

**SUMMARY OF THE  
TNI ASBESTOS EXPERT COMMITTEE MEETING**

**APRIL 18, 2018**

The Committee met by teleconference on Wednesday, April 18, 2018, at 1:00 pm EDT. Chair Myron Getman led the meeting.

**1 – Roll call**

Mike Carpinona, NJDEP (AB)	Absent
Zonetta English, Louisville Jefferson County (Lab)	Present
Myron Getman, Chair, NY State DOH (AB)	Present
Glen Green, Vice-Chair, Xcel Energy (Other)	Present
Dixie Marlin, Marlin Quality Management (Other)	Absent
Michelle McGowan, EMSL Analytical (Lab)	Present
Dan Shelby, EMLab P&K (Lab)	Present
Carl Kircher, FLDOH, Associate Committee Member	Absent
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present

**2 – Review and Approval of Previous Minutes**

It was moved by Glen and seconded by Zonetta to approve the minutes of March 21, 2018. All were in favor.

**3 – Agenda**

It was moved by Zonetta and seconded by Glen to approve the agenda. All were in favor.

**4 – Old Business**

Further sections from Carl Kircher’s e-mail items were considered:

- **Sections 1.7.3.1.1(a), 1.7.3.1.1(b), 1.7.4.3(a), and 1.7.4.3(b)** *“It has been my experience in assessing Asbestos laboratories that FEW Drinking Water or other samples are ever analyzed for NELAC compliance. Consequently, it could be 20-50 years (if ever?) before the 1-in-100 sample requirements would become applicable. Should the frequency be increased to 1 per 20 samples? Or a minimum of once annually or biannually?”*

**Sections 1.7.3.1.1 (a) and (b).** Michelle said good laboratory practice would make this more frequent. Myron referred to method 100.2, which specifies greater than or equal to 1 per 100, and the AHERA method says 1 per 100. His laboratory has low throughput, so he makes sure of doing it annually. Zonetta asked what NVLAP requires for bulk analysis. Mike reasoned this is only for counting, so if they are analyzing a lot of bulk samples and meeting the 1 in 100 frequency requirement, this should suffice for less frequent water analysis. Myron added laboratories are running PTs for water, so there is that oversight; and they could use the PT round to get an annual minimum if they add a rider to say at least annually as well as greater than or equal to 1 in 100. It was agreed to add the wording “..or at least annually whichever is more frequent.”

**Sections 1.7.4.3 (a) and (b).** Since this is bulk analysis, it was considered it should not be a challenge for laboratories to meet the requirement, so it was agreed to leave it as written.

## **5 – New Business**

### **Notice of Proposed Standards Activity**

A draft of the notice was discussed and changes were agreed. It was then moved by Glen and seconded by Michelle to accept the revised notice. All were in favor. Ken would have this posted on the TNI website, as required in SOP 2-100. He also agreed to notify the NELAP ABs of the posting, requesting the input of those accrediting for asbestos, and also asking them to draw the notice to the attention of their accredited asbestos laboratories. It was also suggested this posting could be published in the next TNI newsletter.

### **Method Review**

#### **7.2 Phase Contrast Microscopy**

Section **1.7.1.2** in the 2016 standard was considered.

In **1.7.1.2.2** the requirement for checking the phase-shift detection limit of the microscope monthly was questioned. Michelle said her laboratory does this weekly, and she volunteered to look more deeply into where the monthly frequency requirement may have come from. Dan agreed that monthly should be an absolute minimum, and Myron suggested saying monthly or the next usage.

The requirement for recalibration of field diameter in **1.7.1.2.3** was questioned, and Myron said he would check on it.

The existing wording of **1.7.3.2 (a)** was left unchanged. In **1.7.3.2 (b)** Dan suggested the range of fiber density needed to be specified. Myron said his laboratory used “low”, “medium”, and “high”, and he suggested listing the ranges specified in the method, which states that fiber densities shall cover: 5 - 25; >20 - 50; and >50 - 100 fibers per 100 fields.

## **7 – Adjournment**

It was moved by Mike and seconded by Glen to adjourn the meeting at 2:15 pm EST. The next meeting would be on May 16, when Section 1.7.5.2 of the 2016 standard would be considered.

# TNI Asbestos Testing Expert Committee (ATEC) Conference Call

Committee Meeting  
Wednesday, April 18, 2018  
Call in: 1-712-832-8300; Access code: 862 9608

Myron Getman, Chair  
Glen Green, Vice Chair

## AGENDA

Roll call

Review and approve March 21, 2018 Minutes

Review and approve Agenda

### Old Business

- Carl Kircher email items
  - **Sections 1.7.3.1.1(a), 1.7.3.1.1(b), 1.7.4.3(a), and 1.7.4.3(b)** *“It has been my experience in assessing Asbestos laboratories that FEW Drinking Water or other samples are ever analyzed for NELAC compliance. Consequently, it could be 20-50 years (if ever?) before the 1-in-100 sample requirements would become applicable. Should the frequency be increased to 1 per 20 samples? Or a minimum of once annually or biannually?”*
    - Items **7.1.1.2** and **7.3.6** (below) in new layout
    - Tabled last month for more member input.

### New Business

- Notice of Proposed Standards Activity
- Method Review (refer to draft table of contents)
  - **7.2 Phase Contrast Microscopy**
    - **7.2.1 Calibration** (1.7.1.2 in current standard)
    - **7.2.2 Test Variability/Reproducibility** (1.7.3.2 in current standard)
    - **7.2.3 Analytical Sensitivity** (1.7.5.2 in current standard)
      - Previously addressed on 2/21/18 call. From Carl Kircher’s email.
        - *“The section has some good information, but no requirements. Are there any requirements needed for PCM sensitivity?”*

It was agreed this is defined in the method.

- **7.2.4 Data Acceptance/Rejection Criterial** (1.7.7.2 in current standard)
- **7.2.5 Quality Control** (1.7.2.1.2 in current standard)
- **7.2.6 Other Quality Control** (1.7.4.2 in current standard)
  - 1.7.4.2(b) previously addressed on 2/21/18 call. From Carl Kircher’s email.

- *“The statement reads more like an exemption rather than a requirement. Consequently, I would recommend moving the sentence to (a) or make this a NOTE to Section (a), and renumber (c) as (b).”*

The committee agreed with Carl’s suggestion to make this a note to (a) and to renumber (c) as (b) .

- **7.2.7 Quality of Standards and Reagents** (1.7.6.2 in current standard)
  - Previously addressed on 2/21/18 call. From Carl Kircher’s email.
    - *“The section says that standards of known concentration have not been developed for PCM. Is this still true in year-2018? Since PTs are required (per Section 1.5), should the auxiliary verb “may” be changed to “shall” in the second sentence?”*

Myron agreed, since there are still no standards, “may” ought to be “shall”.

- **7.3 Polarized Light Microscopy** (as time allows)

- **7.3.1 Calibration** (1.7.1.3 in current standard)
  - 1.7.1.3.2 previously addressed on 1/17/18 call. From Carl Kircher’s email.
    - *“The whole paragraph is not really clear. In particular, the second “sentence” is not really a complete sentence (no verb). Is the requirement really to have Refractive Index standards at 1.490, 1.495, 1.500, ... , 1.715, and 1.720 (that’s a lot of RI standards)? Or to have at least 3 RI standards for calibration, at 1.550, 1.605, and 1.680 at +/- 0.005 each?”*

Zonetta said this wording should come from the NVLAP standard, and she suggested deferring consideration of this paragraph until she had located that standard.

- **7.3.2 Test Variability/Reproducibility** (1.7.3.3 in current standard)
- **7.3.3 Analytical Sensitivity** (1.7.5.3 in current standard)
- **7.3.4 Data Acceptance/Rejection Criteria** (1.7.7.3 in current standard)
- **7.3.5 Quality Control** (1.7.2.1.3 in current standard)
  - 1.7.2.1.3(b) previously addressed on 1/17/18 call. From Carl Kircher’s email.
    - *“Any acceptance criteria for the PLM Non-Friable Material negative control? Section (a) above implies that “no Asbestos contamination” shall be detected; is that the criteria for (a) and the criteria for this section (b) as well?”*

It was agreed acceptance criteria should be added. Zonetta suggested the same acceptance criteria may apply to both friable and non-friable material. She said she would look into it.

- **7.3.6 Other Quality Control Measures** (1.7.4.3 in current standard)
  - See Old Business

- Previously addressed on 2/21/18 call. From Carl Kircher's email.
  - *"Are there any acceptance criteria to be specified in this Standard for the PLM Accuracy and Precision checks (as is specified for other matrices and methods)?"*

*Myron said he uses control charts, and the standard should say the acceptance criteria should be developed by the laboratory in accordance with quality control requirements.*

- **7.3.7 Quality of Standards and Reagents** (1.7.6.3 in current standard)
- **7.4 Constant and Consistent Test Conditions Samples and Sampling Requirements** (1.7.8 in current standard)

Next Meeting: May 16, 2018 @ 1pm