

## TNI PT Program Executive Committee Meeting Summary

June 16, 2016

### 1. Roll call and approval of minutes:

Chair, Maria Friedman, called the TNI PT Program Executive Committee (PTPEC) meeting to order on June 16, 2016, at 1:02 PM Eastern by teleconference. Attendance is recorded in Attachment A – there were 10 Executive Committee members present. Associate Members Present: Craig Huff, Carl Kircher, Jennifer Mullins, David Kilhefner, and Jennifer Best.

Maria confirmed that everyone received the meeting information she sent on May 15, 2016.

A motion was made by Dixie to approve the May 19, 2016 minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Gil and unanimously approved.

### 2. Committee Chair Update

- SIRs: 26 and 80 are being voted on by the NELAP AC. Ilona will update the committee when the vote is complete.

- Status of WETT FoPT Subcommittee: Bob Wyeth suggested forming a new subcommittee if there is further work for the subcommittee. Ilona provided an update on the Policy Committee's involvement in the issue. The TNI Board of Directors asked the Policy Committee to make a recommendation on whether the Expert Committee and FoPT Subcommittee need to be 2 separate committees with different reporting relationships.

- DW Radiochemistry FoPT Update: Carl commented on Radiochemistry FoPTs by email on 6/15/16:

*When we drafted the SOP / guidance document for evaluating PT acceptance criteria, we noted that the PT data evaluation procedures and evaluation criteria were the same as for Chemistry FoPTs, only substituting "activities" for "concentrations" for radionuclides. On a technical merit, there is a source of bias when the Radium PTs are formulated with Radium-226 at the high end of activity range and Radium-228 formulated at the low end of its range (due to interference from Radium-224), but the bias was judged back then to be small compared to the PT acceptance criteria.*

*Thus, you could with some confidence assign Radiochemistry FoPT questions to the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee. However, it might be a good idea to recruit some*

*experts from the Radiochemistry Expert Committee (who did the Volume 1 Module 6 work) to work on any changes that might be needed to that Table. In any case, I should probably be included, either because I have the historical perspective (and the data from back then) or because I have to answer for my previous crimes.*

It was proposed that at least two subject matter experts need to be recruited to join the Chemistry FoPT subcommittee to help address questions re. Radiochemistry FoPTs. Michella, representing EPA, volunteered. Ilona will recruit others from the Radiochemistry Expert Committee. Ron Houck (who used to be a member of the PTPEC) or Bob Shannon, are good prospects.

### 3. Drinking Water FoPT Table Footnote

#### - Volatiles – 80% Criteria

The committee compared the information to Footnote 14 of the DW FoPT Table. Attachment D provides a summary prepared by Maria of the information that should be taken into consideration and also provides draft language for consideration.

Guidance for PT Providers is appropriate in the FoPT table, but guidance to the labs is not appropriate.

Nicole noted that it seems a footnote may be needed to tell the PT Provider how to score the Total Trihalomethane (TTHM) PTs. The CFR is clear – all four must be passed. Andy noted that he can miss a Trihalomethane and still pass Total. Michella commented that this was inappropriate.

Maria asked if a footnote needs to be added for the Haloacetic acids. Nicole did not think it was necessary because they are in their own PT. There are less than 10 analytes and all the analytes will be in the PT.

Nicole noted that there is potential for THMs to be together with the volatiles, so a footnote would be helpful.

A footnote for Vinyl Chloride would be similar to THMs. All the regulated volatiles should be in the PT. Need to pass 80% and Vinyl Chloride.

Michella noted there is no 80% rule for Pesticides. Maria commented that this will be corrected in the DW FoPT Table.

Maria asked the PT Providers present in the call if they spike everything and it does appear that they do. Andy said for volatiles the PT always has all regulated analytes.

The group concluded there is a need for the footnote for vinyl chloride discussed last month and the current footnote can be deleted. A THM footnote is also needed.

Michella asked if there are PT providers that ask for a sum for THMs. Andy said he has been asked to report this. Nicole confirmed this.

THMs are covered through the Safe Drinking Water Act – so a THM footnote is actually not needed.

Maria found in her survey that not all PT Providers spike Vinyl Chloride every time. She thinks the footnote should be retained.

Maybe the footnote should be applied to the specific analyte in the table. This way you can footnote all the regulated analytes.

Nicole noted that the committee needs to look at metals too.

The committee agreed to remove part of Footnote 1 and the note about application to pesticides. Update all the regulated analytes with the footnote. The committee does not want to vote until the changes have been made to the table and they can be reviewed. This will be further discussed next month after Maria makes the updates to the table.

#### 5. WETT FoPT Table – Footnote 6 and 7

Maria sent Michella a message asking if she was able to find someone from EPA to comment on the footnotes regarding NOEC evaluation. Michella responded on 6/15/16: *OECA was aware of the changes to the NOEC evaluation and they were fine with it.*

With this information Maria believes the committee can proceed with the publication of the table with an effective date in July 2016. The table will be sent to William for posting.

Maria does not think there is a need for a WETT FoPT Subcommittee with the completion of the table. If a subcommittee is needed in the future, a new subcommittee will be developed. There was general agreement.

A motion was made by Gil to conclude the WETT FoPT Subcommittee task. The work has been completed. The motion was seconded by Eric and unanimously approved through a roll call vote. Matt was no longer on the call to vote. The motion passed and Maria will send a note thanking the subcommittee for their service.

#### 6. FoPT Table Format Subcommittee Charter

Maria summarized the issues raised by the subcommittee and the potential impact on their Scope:

While working to add CAS numbers to the various FoPT Tables, the Subcommittee

identified the following types of errors that were outside of their present scope to address:

- 1) Incorrect Analyte Code used in FoPT Table (e.g., Nitrate+Nitrite as N is code 1820 in the DW FoPT Table; should be 1823 according to LAMS)
- 2) Correct Analyte Code used in FoPT Table, but Analyte Name in FoPT Table does not match LAMS (e.g., “Dibromomethane” in DW FoPT Table is called “Dibromomethane (Methylene bromide)” in LAMS)
- 3) Formatting anomalies in FoPT Tables

The current scope includes one goal/objective, namely, to add CAS numbers. The proposed revised scope includes three goals/objectives (see details in the draft charter):

- 1) Add CAS numbers
- 2) Compare analyte codes and names in FoPT Tables to what is in LAMS; determine which are correct; make corrections to FoPT Tables where applicable, and compile list of corrections to LAMS for later submission to IT Committee, where applicable
- 3) Fix formatting anomalies

Dixie made a motion to accept the update to the FoPT Table Format Subcommittee Charter as described above. The motion was seconded by Andy and it was unanimously approved.

Maria noted that the CAS numbers will be reviewed once the other issues are resolved.

## 7. Addition of Uranium to DW FoPT Table

Maria received the following note from Andy on 5/19/16:

*In drinking water FOPT table Chemistries we should add Uranium to the metals category with code 1184. Radiochemical analysis of Uranium by Radiochemical measurements has a large bias correction factor applied to calculate the amount of Uranium in ug/L, per CFR requirements, and the two method results which could be distinguished by analyte code will have quite different results when scored from the same PT study sample set.*

Maria noted that an ARA would be needed. Carl noted that if this change would be submitted, the deletion of Uranium at the ug/L portion of the table should be considered too. Andy would need a supporting AB to submit an ARA. Carl would consider being a supporting AB if Andy can submit a proposal to him. Andy will look at doing this in two months.

## 8. Update of Future FoPT Tables

Maria reminded everyone about the conversation in Tulsa where the committee brainstormed ideas on how to more efficiently update FoPT tables. Maria will pull this information together for discussion at the next meeting and in Orange County. Maria added this topic at Ilona's request.

## 9. Subcommittee Report

### WETT FoPT Subcommittee

See above.

### FoPT Format Subcommittee

See information in #6 above.

### SOP Subcommittee

SOP 4-102 was reviewed, updated and sent back to the PTPEC. SOP 4-105 is now being reviewed for update. The committee is meeting the second Friday of the month. Maria noted that SOP 4-102 will be reviewed at the next meeting.

### Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee

The subcommittee is not currently meeting. Carl will email the subcommittee to plan a meeting. Carl noted that a new DW FoPT Table was submitted to the PTPEC with the updated Corrosivity Langelier Index footnote. Maria will put this on the agenda next month.

Maria will update the DW FoPT Table with the information discussed in #3 above and send it to Carl. The Corrosivity Langelier Index footnote will also need to be added.

### Microbiology FoPT Subcommittee

The subcommittee met with the PT Providers and explained the data request the subcommittee has. It was suggested to use the standard deviation for the criteria. Dan Dickinson expressed some concerns by email and these will be discussed at a future subcommittee meeting. The data is expected from the PT Providers by the end of June. The subcommittee will then begin work. Maria noted that some PT Providers have requested an ID to upload data. Maria will send a reminder to all PT Providers.

Ilona prepared a DRAFT confidentiality statement that will be used after TNI approval. Maria will contact Jerry for approval.

## 10. Action Items

The action items can be found in Attachment B.

## 11. Next Meeting

The next PTPEC teleconference will be July 28, 2016 instead of the 21st.

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

Maria adjourned the meeting at 2:40pm Eastern. (Motion: Gil, Second: Patrick Unanimously approved.)

## Attachment A

### Participants TNI

#### Proficiency Testing Program Executive Committee

Members	Affiliation	Contact Information
Maria Friedman (2014) <b>Present</b>	n/a	949-307-0949 <a href="mailto:gamfriedman@gmail.com">gamfriedman@gmail.com</a>
Ilona Taunton, Program Administrator <b>Present</b>	TNI	828-712-9242 <a href="mailto:tauntoni@msn.com">tauntoni@msn.com</a>
Eric Smith (2010) <b>Present (added at 1:30pm)</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 Jackson (2012) <b>Present</b>	South Carolina DHEC	(803)896-0978 <a href="mailto:jacksosb@dhec.sc.gov">jacksosb@dhec.sc.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>
Jennifer Duhon (2019) <b>Present</b>	Millipore Sigma	<a href="tel:307-3897218">307-3897218</a> <a href="mailto:jennifer.duhon@sial.com">jennifer.duhon@sial.com</a>
Matt Sica <b>Present</b>	ANAB, ANSI-ASQ National Accreditation Board	<a href="mailto:msica@anab.org">msica@anab.org</a>
Dixie Marlin (2015) <b>Present</b>	Marlin Quality Management, LLC	513-309-3593 <a href="mailto:marlinquality@gmail.com">marlinquality@gmail.com</a>
Gil Dichter (2015) <b>Present</b>	IDEXX Water	207-556-4687 <a href="mailto:gil-dichter@idexx.com">gil-dichter@idexx.com</a>
Patrick Garrity (2019) <b>Present</b>	Kentucky DEP	502-319-4040 <a href="mailto:patrick.garrity@ky.gov">patrick.garrity@ky.gov</a>
Michella Karapondo (2019) <b>Present</b>	USEPA	<b>513-569-7141</b> <a href="mailto:karapondo.michella@epa.gov">karapondo.michella@epa.gov</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  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
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	Completed
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	TBD	TBD	Waiting for



	<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Expected Completion</b>	<b>Actual Completion</b>
	Standard requirement that PTPA be contacted.			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 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)
305	Send response to EDB/DBCP ARA submitter to request more information.	Maria	1/25/16	Complete
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.
312	Review new language in DMR QA and determine if there is any impact on the FoPT table. Does it need to be updated?	John Overbey	3/24/16	Complete

	<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Expected Completion</b>	<b>Actual Completion</b>
316	Make contacts to prepare a DRAFT footnote for volatiles, trihalomethanes and haloactic acids on the DW table.	Michella	6/15/16	Complete
317	Provide Carl/Chem FoPT Subcommittee with information to make updates to the DW table.	Maria	6/15/16	
318	Provide a marked up copy of SOP 4-102 to the PTP SOP Subcommittee so updates can be made.	Maria	5/20/16	Complete
319	Update DW FoPT table with discussed footnotes and Corrosivity Langlier Index footnote.	Maria	7/27/16	
320	Send thank-you note to WETT FoPT Table Subcommittee.	Maria	7/27/16	
321	Send data reminder to PT Providers. Data due the end of June.	Maria	6/23/16	

**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	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	<p>Moved back to Backburner (originally discussed 2/20/14) :</p> <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>	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.

Attachment D: Summary Prepared by Maria Friedman

Additional Footnote for Volatiles:

On the 4-9-2016 PTPEC teleconference, I committed to preparing a draft footnote for the DW FoPT Table, requiring spiking of Vinyl Chloride at all times. Here, then, is the draft footnote:

Per the requirements of 40CFR §141.24(f)(17)(ii), Vinyl Chloride must always have a non-zero assigned value.

It occurred to me that there may be situations, perhaps with supplemental or make-up PTs, where a result for Vinyl Chloride would not be relevant. Rather than compel PT Providers to always spike Vinyl Chloride into Volatiles DW PT samples, an alternative would be to require that whenever Vinyl Chloride is to be included in a PT analyte list (thereby affording the laboratory the opportunity of receiving an evaluation for Vinyl Chloride of “Acceptable” or “Not Acceptable”), then the PT Provider must spike Vinyl Chloride. This would preclude the possibility of a laboratory receiving a passing PT score for Vinyl Chloride when that analyte had not been spiked. Here is a draft footnote that reflects this alternative:

Per the requirements of 40CFR §141.24(f)(17)(ii), when Vinyl Chloride is to be evaluated in a PT study, that is, when Vinyl Chloride is included in the list of analytes that may be reported by a laboratory for a given PT sample, then Vinyl Chloride must have a non-zero assigned value in that PT sample.

Additionally, I was requested to prepare a draft footnote that the 80% acceptance criteria applied to Volatiles is only for the regulated analytes. In considering how to draft such a footnote, I concluded that this footnote would not be appropriate to add, as it pertains to a certification requirement that applies to Laboratories, whereas the FoPT Table footnotes specify requirements that apply to PT Providers. As the NELAP AC argued when they rejected last year’s initial WETT FoPT Table “Footnote #3” proposal, footnotes in FoPT tables are not evaluated by assessors and should not contain instructions for Laboratories to follow.

However, before finalizing these notes, I reviewed the other footnotes of the DW FoPT Table, and the contents of Footnote #14 stood out:

14) Laboratories seeking or maintaining NELAP accreditation for Total Trihalomethanes must meet NELAC PT requirements for all 4 Trihalomethane Fields of Proficiency Testing in the given study, by technology/method (Chloroform, Bromoform, Bromodichloromethane, Chlorodibromomethane). Laboratories seeking or maintaining NELAP accreditation for Total Haloacetic Acids must meet NELAC PT requirements for 4 out of 5 regulated Haloacetic Acid Fields of Proficiency Testing in the given PT study, by technology/method (Monochloroacetic Acid, Monobromoacetic Acid, Dichloroacetic Acid, Dibromoacetic Acid, Trichloroacetic Acid).

As you see, Footnote #14 explicitly tells labs what they must do to be certified for a particular set of analytes. If it would be inappropriate to add a footnote telling Laboratories that they must pass 80% of regulated analytes, then it should also be inappropriate to tell Laboratories that they must pass 100% of Total Trihalomethanes, or 80% of Haloacetic Acids, but as you can see, the current

DW FoPT Table does precisely that.

If I had to write a draft 80% footnote, in the style of Footnote #14, it would look like this:

Per the requirements of 40CFR §141.24(f)(17)(i), laboratories seeking or maintaining NELAP accreditation for Volatile regulated contaminants must meet NELAC PT requirements for at least 80% of the Volatile regulated contaminants included in a given study.

In considering this draft footnote, I would ask the PTPEC to also consider the following questions:

1) Is it appropriate to include Laboratory certification requirements in FoPT footnotes? 2) If the answer to #1 is no, should Footnote #14 be changed or removed?