TNI Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee Meeting Summary April 8, 2014

1. Roll call and Meeting Minutes:

Chair Carl Kircher called the meeting of the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee to order on April 8, 2014 at 12:11 EST. Attendance is recorded in Attachment A. There were 4 members on the call.

The meeting minutes for March 25, 2014 were distributed for review. Carl recommended changing the word "he" to Carl in the first paragraphs under 4-Methyl-2-pentanone and 2 – Butanone. Stephen motioned to accept the meeting minutes with the change. Joe Pardue seconded the motion and they were unanimously approved.

2. FoPT Analyte Addition Application

The subcommittee decided to post-pone this discussion to the next meeting since there were very few members on the call.

3. Metribuzin Discussion

Carl reviewed the email that was forwarded to the subcommittee from Maria Friedman (Chair – PTP Executive Committee).

Andy noted that his lab runs it by 525 and others also run it by 507. He noted that meeting the 70-130% criteria across the board on 525 is not easy because of the large number of analytes. 525 is not going to work well with every analyte. The 507 method is probably more reliable for Metribuzin.

Carl noted that the DW limits on the current table are a concentration range of 2-20 ug/L and fixed limits of +/- 50%. The upper concentration was reduced from the previous table to make it more consistent with other analytes in the pesticide list.

Carl asked the subcommittee if the current listing on the DW table for Metribuzin needs to be revised based on the email sent from Maria and after reexamination of the data looked at when these new limits were set.

Joe Purdue thought the current limits were fine. Andy's lab data also supports the +/- 50% and his reporting limit for Metribuzin is 0.1 ug/L. Carl noted that he does not see any reason that the limits should be changed.

Ilona noted the letter from Maria stated that there were differences between what was being

passed before and what is passing now. The inquirer is claiming that there were rounds with an unsatisfactory of 24%, 21% and 15%. It is stated that between 2010 to 2011 there was only 1 unsatisfactory score. It was commented that because of Metribuzin's low mean recovery, a +/- 50% fixed acceptance criteria around the target may not be appropriate and could be the cause of the increase in failure rate.

Andy noted that in his laboratory the $\pm -50\%$ criteria is fine. He is looking at data from 2012 to present (about 15 batches). The 507 limits are much poorer.

Carl argued that the previous limits were too good. The concentration range for the old PT samples was wider and more environmentally irrelevant.

Carl asked that these notes be forwarded to the missing members of the Chem FoPT Subcommittee and see if they are in agreement.

Ilona asked if Carl had the information from the previous limits where they were based on a linear regression. What would the range be at the lower concentration and what was it at the higher concentration? Carl calculated the information with the following result:

```
2 ug/L – Range 40.6-169.6%
60 ug/L – Range 30-138%
```

Carl sees more labs now using 525.2 for this analyte, but he thinks this data is mainly 507 data.

Stephen noted that this analyte is not very stable – especially in acetone. Andy noted that other analytes in the Metribuzin class get much better recovery. Stephen noted that some solvents are better than others. Andy's lab uses standards made in MTBE.

Stephen noted it is not a popular analyte. There is not a lot of PT data for this analyte.

Andy asked if it would appropriate to contact the PT provider to see what they are making the PT with.

Carl still feels the limits should remain +/-50% fixed based on the discussion above and the input from the other members on the call. Ilona will forward the notes from the Metribuzin discussion to the other subcommittee members for input.

Carl will prepare a summary with the additional input to send to Maria before the PTP Executive Committee meeting on Thursday, April 17th.

Carl questioned whether a PT is still needed for this analyte. Is it still used? Andy commented that it is. Stephen noted that only 10% of the labs purchase a PT with Metribuzin.

Andy read through the 525 method and there is comment about the problems with this analyte.

4. Action Items

See action item table in attachments.

5. New Business

- None.

6. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee has been scheduled for April 22^{nd} . Carl and Dan should have more data available for review.

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

The call was ended at 1pm EST. Motion - Andy Second - Stephen Unanimously approved.

Attachment A

Participants TNI Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee

Members	Affiliation	Contact Information	
Carl Kircher,	Florida DOH		
Chair		carl kircher@doh.state.fl.us	
Present			
Joe Morotti	Sigma-Aldrich RTC	Joe.morotti@sial.com	
Absent			
Melanie Ollila	Pace Analytical Services, Inc.	MOllila@pacelabs.com	
Absent			
Jeff Lowry	Phenova	JeffL@phenova.com	
Absent			
Stephen Arpie	Absolute Standards, Inc.	stephenarpie@mac.com	
Present – after 12:30			
Dan Dickinson	New York, DOH	dmd15@health.state.ny.us	
Dan Dickinson	New Tork, Bott	diffu 15@fleatiff.state.fry.us	
Absent			
Stacey Fry	E.S. BABCOCK & Sons,		
,	Inc.	sfry@babcocklabs.com	
Absent		, •	
Joe Pardue	Pro2Serve, Inc.	423-337-3121	
		joe_pardue@charter.net	
Present			
Dr. Andy Valkenburg	Energy Laboratories, Inc.	avalkenburg@energylab.com	
Present		406-869-6254	
Ilona Taunton,	TNI	Ilona.taunton@nelac-institute.org	
Program Administrator		828-712-9242	
Present			

Attachment B

Action Items – Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee

	A T.	***	Expected	Actual
	Action Item	Who	Completion	Completion
102	Data work-up when it comes in for analyte additions.	Carl	tbd	In Progress
105	Forward Metribuzin discussion to other subcommittee members for opinions.	Ilona	4/15/14	
106	Prepare written comment for PTPEC regarding Metribuzin.	Carl	4/17/14	
107				

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			