

Lab Subcommittee Meeting
June 15, 2010

- A. New Chair of Lab Subcommittee
 - a. This is Bob Ireland's second year as chair of the lab subcommittee
 - b. Subcommittee decides that each person should be chair for two years, because there is some learning curve involved and a longer term will help preserve continuity
 - c. Responsibilities as chair
 - i. The subcommittee chair collects data for 3 studies – turnaround time, transit time, reproducibility
 - ii. The chair reviews subcommittee agendas
 - iii. The chair runs meetings
 - iv. The chair serves on the National Chlamydia Lab Committee, and will have to participate in these meetings by phone
 - d. The first half of the rotation goes in the following order: Eunice, Gary and Bob
 - e. Arthur Kazianis will be the next subcommittee chair beginning July 2010
 - f. After Arthur serves as subcommittee chair, Carol Loring or Jemelie Bessette will serve as subcommittee chair

- B. Turnaround Time Study
 - a. Bob collected all data for the study
 - b. Everyone, except one specimen, fell within the required timeline – therefore, Region I labs are clearly meeting that objective
 - c. Individual state data are also included in the study report
 - d. The data is collected differently in each state
 - i. The data is not difficult to correlate as long as everyone completes the summary piece; the summary data makes it easier to compile data
 - ii. A template should be developed for everyone to use, this would make it easier – everyone agrees that this is a good idea; can then cut and paste the data in to the template
 - iii. Arthur will choose one of the state templates and send it out to all lab subcommittee members (it should be in Excel so that they can use formulas)

- C. Transit Time Study
 - a. The ME data is included in the study, but it is an addendum, because it was submitted after the deadline (i.e. it is not included in overall analysis)
 - b. The VT aggregate data is not included, because of a miscommunication between VT and Bob, though it was in the guidelines

- c. All states are, for the most part, in the same range (i.e. within the transit time guidelines)
- d. CT had a transit time issue: it is difficult to identify specimens that have arrived at the building, but are not yet in the lab itself
 - i. In other states, transit time is marked at the end using the date the specimen arrives at the building, not the date it arrives at the lab
 - ii. CT has identified the offenders as those that take at least 7 days; Gary personally called them
 - iii. Only one CT site uses mail; otherwise, the sites use a courier
 - iv. Gary found that the pick-ups for some sites only occurred once a week (as opposed to more regularly in other states)
 - v. In some cases, sites have been in direct contact with the courier to determine pick-up dates/frequencies
 - vi. Specimen collection is a bit of a challenge with high schools, because high schools do not necessarily have specimens frequently, so the specimens do not get picked up regularly
 - vii. The results of this study will inform the offenders letter
 - 1. The subcommittee is considering targeting programs that impede treatment within 14 days of specimen collection (which is the guideline)
 - viii. The numbers get skewed when there are holidays, i.e. specimens are in the lab, but are not entered in the system
- e. NH is confident that the percentage of specimens anticipated to arrive at the lab within the specified transit time target will be lower than last year, because the lab lost its courier this year
 - i. It will be important to look at this study next year as a basis for comparison
 - ii. Other couriers in NH are working for private labs
 - iii. It is up to the sites to set up courier arrangements; labs have encouraged the sites to do that
- f. What do states use as their “date received” measure?
 - i. NH, VT and RI all measure the “date received” as the date the specimen arrives at central receiving
 - ii. MA measures “date received” as the date the specimen is processed in the lab; i.e. specimens are not time stamped until they get to lab, but almost all samples are processed the same date they arrive at central receiving
 - iii. What does the subcommittee want to consider “date received”, i.e. should there be a consensus around this measure?
 - 1. Subcommittee members indicate that “date received” should probably be the date the specimen arrives at the building, however they acknowledge that this measure will probably continue to vary by state

2. There is a discrepancy regarding whether the time it takes for the specimen to travel from central receiving to the lab is considered transit time or processing/turnaround time
 - a. VT considers it processing time
 - b. All other states consider it transit time
 - c. Between the two studies, the time is getting covered somewhere (i.e. either under transit time or processing time) – therefore, in a way it does not matter

D. Combining Transit Time and Turnaround Time Studies

- a. For future studies, the subcommittee should select a time period that reflects shut-down days, long weekends, etc. (i.e. not choose a time period that intentionally excludes these)
- b. Subcommittee members decide to do the turnaround and transit time studies over same period of time – for the entire month or a minimum of 500 specimens, starting on February 1st and August 1st
 - i. The subcommittee will discuss the February study at the June meeting
 - ii. The subcommittee will discuss the August study at the November meeting
- c. Objectives 3.2 (95% turnaround time within 3 working days from receipt of specimen in lab to reported results) and 3.3 (60% of sample specimens will be received in the lab within 3 calendar days from date of specimen collection; 95% will be received within 6 calendar days of date of specimen collection)
 - i. While these two objectives remain stated as individual objectives, in practice they will be monitored by two studies
 - ii. The purpose is to ensure that there is sufficient time between specimen collection and result reporting to ensure that treatment begins within the guidelines of Objective 3.1
- d. Look for trends from collection date to report date to ensure that the programs have enough time to be able to meet the 14 day treatment guideline
- e. Bob will take the collated data from this year and last year and send it out to the group for review
 - i. Members should make note of any extenuating circumstances that contributed to falling outside guidelines

E. Reproducibility Study

- a. The subcommittee determines that this study is no longer needed
- b. The numbers for this study have not changed at all

F. Implementing Routine Repeat Testing

- a. The labs will wait until the official guidelines come out to determine the routine for repeat testing

G. Offenders letter

- a. Arthur and Bob will work on the offenders letter together

H. Discussion of Specimens

- a. NH is using rectal specimens for CT only
- b. CT is looking into the possibility of using rectal specimens
 - i. Gary will contact NH to get their old specimens for pilot testing

I. Positives

- a. NH now faxes positives to clinics and clinics like receiving this data via fax
- b. Some states find that it is good to call sites and inform them of positives
- c. Fax/mail can be problematic, because it is possible that the paper will get lost or trashed