometimes it is for technical reasons. Kelly is suggesting that the ranges need to be looked at by the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee for analytes that can't use the range for technical reasons.

The slides showed some extreme instances where it was clear the data was not being randomly allocated.

Stephen noted that the Chem FoPT Subcommittee prefers to give a wide enough range to make it challenging.

In addition to Matt's comment above, this is another item to consider when developing how the PT Program should be evaluated.

5. 2014 Plans

- See slides in Attachment D.

Stacie prepared the response to the complaint and ERA has received it. Stacie was thanked for her response and no additional requests were made.

6. Complaints and Issues

NPW FoPT Table Complaint

See slides in Attachment D. Stacie explained the issue as described in the recent December 19th and January 16th minutes. The table that is posted is now correct.

Metribuzin Issue

We have requested summary data from the PTPA's to evaluate whether the limit change made a significant difference in the failure rate.

7. Application for New FoPTs

See slides in Attachment D.

This is the committee's first application. Stacie reviewed the application and process with the membership. The three analytes are already on the FoPT table, but the request is to have them added at different concentrations.

The Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee is collecting data to evaluate the addition of these analytes in the concentration range being recommended.

The process can take up to 18 months to complete. There will be an update at the DC meeting in the summer.

The SOP for this process will be reviewed after its completion to look for any needed updates to the written procedure.

Patrick asked if this SOP has been through the Policy Committee. It will not be resubmitted until we are further through the process.

8. Comments/Discussion

None.

9. New Business

None.

10. Action Items

- See Attachment B.

11. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be by teleconference on February 20, 2014 at 1pm EST.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10pm EST. Matt motioned Nicole second. Unanimously approved.

Attachment A

Participants TNI

Proficiency Testing Program Executive Committee

Members	Affiliation	Contact Information
Stacie Metzler (2009) CHAIR Present	HRSD	757-460-4217 smetzler@hrsd.com
Ilona Taunton, Program Administrator Present	TNI	828-712-9242 tauntoni@msn.com
Eric Smith (2010) VICE-CHAIR Present - Phone	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 Butts (2012) Present - Phone	South Carolina DHEC	(803)896-0978 buttse@dhec.sc.gov
Carl Kircher (2010) Absent	Florida DOH	904-791-1574 carl_kircher@doh.state.fl.us
Patrick Brumfield (2012) Present	Sigma-Aldrich RTC	(307) 721-5488 Pat.Brumfield@sial.com
Michella Karapondo (2011) Present	USEPA	513-569-7141 karapondo.michella@epa.gov
Jennifer Loudon (2013) Present - Phone	Raritan Township Municipal Utilities Authority	(908) 782-7453 x19 JLoudon@rtmua.com
Nicole Cairns (2012) Present	NY State DOH	(518) 473-0323 nlc02@health.state.ny.us
Joe Pardue (2011) Present - Phone	Pro2Serve, Inc.	423-337-3121 joe_pardue@charter.net
Dr. Andy Valkenburg (2011) Present	Energy Laboratories, Inc.	avalkenburg@energylab.com 406-869-6254
Ron Houck Present - Phone	PA DEP	Need Information
Matt Sica Present	ACLASS	Need Information

Associate by phone: Jeff Lowry

Attachment B

Action Items – TNI PT Executive Committee

	Action Item	Who	Expected Completion	Actual Completion
165	Follow-up on need for NEFAP EC approval of the FSMO FoPT Table.	Eric	Next Meeting	4/18/13: Ilona – will ask NEFAP EC if they need to approve the Lead table.
185	Send updated DW table with Footnote 15 to NELAP AC for approval.	Stacie	4/1/12	Stacie submitted this. Need to confirm approval.
196	Prepare final response to Complaint and forward to committee for approval.	Stacie	10-18-12	
205	Follow-up on membership candidates.	Stacie	6/19/13	In Progress
208	Work with Dan Hickman on any method code issues regarding Tin and Cyanide issues.	Stacie	8/6/13	
213	Update FoPT Subcommittee lists and give to Ilona for corrections on the website.	Stacie	Next Meeting	
214	Update Tin, Total Xylene and Total Cyanide on FoPT tables and submit for approval.	Carl Stacie	Next Meeting	In Progress
217	Cyanide and Footnote 15 needs to be updated on the DW table. There is a question about analyte code. This needs to be researched and a proposed update made to the PTP EC to complete this action item.	Michella	January Meeting	

	Action Item	Who	Expected Completion	Actual Completion
218	Complete response to Complaint #14.	Stacie, Eric, Ilona	12/31/13	Complete
219	Send application and information for new analytes to Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee.	Stacie	12/31/13	Complete
220	Update NPW FoPT table (delete Footnote 18 and add title correction) and send to William for posting.	Stacie	1/27/14	
221	Update FoPT Table Subcommittee charter/mission for approval in Kentucky.	Jennifer	1/27/14	
222	Metribuzin – Request information from Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee and PTPAs.	Stacie	1/27/14	
223				
224				

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	
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	