Minutes from 2/29/12 Meeting for Protozoa FoPT subcommittee;

Conference Call Attendees:

Phillip Briggs	*Lisa McDonald*
Jim Broderick	*Stacie Metzler*
Po Chang	*Carrie Miller*
Carl Kircher	*Eric Smith*
Becky Hoffman	*Steve Via*
Shawn Kessner	*Leah Villegas*
Tricia Klonicki	

Discussions:

1.) Opened for comments on the previous discussion to determine if *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* should be treated as separate analytes.
   - Leah stated that discussions with Carrie Miller and others within the EPA team have determined that the EPA regulation and approval is only for *Cryptosporidium*, not *Giardia*. *Giardia* is a separate analyte.
   - Several committee members agreed with this statement that the organisms are separate analytes, and a PT fail of one does not impact the other.

2.) Discussed if *Giardia* should be included on the table, since the LT2 regulation is for *Cryptosporidium*.
   - Steve Via expressed concerns that regulations may be inferred or mistakes might be made to include both analytes together
   - Jim, Shawn, Carl and Po agreed that *Giardia* is a separate analyte and should remain on the chart
   - Carl mentioned that his State accreditates laboratories for *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* as part of 1623, not *Cryptosporidium* only
   - Carrie mentioned that the EPA lab approval program is for *Cryptosporidium* only and it is up to the States to make determinations about *Giardia*
   - Steve was concerned about State implementation and if we had enough data to support the table
   - Leah mentioned that the *Giardia* data given to the committee supports the values provided in the table.

3.) Discussed if an additional footnote is needed to clarify that a round with a mean below 20% is deemed invalid
   - It was clarified that the footnotes 17 - 19 referred to the assigned value of the spike and not the mean of the round.
   - The Australia PT program is a 6-month frequency with 10 -110% range

- Stacie raised concern, was a lab in compliance if they participated in a PT Round that was deemed invalid because of the quality of the organisms
- Becky Hoffman responded that if a Round is deemed invalid she as the PT provider would resend the PT samples (how a "make-up" round impacts laboratory accreditation needs clarification from the accreditation agency)
- Many of the questions raised are administrative and not for footnotes
- Acceptance or not of a PT study round is up to the PT provider. This is explained in Volume 3 of the TNI PT Standards
- An additional footnote is not necessary since it is redundant to the Standard

4.) Clarification is needed as to whether this is a new FoPT table or if it is proposed to add to the existing drinking water tables.
    - The subcommittee is proposing a to add Cryptosporidium and Giardia as analytes to the existing drinking water FoPT table

5.) Is EPA looking for a full quality system or interested in using TNI PT Standards (Does the *Cryptosporidium* program need a separate Standard)?
    - Determined that the TNI PT program meets EPAs PT needs for LT2

<u>Vote</u>:

- Motion: Shaw Kessner: Move to accept proposed table and footnotes without the EPA code
- 2nd: Carl Kircher
- Roll Call Vote: 8-For, 5 Abstains

Phillip Briggs-	*A*	*Lisa McDonald-*	Y
Jim Broderick-	*Y*	*Stacie Metzler-*	A
Po Chang-	*Y*	*Carrie Miller-*	A
Carl Kircher-	Y	*Eric Smith-*	A
Becky Hoffman-	Y	*Steve Via-*	A
Shawn Kessner-	Y	*Leah Villegas-*	Y
Tricia Klonicki-	Y		

Motion Passes: Congratulations on all the hard work. The table listed below will be presented to the TNI PT Executive Committee for consideration to inclusion in the TNI Drinking Fields of Proficiency Table. Eric asked that we forward the table along with our previous recommendations to the Standards committee listed below.

Meeting Adjourned and Subcommittee work complete

Recommendations to Standards Committee:

1. PT frequency will remain two times a year.
2. Because the acceptance criteria is based on the mean and standard deviation of participating laboratories in each round, a PT provider must have a reasonable number of laboratories participating in the PT round. We suggest that a PT provider have a SOP describing how to develop acceptance criteria on a small data set.
3. PT Provider should be using a random number generator for spike values.

Approved FoPT Table and footnotes:

Matrix	NELAC Code	Analyte	Conc. Range	Acceptance Criteria	NELAC PTRL
Drinking Water	2510	Cryptosporidium	50-200	Mean +/- 2SD (footnotes 17, 18, 19)	Not Applicable
Drinking Water	2545	Giardia	50-200	Mean +/- 2SD (footnotes 17, 18, 19)	Not Applicable

Footnotes:

17) If the lower acceptance limit generated for Cryptosporidium or Giardia using the criteria contained in this table is less than (<) 10% of the assigned value, the lower acceptance limits are set at 10% of the assigned value.

18) If the lower acceptance limit generated for Cryptosporidium or Giardia using the criteria contained in this table is greater than (>) 60% of the assigned value, the lower acceptance limits are set at 60% of the assigned value.

19) If the upper acceptance limit generated for Cryptosporidium or Giardia using the criteria contained in this table is less than (<) 105% of the assigned value, the upper acceptance limits are set at 105% of the assigned value.