

**SUMMARY OF THE  
TNI CHEMISTRY EXPERT COMMITTEE MEETING**

**MARCH 13, 2015**

The Committee held a conference call on Friday, March 13, 2015, at 2:00 pm EST. Chair Richard Burrows led the meeting.

**1 – Roll call**

Richard Burrows, Test America (Lab)	Present
Francoise Chauvin, NYC DEP (Lab)	Present
Brooke Connor (Other)	Present
Gale Warren, NYSDOH (Accreditation Body)	Present
Colin Wright, Florida DEP (Lab)	Present
JD Gentry, ESC (Lab)	Present
Nancy Grams, Advanced Earth Technologists, Inc. (Other)	Present
Anand Mudambi, USEPA (Other)	Absent
John Phillips, Ford Motor Co. (Other)	Present
Scott Siders, IL DEP (Accreditation Body)	Absent
Gary Ward, OR DPH (Accreditation Body)	Present
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present

Associate Committee Members present: Arthur Denny; Dan Dickinson; Tom Dziedzic; Reed Jeffery; Diana Shannon; Marilyn Slaven.

**2 – Previous Minutes**

It was moved by Nancy and seconded by Brooke to approve the minutes of February 27, 2015. All were in favor, except Francoise who abstained.

**3 – Detection/Quantitation WDS**

Richard summarized the answers to the “big” comments from the January meeting in Crystal City.

1. Should we make the new EPA MDL mandatory for determining the TNI LOD (in the absence of method or regulatory constraints to the contrary)? Most people seemed to think this would not be a good idea.
2. Should we change the name of the LOD to the MDL? There was a sense people wanted to change it to MDL or DL.

3. Should 3x LOD be the minimum criterion for LOQ? What are the benefits of that and what are the alternatives? What were the pros and cons of alternatives? There was no real consensus this was a good idea, but neither were there strong feelings for anything else. Richard noted in the Methods Update Rule, EPA seems to have resurrected the ML as 3xMDL.
4. Should LOD be required if not reporting below LOQ? What were the pros and cons? If not, what alternative criterion would be best for LOQ? Richard thought a RSD criterion would be best, but no clear feeling was received from the audience.
5. What is the best language to convey when LOD/LOQ needs to be repeated in the event of a change in methodology or instrument sensitivity? There was no general consensus here, though there was agreement something as clear as possible was needed. Changes in instrument sensitivity should be differentiated from method sensitivity.
6. Do we need more clarification for gravimetric, titrimetric, colorimetric methods? It should be made consistent with LCS. Steve Arms offered to share a list they use in Florida.

The committee then worked through the draft standard.

**1.5.2.1 Limit of Detection (LOD)** Richard said one option is to use the spike blanks required for verification of the LOQ to calculate an LOD following the EPA MDL procedure. Most people at the Crystal City meeting wanted to just present the new EPA MDL procedure as an option, and not to mandate it. There was some concern about making it clear the EPA MDL procedure should only be the new one, and John suggested specifying the use of both blanks and spiked blanks to preclude the old procedure. The first paragraph was discussed and word-smithed.

Colin volunteered to work on the language of subsection (a). In subsection (b) Françoise mentioned that MDL, which is listed as exempted, is needed for turbidity in Standards Methods, though TNI does not have to require it. The next subsection (also labeled (b)) could remain, being non-controversial. In subsection (c) (that would be re-labeled (d)) it was discussed under what circumstances the LOD would be repeated. Richard added some language and asked participants to consider it. Subsection (d) (to be re-labeled (e)) was not resolved.

The committee discussed the question whether LOD should be required if not reporting below the LOQ. Nancy suggested everyone should have to do an initial LOD, but questioned if it had to be continually verified if the laboratory is not reporting below the LOQ. Richard believed laboratories should have to do an LOD, and reminded everyone the way LOQ is written, a laboratory will have all the data needed to calculate an LOD. Nancy added having an initial LOD would allow a laboratory to make sure the LOQ remains at least 3 times higher.

**Limit of Quantitation (LOQ)** The first paragraph discussed where it was not required, and Colin would look at this language to see where it is not required. The only other point raised was a comment Nancy had on 1.5.2.2.2 (d), and she said she would suggest wording.

There was some discussion whether the name of the LOD should be changed, with Nancy suggesting DL. John said most people liked MDL, but there would be a problem if people were to determine it by a

different technique. Gale suggested TNI MDL to differentiate it from the EPA MDL. Richard said he would add this to the list of questions for the committee to consider before the next call.

#### **4 – Review Assignments**

Reed volunteered to review editorial changes to the calibration standard before the next call, and to incorporate them where needed. John and Marilyn would look through the comments on detection/quantitation to check if anything important had been missed.

#### **5 – Next Calls**

The committee would meet next on March 20 to discuss comments to send to EPA on the new MDL procedure. The next meeting after that would be April 2 to review the detection/quantitation language that was being generated as a result of the present call.

#### **6 – Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 pm EST.