

## **Magruder Committee Meeting – Draft Minutes**

2023 Winter Annual Meeting - Santa Fe, NM

2/14/2023

Meeting called to order at 2:40 pm

Meeting Agenda – Motion to approve-Sharon Webb with Second-Kevin Sapp - Motion passed

Minutes – Motion to approve-Sharon Webb Second—Kevin Sapp- Motion passed

### **Treasurers' Report – Matt Pearson**

Matt Pearson gave the Treasurer's Report. Frank Sikora shared the report on the screen that Matt had sent out a couple days ago. (see Magruder statement as of February 11, 2023). Net revenue is (\$28,412.38) with \$48,346.50 payment from FASS = \$19,934.12. January bill from FASS is \$1,461.90

Frank asked where the shipping cost information is located. Matt said that it probably hasn't been moved over from the AAPFCO side yet. Sharon Webb asked what Membership Services is related to. Bill Hall asked if sample prep is in here (Able Labs)? Matt said it is. Frank asked to have sample prep separated out. Bill asked about how much money is in the bank (would be a good separate report). Matt looked it up and checking is \$82,584.01, CD is \$63,121.13 CD and savings is \$6,655.22.

Motion to accept Treasurer's Report by Sharon Webb and James Bartos seconded – Motion passed

Bill Hall said based on these amounts, we should prepare for a statistical analysis of this Magruder data. Create a small working group for some contract statistical analysis.

### **Administration Update – Frank Sikora/Job Fugice**

- a. New N, P and K samples schemes
- b. Number of labs enrolled
- c. Paid vs. unpaid labs
- d. Scheduled samples
- e. Method codes

Frank Sikora provided an administrative section update (see presentation document). Included graphs for the # of labs reporting in Regular Scheme, the # of labs reporting in the nutrient schemes, # of paid labs vs enrollment year (currently low but its early in the year), # of paid labs in the different schemes, income vs. expenses (including breakdown from where income is coming from with respect to the different schemes). Frank shared the samples spreadsheet and said that Job Fugice is doing a great job with the samples. On Frank's to do list, would like to convert method code list from pdf to xlsx and get FASS update for selecting reference materials on-line.

Discussion: Bill Hall mentioned the high micro sample that will have a duplicate in the future. Regarding the labs that aren't doing the nutrient schemes this year, Bill asked if we picked up industry labs that decided to go for the regular scheme. Frank said last year they did both and this year only one. Sharon Webb asked if we've lost any labs from the middle east (one from Ukraine).

Question on # of labs that paid vs did not submit data, how does that compare? Are those the labs that didn't pay this year? Frank said you never get 100% participation, it's usually 70-80%. Also is it consistent? James Bartos asked if the silicon product will contain anything other than silicon? Frank is not sure; will look into it and get with Job. It does have other nutrients with it. Bill Hall said just one other comment, Andy wants to run the duplicate close to the first one but these don't degrade. Bill is bringing this up for Sharon's purposes to fill data gaps without having to wait until 2024 (to help move the micronutrient data validation along). Sharon asked for everyone to encourage their labs to do the 2017 method for their analysis to have more data. Bill asked if there is anything labs can do if they miss the reporting period? Frank said not for the regular scheme but the samples are still available. Frank also suggested to Sharon that she could contact the labs that signed up for running the method. Bill also said he used the SUIP worksheet to calculate what he decided to put in there, for example, lead was at different levels based on what he used. Not sure if these calculations are all correct but we may see some really high levels. It was asked if we need to alert the labs (to let them know that it may have a high concentration of non-nutritive metals). Frank will contact Able Labs to see if there are any other considerations.

#### **Updates to LabPortal and web payment method – Frank Sikora**

#### **Magruder Newsletter – Frank Sikora/Sally Flowers**

Frank Sikora shared the due date for articles from 2/21/23 (see document)

Status of 'f' (Tips and Techniques for N via combustion) and 'g' (Methods Forum over the years) was discussed. These are due in a week. Suggestion to put the quality one in the summer 2023.

#### **Assessing Lab Community Performance with respect to Investigational Allowances – Frank Sikora, James Bartos and Peng Li**

#### **"Evaluating Magruder NPK data against Investigational Allowances – Part 2" – Frank Sikora, KY**

Discussion: Wendy Zellner said from an analysis standpoint you have multi-variant data. Have you done anything to tease out some of the details, is it a method issue, or is it all encompassing? Frank Sikora said the first goal is to see where the broad data is (the variability is). Plan is to look at it in a principle component model to see what it looks like. Greg Olsen also volunteered to look at it from the statistical standpoint. Beatrice Pardo from True Organic Products volunteered to work on this as well. Bill Hall asked about the deficient/excessive graphs and said he noticed there are none with zero. Frank said there are some but they are not shown here. James Bartos (referring to relating it to Horwitz), asked if he planned to have 2 different calculations but Frank said it may be Horwitz (for Fit for Purpose). Use Horwitz to calculate z-score. Also, using the original study, labs prepared the sample. Wondering if there were some non real world scenarios in the original study (picked the labs, etc.). Greg said the initial concept for IA is an uncertainty component sum, deviation would have an uncertainty; might be a reason why z-score is calculated off of. Greg said the uncertainty budget isn't the same as the deviation between values. Frank said he wondered, did the original data just look at uncertainty?

James said if you follow this trend, the IA for P&K would increase significantly. Frank said that could happen but the first step is to communicate this to the labs. Greater variability is greater than our IAs. Bill said from an industry perspective, wouldn't be for widening the road; need to find out why this is happening. Need to make sure labs realize how poorly they are performing. Frank asked where else

should we go with this? Bill proposed sending letters to labs that are underperforming at some cut off point. Sharon Webb suggested sending it to their regulatory side too. Bill said there is no action that we can make them take. Discussed effect for labs getting accredited. Sharon shared some ideas for asking questions to help themselves. Ask them to do an internal audit with some guidance. If not, go outside. If Frank sends a letter, he will get follow up on how to fix this. Needs a plan for what to advise them. James said that we proposed this before, and most folks were opposed to it. Could try to contact the lab folks first; then go to a higher level if needed. A compromise would be to try to go to the labs first; then go to the higher up. Bill suggested to send a letter to everyone and then automate, here are your scores. Please look into these to see if there is anything you need to do. Discussed a motion that we should contact the labs and meet later to discuss this further.

James Bartos made a motion that we make labs aware that we are using other indicators for quality assessment and are going to bring those (results and lower z scores) to their attention; for decision making purposes. Motion seconded by Bill Hall.

Discussion: Need to be careful as to whether you are assessing the lab or the method. The difference could be more a difference in the quality or the difference in the method. Frank said that there could be differences due to methods but it is difficult to see that its from a method difference. Bill said this leads us back to the statistical data study that we discussed. Frank said maybe we should do this before we send the letter. Frank said to add that we are further analyzing this by method. Need to get a working group together to draft this letter and work on this.

Working group members: James Bartos, Bill Hall, Sharon Webb, Wendy Zellner, Greg Olson, and Beatrice Pardo.

Motion passed.

### **Survey on methods used for K – Frank Sikora**

Update: Frank Sikora sent out a survey last year and found that 40% of labs are reporting 'other'. Frank asked James Bartos if Peng Li would be interested in looking at the info from the survey. James said yes as long as the info is available. Sharon Webb said she would look at the survey responses as well.

### **New Topics**

Motion to adjourn- James Bartos Second-Bill Hall - Motion passed

Meeting adjourned at 5 pm