

**SUMMARY OF THE
TNI LABORATORY PROFICIENCY TESTING EXPERT COMMITTEE MEETING
FEBRUARY 20, 2015**

The Committee met by teleconference on Friday, February 20, 2015, at 11:00 am EST. Chair Shawn Kassner led the meeting.

1 – Roll call

Fred Anderson, Advanced Analytical Solutions (Other)	Present
Kareen Baker, Independent (Other)	Present
Yumi Creason, PA DEP (AB)	Present
Rachel Ellis, NJ DEP (AB)	Present
Scott Hoatson, Oregon DEQ (AB)	Present
Shawn Kassner, Phenova (Chair; Other)	Present
Stacie Metzler, Hampton Roads San. Distr. (Lab)	Absent
Mitzi Miller, Dade Moeller Assocs. (Other)	Absent
Judy Morgan, Env. Science Corp. (Lab)	Absent
Joe Pardue, P2S (Other)	Present
Jim Todaro, Alpha Analytical (Lab)	Absent
Lisa Touet, MA DEP (AB)	Present
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present

Associate Committee Members present: Nicole Cairns, NYSDOH; Rob Knake, A2LA; Jeff Lowry, Phenova; Shari Pfalmer, ESC; Ella Rae, WA Dept. of Ecology; Brian Stringer, ERA.

2 – Previous Minutes

It was moved by Fred and seconded by Rachel to approve the minutes of January 23, 2015 and February 4, 2015. All were in favor.

3 – Committee Membership

Virgene had resigned from the committee due to reassignment of duties at work. This left an opening for a laboratory person. Nicole Cairns had submitted a self nomination to join the committee, and her work duties with the NYSDOH would qualify her to be designated “Laboratory” or “Other” (i.e., PT Provider). After some discussion it was moved by Fred and seconded by Scott to appoint Nicole as a PT Committee Member with the “Other” designation. Shawn said he would request Nicole’s appointment by the CSDEC Chair, as required in SOP 2-101.

4 – Volume 3

Comments submitted by Nicole Cairns were discussed.

1.3 “No actual statement on applicability. Only states what is not applicable.” Language similar to Volume 4 applicability statement was added.

5.5.3.3 “All of this information (including subparts a-d) is currently on the FoPT tables. Does it need to be in the standard too? What if the criteria on the FoPT table changes? Then the Standard will be in direct conflict with the Tables.” It was discussed whether the information should be in the

standard or if the standard should just say to list the requirements in the FoPT tables. Jeff said it needed to be decided “what drives what”. Fred thought all of it should be in the FoPT tables, and Scott agreed it should not be in the standard, because the committee has no influence over the FoPT tables. Jeff, however, advised caution. He said the design should be in the standard, because the FoPT tables do not hold up in state regulations. He added more communication is needed between the PTPEC and the PT Expert Committee. Nicole said the standard needs to require PT providers to comply with the FoPT tables which are quicker to update than the standard. Shawn questioned what would happen if this section was dropped from the FoPT tables. However, two Associate Committee Members are also on the FoPT subcommittee, so this will allow both sides to keep abreast of what is happening. It was agreed to leave the wording in the standard.

Nicole had comments on **5.6.1.5**, **5.6.2.2**, and **5.6.3.3**. They were no longer valid because the language had been removed from the standard.

5.6.3.4 (b) *“Question on the intent of this wording “the provider's stability analyses....”. Does that statement mean that every individual stability analysis needs to meet the criteria, or is it supposed to be the mean of the provider's stability analyses, as is stated in the section a) requirement?”* This was clarified by saying “the mean of the provider's stability analyses...”.

Typographical errors in **5.6.4.1** and **5.7.6** were corrected.

5.7.3 (a) *“Reference to 5.9.2.6 is to a Study Standard Deviation. I think only Study Mean references are intended here.”* The committee agreed and made the change.

5.9.2.1, **5.9.2.2**, and **5.9.2.4** *“The term Fields of Proficiency Testing is spelled out in both sections. Since the acronym has already been defined previously, just the acronym can be used here.”* The committee agreed and made the changes.

5.9.2.4 *“I don't think the last phrase is worded correctly. “...the PT provider shall use their assigned value and calculate the acceptance limits defined in the TNI FoPT tables”. The acceptance “limits” are not defined in the FoPT tables, but rather the equations/criteria for calculating the acceptance limits.”* The suggested revision” “...the PT provider shall use their assigned value and calculate the acceptance limits using the criteria defined in the FoPT tables.” was made.

5.9.2.7 *“What is meant by “as defined by the PT Board”? What are they defining and where is it defined?”* This section referred to “actual study median” and was applicable to Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing (WETT). Jeff said perhaps it belonged in 5.9.2.9, and he suggested just removing “as defined by the PTPEC”. The committee agreed. Jeff added that “median” needed to be defined, and in particular which number is the median in an even number set of values where both middle values are different numbers.

Nicole suggested a word change in **5.9.2.8.2**, pointed out the use of inconsistent terminology in **5.9.3.3**, and a typographical error in **5.10.1.3 (g)**, and change **5.10.1.4 (a)** to read “lot or PT sample number”. All suggested changes were made.

5.10.1.4 (e) *“I recommend additional clarification due to the various definitions for the term assigned value.”* It was suggested to say assigned value “as defined in the standard” (the definition is already in section 3.1). Shawn said that phrase should also be added for mean and standard

deviation in subsections (j) and (k). In those two subsections it was agreed to remove “all” after Jeff reminded the committee different means and standard deviations are obtained when outliers are eliminated compared with all values being used.

Shawn described changes he had already made to the standard, and these were discussed as follows.

5.7.5 Information had been added for WETT. The only comment was the use of “AV” as an acronym, for Assigned Value. This acronym had not been used elsewhere and was not defined, so it was agreed not to use it.

5.9.2.9 These were WETT acceptance limits and there were no comments, so the clause was acceptable.

5.8.1 This was the only remaining subsection under “study instructions”. It stated “*The PT Provider shall not directly market or instruct laboratories to use additional quality control samples or quality control samples designed specifically for a given PT sample or PT Study*”. This was acceptable, but on Scott’s suggestion the sub-section labeling of 5.8.1.1 was deleted.

5.6.4.1 This was a combined section discussed previously, and read: “*Upon request the PT provider shall release to laboratories and/or the laboratories’ accreditation bodies the results of the provider’s assigned value, verification, homogeneity, and stability testing for any PT sample/analyte for which results were submitted to the specific laboratory and/or the specific laboratory’s accreditation bodies after the release of the final study reports.*” The committee agreed with it, but it was suggested the wording could be improved. Scott e-mailed suggested language to Shawn who said it could be discussed during the next call.

5.10 Shawn shared an e-mail message from Ella Rae who was concerned about the absence of wording regarding data reporting formatting requirements. She pointed out the EPA in 2001 had specified the data files that had to be provided. Most, but not all PT Providers were sending the study reports to the ABs as hard copies, but were also providing the 3 EPA-specified electronic data delivery files. Ella Rae asked for this to be made a requirement for all PT Providers. Scott asked if ISO has the requirement to provide what the client wants, but it does not. Therefore, the committee agreed to add to **5.10.1.2** Ella Rae’s suggested wording: “*Providers shall supply PT data in formatting acceptable to the laboratory-requested accreditation bodies.*”

5.9.2.8.2 Jeff said this should be **5.9.2.8.1**.

5.7.1.2 It was suggested to change the language to read: “*Any modifications to randomly-selected assigned values shall be documented with the justification for the modifications.*”.

5 – Next Steps

During the next call, the committee would discuss Volume 4 comments, and then deal with Volumes 1 and 2.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 pm EST.