1. Roll call and approval of minutes:

Chair, Maria Friedman, called the TNI PT Program Executive Committee (PTPEC) meeting to order on November 20, 2014, at 1:04 PM Eastern. Attendance is recorded in Attachment A – there were 9 Executive Committee members present. Affiliates Present: Craig Huff, Carl Kircher, Rob Knake, and Dixie Marlin.

Maria reviewed the handouts everyone should have received for today’s meeting.

A motion was made by Nicole to approve the October 16, 2014 minutes. The motion was seconded by Joe P.
Vote: 8 – For 0 – Against 1 – Abstain (Michella)
The motion was approved and the minutes will be prepared for posting to the TNI website.

2. Chair Update

- The FoPT Table Format Subcommittee has elected a Chair – Craig Huff. Craig introduced himself to the PTPEC. He is the Senior Technical Manager at ERA.

- Stacie Metzler received a promotion and will not be continuing as Chair of the SOP Subcommittee. A new chair will need to be found for this committee. We need more membership on the subcommittee. Eric noted that the Policy Committee has finished up their PT SOP reviews and there is work that needs to be done. Dixie will be added to the subcommittee. Ilona will send out a Doodle to plan the next meeting and the subcommittee will discuss leadership options and get back to the PTPEC in December.

- Maria has been working with Rami on the issue of how the WET Testing PT samples need to analyzed and how this is documented. The subcommittee is asking how to deal with all the different state requirements – labs are needing to run the PT many different ways due to state requirements. Maria asked for help from ELAB and Patsy Root (Chair of ELAB) let her know that this is not within their charter. She suggested consulting with the DMR QA Coordinator in each state.
- Maria asked that people send her requests for PTPEC agenda time a week in advance of the meeting.

- Action Item #251: This involves the issue with where to include instructions for the PTs – in the PT Provider instructions or the WET Testing FoPT Table. The NELAP AC is concerned about instructions being in the FoPT Table. Maria noted that the ABs commented that they don’t look at FoPT tables when they assess labs and would prefer that it be in the PT Provider instructions. As an alternative, the NELAP AC pointed to Volume 1 Module 2 of the PT Standard states that PT instructions can be used to guide the labs in preparing the sample. This reference is being removed in the DRAFT new standard.

Eric is concerned that the table is being held up because of a concern of where instructions are written and not what is written. He feels strongly that the PTPEC should request that the table be approved and that this committee will continue to work on the best place for the language.

Rami had told Maria there are instructions from each PT provider, but the instructions are not consistent between providers. The subcommittee is concerned about this and would like all providers to be consistent.

Maria will contact Aaron from the NELAP AC to talk about next steps.

3. Asbestos PT Update

Maria provided an asbestos PT update to Jerry. NY is still discussing the possibility of providing Asbestos PTs to non NY accredited labs. Jerry responded:

*Maria:*

*Looks like NY is going to reconsider, but if they do not, this is my recommendation.*

*First, I think you may need a Policy that states if PTs are not commercially available the FoPT will be withdrawn. I did not see this in SOP 4-107 and do not think it is addressed anywhere in the standards.*

*Then, I think you notify NELAP that you plan to withdraw the FoPT for asbestos since PT samples are not available. From discussions I had today, I think this would be supported by most ABs. NY could continue to have their samples analyzed as a state program.*

*In looking at LAMS, only 18 labs accredited for asbestos, and some, but not all have NY as primary already.*
Carl commented that it is not an option to drop Asbestos from the DW FoPT table. Michella commented that EPA is looking at giving labs interim accreditation until a PT is made available. This would be a compromise to temporarily handle the situation. EPA is also talking to another supplier (RTI International) about making Asbestos PTs. This company is currently making samples in other matrices.

Maria asked Nicole for an update: NY would need to be funded by EPA if they decide to distribute these PTs to labs outside of their program. NY has sent EPA a proposal, but has not heard anything back.

Maria worked on a recommendation to the SOP Subcommittee if an update to SOP 4-107 is needed:

10. Notification of FoPT Table Updates

10.1. PT Providers
The PTPEC Chair notifies PT Providers by email anytime there is a change to a FoPT table.

10.2. TNI Community
A notice is placed in the "News" section of the TNI website every time a FoPT table is changed. In addition, subscribers to direct email notifications will receive information alerting them to the posting of an updated FoPT table.

10.3. Programs
When an FoPT Table is created by the PTPEC at the request of an entity outside of TNI, the PTPEC Chair shall notify (by e-mail) the Chair of the NELAP Accreditation Council (AC) to give that Program the opportunity to adopt the new FoPT Table into NELAP. The NELAP AC shall have 30 days from said notification to respond. The effective date for the new FoPT Table shall be assigned accordingly.

4. DW FoPT Table

The committee was requested to review the note received from Carl Kircher, Chair of the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee:

Dear Maria,

The Chemistry Fields of Proficiency Testing Subcommittee respectfully submits this
response to your request from the PT Program Executive Committee to compare the Drinking Water FoPT Table footnotes with the US EPA National Standards for Water Proficiency Studies Criteria Document. The Subcommittee also submits for your approval a slightly revised DW FoPT Table for your approval, in which an additional sentence is added to Footnote 1 to reflect the expectations of US EPA for proficiency test samples for regulated analytes.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE US EPA CRITERIA DOCUMENT AND TNI DW FoPT TABLE FOOTNOTES (I do not like the word “inconsistencies”)

Footnote 1: The US EPA Criteria Document never specified the minimum number of analytes to spike into the PT. The Criteria Document does allow for the Assigned Value for an analyte to be “0”.

Footnote 2: same (no differences between TNI DW FoPT Table and Criteria Document), although it is Footnote 13h that refers to EPA Method 508A for the Decachlorobiphenyl equivalents in the 7 Aroclors.

Footnote 3: same, but refer to the Criteria Document text for WS along with any table footnotes).

Footnote 4: NOT in the Criteria Document. The TNI DW FoPT Table will not reward a lab. for passing a PT when it reports 0% of the Assigned Value.

Footnote 5: NOT in the Criteria Document. The TNI DW FoPT Table will not punish a lab. for reporting a result that is equal to the verified Assigned value.

Footnote 6: NOT in the Criteria Document. The TNI DW FoPT Table will not punish a lab. for reporting a result that is equal to the verified Assigned value.

Footnote 7: PTRLs are NOT in the Criteria Document. The TNI Dw FoPT Table thus provides the participant lab. guidance to run its test method such that its routine LOQ is less than or equal to the PTRL listed.

Footnote 8: The TNI DW FoPT Table includes E. coli along with Fecal Coliforms; the Criteria Document just has Fecal Coliforms. The Criteria Document specifies “atypical colonies” that will not verify as total or fecal coliforms, but the TNI DW FoPT Table just says “negative results.” However, DW FoPT Table Footnote 9 will ensure that a non-target organism is included.

Footnote 9: Criteria Document says that the 10-sample set (Microbiology) should have 3 with E. coli, 3 with Total Coliform positives but Fecal Coliform negatives, 2 with nontarget organisms, and 2 blanks. The TNI DW FoPT Table is more variable and specifies 2-4, 2-4, 1-2, and 1-2, respectively.

Footnote 10: The Criteria Document and TNI DW FoPT Table express the wording
differently, but the requirements are essentially the same.

Footnote 11: There are no specifications for quantitative Microbiology PTs in the Criteria Document.

Footnote 12: There are no specifications for quantitative Microbiology PTs in the Criteria Document.

Footnote 13: The Criteria Document does not specify whether chlorinated acid herbicides are supplied in the acid or ester form (with the exception of 2,4-D). Footnote 13e in the TNI DW FoPT Table specifies the recommended PT formulation criteria for 2,4-D that matches the recommendation in the Criteria Document. Footnote 13d recommends the acid form for the other PT herbicides. All other PT formulation recommendations in the TNI DW FoPT Table match the recommendations in the Criteria Document.

Footnote 14: There is no equivalent requirement specified in the Criteria Document. However, these TNI DW FoPT requirements conform to US EPA regulations at 40 CFR Part 141.131(b)(2).

Footnote 15: The Criteria Document only lists “Total Xylenes” and does not contain any requirements for the 3 individual isomers.

Respectfully submitted,
Carl Kircher, Chair, Chem FoPT Subcommittee
904-791-1574

The committee reviewed the information in Carl’s email and looked for any needed modifications to the DW FoPT table.

Footnote 1:

Michella noted that if you have 1-10 analytes you cannot assign a “0” value, but if you have 20 or more you can. Andy added that many PTs contain numerous unregulated analytes because states require them. There are both regulated and unregulated analytes in PTs. The unregulated do not count towards the numbers (1-10 or more than 20).

Ron reminded everyone that all the regulated volatiles must be reported for the PT – even those with “0” value.

Michelle noted that there is a requirement that you must run a PT for Vinyl Chloride, so this analyte can never be left out. It has to have a non-zero value. She also prefers the use of “should” instead of “shall”, but this language needs to stay as written because it is from the standard.
Carl noted that perhaps Volume 3 of the standard can be changed to require spiking of everything and not give the option of percentages. Maria noted that not all PT providers spike everything.

Nicole asked if the footnote needs to be written more clearly to note that there are regulated and unregulated analytes and how the footnote applies to regulated analytes. Carl was concerned that this could not be done without causing confusion. It might also cause changes in which analytes are in each PT. This may cause the need for more PTs which increases costs for labs and PT providers.

If the EPA Criteria Document is OK with non-spiked analytes outside of Vinyl Chloride, maybe that should be noted. Leave it as it has been, but note Vinyl Chloride cannot have a “0” value.

The requirement for Vinyl Chloride to not be “0” is in the regulations and not in the EPA Criteria Document. It states the lab must achieve quantitative results within +/- 40% of the amount in the sample. EPA considers this statement to mean it has to be present. Michella offered to have an EPA attorney look at this and confirm this interpretation.

Michella noted that the wording in Footnote 1 is fine.

The committee decided to hold on a final decision about Footnote 1 until Michella gets feedback from the attorney.

Footnote 2, 3: No change.

Footnote 4,5,6,7: OK

Footnote 8,9: OK

Footnote 10: OK

Footnote 11, 12, 13: OK

Footnote 14: OK

Footnote 15: OK

5. Subcommittee Updates

FOPT Table Format Subcommittee

They met yesterday.

WET Testing FoPT Subcommittee
See above. Maria spoke to Rami last Tuesday and will work with Aaren to find a solution.

Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee:

The Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee is continuing to review SCM analytes. The group is now working on Pesticides.

SOP Subcommittee

Stacie updated the SOP the subcommittee has been working on to ensure all comments have been included. The next meeting will be in December.

6. New Business

- Eric noted that comments are coming from the Policy Committee on the SOPs that were submitted to them for review. These comments will go to Maria and Ilona. They will review the comments for any issues that need to be discussed by the PTPEC before they go back to the SOP Subcommittee. The PTPEC may need to give some guidance to the subcommittee before they can begin to update these.

- Michella asked to talk about EPA Lab ID Codes. The person handling Lab ID codes has retired after 50 years of service and they have no one to replace him at this point. They have temporarily stopped issuing federal lab IDs. She has sent out a request for impact to the PT providers, but has not heard anything back. She is now asking this committee for impact if EPA stops issuing these IDs. Is there something in TNI’s standard that requires it?

The state Drinking Water programs have said that they need the ID.

What is the need for it and what is the impact of dropping it to TNI?

Maria noted that she will be talking about this during the TNI IT Committee meeting. TNI may be able to pick-up this task. Michella noted that she thinks they will only be continuing to offer IDs to new DW only labs. They may need the numbers for the Safe Drinking Water Information System (SDWIS) in the future. Maria will get back to Michella.

Nicole asked for clarification that this is only about laboratory IDs – not analyte IDs. Michella confirmed.
Ron Houck asked a question about a Fecal Coliform PT. He received PT results from a provider for fecal coliform in Non-Potable water. The assigned value was 294 CFU/100 mL, and the acceptance range was 0-844 CFU/100 mL. His question was, how can the lower limit of an acceptance range be 0 CFU/100 mL if the PTRL for this FOPT is 2 CFU/100 mL?

Carl commented that he agreed with Ron’s concern. Nicole commented that this is a PT Provider issue and this question needs to go to the PT Provider. There was agreement.

7. Action Items

- See Attachment B.
- Complaints are still being addressed.

8. Next Meeting

The next teleconference will be December 18, 2014 at 1pm ET.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 2:33pm EST. Nicole motioned, Andy seconded. Unanimously approved.
### Attachment A

**Participants**

**TNI Proficiency Testing Program Executive Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stacie Metzler (2009)</td>
<td>Present HRSD</td>
<td>757-460-4217 <a href="mailto:smetzler@hrsd.com">smetzler@hrsd.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Friedman (2014)</td>
<td>Present TestAmerica</td>
<td>949-260-3201 <a href="mailto:mariam.friedman@testamericainc.com">mariam.friedman@testamericainc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilona Taunton,</td>
<td>Present TNI</td>
<td>828-712-9242 <a href="mailto:tauntoni@msn.com">tauntoni@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Smith (2010)</td>
<td>Present ALS Environmental</td>
<td>904-394-4415 <a href="mailto:eric.smith@alsglobal.com">eric.smith@alsglobal.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Brown (2011)</td>
<td>Absent Environmental Monitoring and Technologies, Inc.</td>
<td>847-875-2271 <a href="mailto:jbrown@emt.com">jbrown@emt.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Butts (2012)</td>
<td>Present South Carolina DHEC</td>
<td>(803)896-0978 <a href="mailto:buttsse@dhec.sc.gov">buttsse@dhec.sc.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Brumfield (2012)</td>
<td>Absent Sigma-Aldrich RTC</td>
<td>(307) 721-5488 <a href="mailto:Pat.Brumfield@sial.com">Pat.Brumfield@sial.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michella Karapondo (2011)</td>
<td>Present USEPA</td>
<td>513-569-7141 <a href="mailto:karapondo.michella@epa.gov">karapondo.michella@epa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Cairns (2012)</td>
<td>Present NY State DOH</td>
<td>(518) 473-0323 <a href="mailto:nicole.cairns@health.ny.gov">nicole.cairns@health.ny.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Pardue (2011)</td>
<td>Present Pro2Serve, Inc.</td>
<td>423-337-3121 <a href="mailto:joe_pardue@charter.net">joe_pardue@charter.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Andy Valkenburg (2011)</td>
<td>Present Energy Laboratories, Inc.</td>
<td>406-869-6254 <a href="mailto:avalkenburg@energylab.com">avalkenburg@energylab.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Houck</td>
<td>Present PA DEP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rhouck@pa.gov">rhouck@pa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Sica</td>
<td>Absent ACLASS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:msica@anab-aclass.org">msica@anab-aclass.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment B

### Action Items – TNI PT Executive Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Expected Completion</th>
<th>Actual Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Stacie</td>
<td>4/1/12</td>
<td>Stacie submitted this. Need to confirm approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Carl Stacie</td>
<td>Next Meeting</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Ilona Maria</td>
<td>4/15/14</td>
<td>See Action Item #249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Maria Ilona</td>
<td>5/14/14</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Ilona</td>
<td>7/16/14</td>
<td>10/16:Dixie suggested contacts. Maria to follow-up with Jerry to see if need is still there. 11/20/14: Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>9/11/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Expected Completion</td>
<td>Actual Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248 Contact Stacie to check on status of the SOP Subcommittee.</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>10/6/14</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249 Meet with PTPAs to discuss issues surrounding receiving data for FoPT Limit Updates and complaints. Determine if issue exists and whether subcommittee is needed to address this issue.</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>11/13/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 Contact Stacie about expediting work in SOP Subcommittee so the PTPEC can respond to PT Expert Committee comments. Also provide feedback about looking at prep methods and collecting information on methods.</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>10/30/14</td>
<td>Complete (Though Stacie is stepping out of Chair role for this subcommittee.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251 Follow-up with Rami to provide support to solve footnote issue on WET FoPT Table.</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>10/30/14</td>
<td>Still in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252 Set-up meeting with Aaron (NELAP AC) to discuss approving the WET FoPT Table as is.</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>12/5/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253 Check with EPA attorney on requirement that Vinyl Chloride cannot be “0”.</td>
<td>Michella</td>
<td>12/15/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254 Review PT SOP comments by the Policy Committee and add to agenda as appropriate.</td>
<td>Maria Ilona</td>
<td>12/15/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255 Get back to Michella regarding Lab IDs.</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>12/15/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Meeting Reference</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3/4/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5-19-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8-6-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2/20/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Item 7:** Add the Field PT Subcommittee to the limit update SOP during its next update.

**Item 11:** Evaluate how labs are accredited for analytes that co-elute.

**Item 12:** PTPA Evaluation Checklist needs to be updated prior to next round of evaluations.

**Item 13:** Charter needs to be updated in November.

**Item 14:** When new limits are established for the FoPTs, what is considered to be a statistically significant change to the old rates? At what point is it appropriate to question new limits? This lends to the TSS discussion a few months ago.

Patrick commented that it would make sense to look at changes to pass/fail rates 6 months after new limits are effective. This possible addition to procedures should be evaluated when updating the limit acceptance SOP.

3/20/14: Eric noted that there are some logistics with doing a 6 month review. This may need to be a separate committee so it does not hamper the progress of the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee.