

TNI Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee
Meeting Summary
October 22, 2013

1. Roll call and Meeting Minutes:

Chair Carl Kircher called the meeting of the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee to order on October 22, 2013 at 12:06 EST. Attendance is recorded in Attachment A. There were 7 members on the call.

The meeting minutes from the October 8, 2013 call were reviewed. Dan sent comments by e-mail:

Current Note: FoPT recommendations for the SCM FoPTs are fit for use despite any statement about a departure from the SOP. The SOP makes allowances for departures (Sections 2.5, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9 and 2.15). Some of the recommendations that get made and approved by the subcommittee turn out to be not fit for use. Case in point, Total Suspended Solids. As you know, I continue to have concerns about the exaggeration of fixed acceptance limits when the data set suggests an LRE with tighter limits which vary over the range and not necessarily centered on the AV, such as with Chlorobenzene and a few others on which I have cast negative votes. If a note is really necessary for the minutes, I suggest the following revision. At this point I think it is too bold to equate our recommendations with fitness for use. Note: FoPT recommendations for the SCM FoPTs are made based on majority vote by the Subcommittee. Recommendations may be based on considerations that depart from the SOP requirements. Such departures are allowed and must be documented per Sections 2.5, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9 and 2.15.

After discussion, the subcommittee agreed the note was not necessary and it should be removed. Information for why there was a departure from an SOP should be included under the text of the analyte. Dan also noted that the references given in the original footnote were not all appropriate. Some seemed irrelevant.

A motion was made by Dan to accept the October 8th minutes with the removal of the footnote discussed above. The motion was seconded by Stephen. Vote: 6 – For 0 – Against 1 – Abstain (Jeff – He was not in attendance and preferred not to vote).

The September 24, 2013 minutes were reviewed. A motion was made by Dan to accept the September 24th minutes with the removal of the footnote discussed above. The motion was seconded by Stephen. Vote: 5 – For 0 – Against 2 – Abstain (Jeff – He was not in attendance and preferred not to vote. Andy – He was not a member of the committee at that time and preferred not to vote).

2. SCM FoPT Table

1,4-Dichlorobenzene

Discussion on this analyte began at the 10/8/13 meeting. The study concentration was 1080-9250 ug/Kg. It passed the SOP criteria. The current lower limit is 1000 ug/Kg. It did not pass the fixed limit tests as per the SOP criteria (the b coefficient fails). The PDF is dated June 28, 2011. Carl would still recommend a fixed limit of 30%. Andy commented that the proposed limits using the regression equation are tighter than any of the previous limits for the analyte. Andy asked if the statistical limits could be used, but not at a level tighter than a certain value. Carl reminded everyone that the subcommittee has set limits for two different concentration ranges for the same analyte – segmented limits. Andy would like to see fixed limits above a certain concentration and the regression equation at the lower concentration. Stephen noted that there would be fallout in the database if something like this were decided. Joe agreed with this comment. Dan would prefer to use the regression equation.

A motion was made by Dan to use a concentration limit of 1,000 – 10,000 ug/Kg for 1,4 Dichlorobenzene on the NPW FoPT accreditation table and use the new regression equation with the abcd coefficients described in the PDF provided by Jeff by on June 28, 2011. The motion was seconded by Joe.

Discussion: Andy was concerned that the limits are tighter than what many labs use as limits. Andy feels the PTs should not be tighter than the method limits. Carl thinks the information shows a limit of about 75-125%.

Joe reviewed his data. Stephen made the comment that people look at their data, which is more current than what is in the PDF provided for these meetings, and then use the current info to make a decision. Given this imperfection in the process, Stephen asked what the problem was with using a Fixed Limit.

Vote: 6 – For 1- Against (Stephen) Abstain – 0. The motion passes.

1, 3- Dichlorobenzene

The study concentration was 1480-9840 ug/Kg. It passed the SOP criteria. The current lower limit is 1000 ug/Kg. It did not pass the fixed limit tests as per the SOP criteria (the d coefficient fails). The PDF is dated June 28, 2011. Carl recommends going with the regression equations. If a fixed limit were used, he would not go any tighter than +/-30%.

A motion was made by Jeff to use a concentration limit of 1,000 – 10,000 ug/Kg for 1,3 Dichlorobenzene on the NPW FoPT accreditation table and use the new regression equation with the abcd coefficients described in the PDF provided by Jeff by on June 28, 2011. The motion was seconded by Dan.

Discussion:

Carl agrees that there are some analytes that work well with fixed limits and others that are a problem. Dan thinks the regression equation works because it passes the SOP criteria. There was no issue with outliers. Stephen was concerned about the points that were outside of the

line. It was agreed that if the two points were not there, a fixed limit could be used. Dan commented that if more points were thrown out, the data would be less helpful.

Vote:

For: 5 Against: 1 (Stephen) Abstain: 0 . The motion passed. (Jeff was missing from the vote.)

m/p-Xylene and o-Xylene

The xylenes were discussed on the 9-24-13 call and discussion was tabled for a later meeting. The meeting minutes for these analytes were reviewed by the subcommittee.

A motion was made by Jeff to use a concentration limit of 1,000 – 10,000 ug/Kg for m/p-Xylene and o-Xylene on the SCM FoPT accreditation table and using a fixed limit of +/- 30% across the range for these analytes relative to the assigned value. The motion was seconded by Dan. Vote: For - 7 Against – 0 Abstain – 0. The motion passed.

These were the last of the fields of proficiency testing available for review at this time. Carl offered to help pull more data together, but would need assistance from Jeff with the graphs. Jeff can give Carl the files that handle the graphing in Excel. Jeff will also provide instructions on how to put the data together and will review Carl's work before it is distributed.

3. Action Items

See action item table in attachments.

4. New Business

- None.

5. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee will be November 5, 2013, at 12:00 PM EST.

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

Stephen motioned to adjourn the meeting and Stacey seconded the motion. Unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 1:15 pm EST.

Attachment A

Participants TNI Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee

Members	Affiliation	Contact Information
Carl Kircher, Chair Present	Florida DOH	carl_kircher@doh.state.fl.us
Joe Morotti Present	Sigma-Aldrich RTC	Joe.morotti@sial.com
Melanie Ollila Absent	Pace Analytical Services, Inc.	MOllila@pacelabs.com
Jeff Lowry Present	Phenova	JeffL@phenova.com
Stephen Arpie Present	Absolute Standards, Inc.	stephenarpie@mac.com
Dan Dickinson Present	New York, DOH	dmd15@health.state.ny.us
Stacey Fry Present	E.S. BABCOCK & Sons, Inc.	sfry@babcocklabs.com
Joe Pardue (2011) Absent	Pro2Serve, Inc.	423-337-3121 joe_pardue@charter.net
Dr. Andy Valkenburg (2011) Present	Energy Laboratories, Inc.	avalkenburg@energylab.com 406-869-6254
Ilona Taunton, Program Administrator Present	TNI	Ilona.taunton@nelac-institute.org 828-712-9242

Attachment B

Action Items – Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee

	Action Item	Who	Expected Completion	Actual Completion
101				

Attachment C

Backburner / Reminders – Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee

	Item	Meeting Reference	Comments
4	Consider nomenclature differences between the analyte codes and the FoPT tables.	2-23-10	
10			