

**SUMMARY OF THE
TNI LABORATORY PROFICIENCY TESTING EXPERT COMMITTEE MEETING**

JULY 8, 2016

The Committee met by teleconference on Friday, July 8, 2016, at 11:00 am EDT. Chair Shawn Kassner led the meeting.

1 – Roll call

Fred Anderson, Advanced Analytical Solutions (Other)	Present
Nicole Cairns, NYSDOH (Other)	Present
Rachel Ellis, NJ DEP (AB)	Present
Patrick Garrity, KYDOW (AB)	Present
Scott Hoatson, Oregon DEQ (AB)	Present
Craig Huff, ERA (Other)	Absent
Shawn Kassner, Neptune (Chair; Other)	Present
Stacie Metzler, Hampton Roads San. Distr. (Lab)	Absent
Mitzi Miller, Dade Moeller Assocs. (Other)	Present
Tim Miller, Phenova (Other)	Absent
Judy Morgan, Pace (Lab)	Present
Joe Pardue P2S (Vice-Chair; Other)	Absent
Donna Ruokenen, Microbac (Lab)	Absent
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present

Associate Committee Members present: Mike Blades, ERA; Thekkekalathil Chandrasekhar, FLDEP; Audrey Cornell, ERA; Amanda Grande, Phenova; Brian Stringer, ERA

2 – Previous Minutes

It was moved by Fred and seconded by Scott to approve the minutes of June 24, 2016. All were in favor.

3 – Volume 3 Comments

V3 5.9.3.2.1 and 5.9.3.2.2 *“So, if the Assigned Value for a PT is <0.5 ug/L and the laboratory reports <5%, the result is scored acceptable? To correct for this possible problem, I would word clause 5.9.3.2.2(a) as follows: “the numeric value reported is greater than or equal to the PTRL, whether or not a less than (<) sign is included; or”.*” During the previous call, it was decided Shawn should seek clarification from the commenter. Having now done so, Shawn said the commenter was concerned that a state AB might delegate the consideration of PT scores to a third party that could fail to catch a laboratory reporting a result with an unrealistically high number after the “<” sign. Mitzi understood this could be a concern, but she stressed it is the state AB’s responsibility to conduct the application review and check on the laboratory’s reporting limits. Rachel stressed that NJ would certainly catch a laboratory reporting a high number in this way. Shawn said this has not changed as long as the program has been in place, and he did not see it as an issue. It was moved by Scott and seconded by Nicole to rule the comment Non-Persuasive, because this is an issue outside the scope of the PT Committee if states are giving all PT review to a third party. All were in favor.

In response to a suggestion by Nicole, the Committee agreed to add ISO 13528 to the reference section of V3 now that compliance with this ISO standard is required for homogeneity testing.

4 – Next Steps

Consideration of all V3 and V4 comments was now complete. Shawn said he would edit the standards and circulate the changes together with the response-to-comments spreadsheet. He asked the committee to review these prior to the next call in 1 week, when it was hoped to vote everything out of committee. Therefore, the next call would be on July 15.

5 – Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 am EDT.