SUMMARY OF THE
TNI CHEMISTRY EXPERT COMMITTEE MEETING

JANUARY 24, 2017

The Committee met at the Forum on Laboratory Accreditation, Houston, TX, on Tuesday, January 24, 2017, at 1:00 pm CST. Chair Valerie Slaven led the meeting.

1 – Roll call

Richard Burrows, Test America (Lab)	Present
Francoise Chauvin, NYC DEP (Lab)	Present (by phone)
Eric Davis, Austin Water Utility (Lab)	Present
Deb Gaynor, Phoenix Chemistry Services (Other)	Present (by phone)
Shawn Kassner, Neptune (Other)	Present
Scott Siders, PDC Labs (Lab)	Present
Valerie Slaven, Teklab (Lab)	Present
Gale Warren, NYSDOH (Accreditation Body)	Absent
Colin Wright, Florida DEP (Lab)	Present
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present

It was noted that representatives from most of the NELAP Accreditation Bodies were in the room

2 – Introduction

Valerie welcomed the participants and the Committee members introduced themselves. The agenda was to approve editorial changes to Volume 1 Module 4; to address unresolved issues from the Accreditation Council; and to consider how the module should address its reference to the new EPA Method Detection Limit if 40 CFR part 136 was not published.

3 – Editorial Changes

Valerie described the following editorial changes made by the Committee:

a. changing MDL to DL;

b. in the initial DL determination, adding that at least one replicate must be analyzed on each individual instrument;

c. in Section 1.7.1, removing the unnecessary statement that calibrations may be performed at the instrumental level or the method level.

4 – Unresolved Issues from the Accreditation Council Members

a. There is no spiking solution available for Total Suspended Solids (Section 1.5.2.1)

Paul Junio said that was there originally because a detection limit (DL) study was not required for a physical parameter, so he thought striking "such as total suspended solids" would then make it a requirement for a DL study. However, Richard thought not, since EPA says it "may" be needed. Aaren Alger said it would be acceptable to remove the phrase. Bill Hall said a laboratory must meet a client's data quality objectives that may require Limit of Quantification (LOQ) verification for solids. It was subsequently moved by Shawn and seconded by Richard to remove the phrase "such as total suspended solids". All were in favor.

b. The LOQ must be at least 3 times the DL (Section 1.5.2.1.3)

The major problem with this requirement was that some drinking water analytes would have an LOQ that was too high. However, Aaren Alger had met with an EPA Office of Water representative who said they would allow data to be qualified if this requirement remained in the standard. She said she would ask the other AC memebrs if they would be agreeable to this. Valerie tabled the item pending that feedback.

c. Ongoing verification of the LOQ is only qualitative (Section 1.5.2.2.2)

Ken Jackson explained adding a quantitative requirement would be a substantive (not editorial) change that could not be made to the 2016 standard. A new standard would be required. Richard explained why the committee had decided not to include a quantitative requirement. They could not put in specific limits, because they did not know what the performance would be at the LOQ. A lot of analytical data would have to be collected for this. Therefore, the committee favored a phased approach to get the data and allow laboratories to determine the performance they could achieve. Valerie summarized the questions that should be addressed: what the consequences are for adding acceptability requirements; what happens if verification fails; whether it is looked at by analyte or method; and what the committee's intent is for the qualitiative requirement listed in the initial LOQ section. Bill Hall said the New Hampshire accreditation program would have no problem allowing laboratories to come up with temporary limits until they have established in-house limits. Aaren Alger stressed there must be acceptance criteria and the laboratory must do corrective action if it fails. She said it is only necessary to require a laboratory to establish limits. A wording change from "qualitative" to "quantitative" would be needed. Richard suggested treating it like a laboratory control sample (LCS). If it fails in a batch, corrective action is required. Besides changing "qualitative" to "quantitative", he said corrective action could be changed to be like a LCS. Ken Lancaster said corrective action must determine if it is a random error or a systematic error over time. Carl Kircher suggested just eliminating "qualitative".

5 – Action to be taken if 40 CFR part 136 was not published.

Dan Hautman (USEPA) said it is halted, but speculated it would be published within 6 months. Richard said Module 4 refers to the new MDL in 40 CFR part 136, and depends on it. The DL language could be made consistent and appropriate. Then if the new MDL gets published in the meantime, that language could be removed. Valerie said that reference should then be removed from the 2016 standard. Richard favored putting the new MDL procedure into the standard, and Shawn agreed. There was further discussion, and no definitive action was agreed on.

6 – Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 om CST.